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ABSTRACT

The eighteenth century witnessed the proliferation of voluntary associations throughout the British-Atlantic world. These voluntary associations consisted of groups of men with common interests, backgrounds, or beliefs that were willing to pool their resources in order to achieve a common goal. Enlightenment Scotland was home to large numbers of clubs ranging from small social clubs to large national institutions. The records of these societies suggest that most, if not all, of the men who formed them believed that defining and performing Scottish identity was important to preserving the social and cultural traditions of Scottishness in the absence of state institutions. These patriotic associations followed Scots across the Atlantic and provided the model for similar clubs in the American colonies.

This thesis examines the construction and performance of Scottish identity by Scottish clubs in Scotland and America from c. 1750-1832. It, in contrast to the existing historiography of Scottish identity, asserts that associations were vehicles through which Scottish identity was constructed, expressed, and performed on both sides of the Atlantic. It demonstrates that clubs provided Scots with the tools to manufacture identities that were malleable enough to adapt within a wide variety of political and cultural environments. This was particularly important in a period that witnessed major political disruption in the shape of the American and French Revolutions.

By directly comparing Scottish societies in both Scotland and America, the thesis also reassesses and revises common attitudes about the relationship between Scottish identities at home and in the wider diaspora. Often seen as distinct entities, this thesis emphasises the similarities in the construction of Scottish identity, even in divergent national contexts. Drawing on a variety of sources ranging from rulebooks, minute books, and published transactions to memoirs, newspaper articles, letters, and even material goods, this thesis reveals that the Scottish identity constructed and performed by associations in America was no less ‘Scottish’ than that formulated in Scotland, indeed it paralleled and built upon the practices and attitudes developed in the home country. It rested on the same foundation, yet followed a different political trajectory as a result of the differing environment in which it was expressed and the different communities of Scots that expressed it. Indeed, the comparison between Scottish clubs in Scotland and America demonstrates that modern Scottish identity is the creation of a diasporic, transnational Scottish experience.
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INTRODUCTION

Over five million people (1.7 per cent of the population of the United States) claimed Scottish ancestry on the 2000 United States Census, making ‘American Scots’ the ninth largest ethnic group in America.1 In 2011, Duncan Sim set out to examine this diasporic Scottish community, seeking to understand the ways in which they defined their connection to Scotland. When attempting to locate these diasporic Scots, Sim realised that ‘the Scots may not have formed diaspora “communities” in the way that groups such as the Irish or Italians did, but they did form Scottish organisations – in significant numbers’.2 After conducting forty-seven interviews with members of these Scottish organisations in America, particularly the St. Andrew’s Societies of New York and Colorado, Sim also realised that the Scots who joined these Scottish societies performed a dual ‘Scottish-American’ identity, rather than simply a ‘Scottish’ identity. In his words:

They appeared…to be able to distinguish between being American, an identity in which they took a great deal of pride, and being Scottish in the sense of having a Scottish ancestry. Thus the two identities could co-exist side by side, neither threatening the other in any way.3

As one of Sim’s interviewees explained, ‘I’m an American of Scottish ancestry. I have some shirts: “America first, Scotland forever”’.4

This dynamic is not simply an American curiosity, but rather a global phenomenon. Alan Hunt wrote in his memoir describing life in contemporary Libya, ‘How ever remote the location or however small the community you can rely on the Scots to form a Caledonian Society’.5 Today, Scottish-themed organisations, ranging from St. Andrew’s Societies and Caledonian Clubs to Scottish football supporters’ clubs, can be found in places as far reaching as Moscow, Cyprus, Hong

---

3 Ibid., p. 121.
4 Ibid., p. x.
5 Alan Hunt, Sea, Sand, and Sunshine (Durham, CT: Strategic Book Group, 2010), p. 106.
Kong, Kenya, Abu Dhabi, Prague, Java, Bahrain, and Kuwait. Each of these associations presents a hybrid identity. They each perform Scottishness along with the culture of their host country and/or region, picking and choosing the Scottish symbols that best fit the priorities of their unique membership base.

Scots in Scotland often look down upon these diasporic Scottish associations and the dual identities they perform. In fact, they tend to see Scottish-American associations as the creation of a manufactured community of ‘fake’ Scots, which perform an illegitimate version of Scottishness. Many believe that Scottish ethnic-cultural associations created by expatriate and even ‘affinity’ Scottish communities, particularly in the United States, celebrate an overly romanticised form of Scottishness that does not engage with the ‘real’ Scotland and is thus not ‘Scottish’. As Hewiston wrote:

There’s certainly a temptation to dismiss the Scottish-American scene as a superficial hotch-potch of bagpipes, caber-tossing and swirling kilts, peopled by groups of slightly eccentric enthusiasts trapped in a ‘loch and glen’ mentality, a past which effectively vanished with Culloden.

The authors of ‘The Scottish Diaspora and Diaspora Strategy’ commissioned by the Scottish Government in 2009 even claimed:

Scottish identity and Scottish-mindedness very rapidly dissipated to become a “historical badge” little worn or displayed except on particular occasions...Whilst sharing a Scottish ancestry clearly mattered, the concerns and tribulations of the domestic country proved to be immediately arresting and primary loyalties were more readily redirected from the old to the new homeland.

---

6 For a comprehensive (but in no way exhaustive) lists of the Scottish societies in the world see http://www.rampantscotland.com/features/societies.htm.
7 Kim Sullivan has demonstrated that the versions of Scottishness expressed by associations in the twentieth century related to the specific cultural and political environments in which they existed. See Kim Sullivan, ‘Scots by Association: Scottish Diasporic Identities and Ethnic Associationism from the Nineteenth – Early Twentieth Centuries and the Present Day’ (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation: University of Otago, 2010).
8 Sim, American Scots, pp. 122-123.
10 Delphin Ancien, Mark Boyle, and Rob Kitchen, ‘The Scottish Diaspora and Diaspora Strategy:'
Indeed, they went on to argue that the Scottish diaspora is ‘not...well organized or culturally ready to be engaged’.

This dismissal of diasporic representations of their Scottish heritage by Scots at home, however, represents a parochial elitism that misunderstands or is ignorant of the very Scottish associations in Scotland that provided the model on which Scottish-American societies, which express this seemingly superficial version of Scottish identity, first formed. In turn, it ignores the important role that associations still play in shaping and performing Scotland’s Scottish identity. Today’s ‘clans’, for instance, are almost exclusively voluntary subscription associations that draw from the example of the Buchanan Society, which first formed in Glasgow in 1725. Country dancing societies, pipe bands, Burns societies, and Highland societies act as the key institutions that keep Scottish ‘traditions’ alive. It is the associations, indeed even now, that shape Scotland’s modern identity. The awarding of a fellowship to the Royal Society of Edinburgh is still considered one of the highest academic distinctions awarded in Scotland. As McCrone has stated, ‘Even with the election of a democratically elected parliament in 1999, there is still likely to remain tension between the new political institution and Scottish civil society as regards who speaks for Scotland.’

Scottish identities in Scotland, like the ‘Scottish’ identities in other places in the world including the United States, are also not performed in a vacuum and are usually hyphenated. Since 1707, Scotland’s identity has been wrapped up in the wider conception of Britishness. Even with parliamentary devolution and the recent nationalist resurgence, Scotland’s identity is almost always presented as either ‘better together’ with England in Britain, or as an independent nation in partnership. This has led to a myriad of surveys and political and sociological investigations into whether the population of Scotland feels more Scottish than British, British than Scottish, one without the other, or both in equal measure – investigations which have

---


11 Ibid., p. 43; Sullivan, ‘Scots by Association’, p. 313.

striking similarities to Sim’s examination of the identities expressed by American Scots. With the creation of a new Europe, Scotland is also often expressed as inside or outside of the European community. Indeed, globalisation itself has led the Scottish government into engagement with the Scottish diasporic communities, presenting Scotland as a globalised rather than an insular ‘brand’.

This thesis, “‘Great Gathering of the Clans’: Scottish Clubs and Scottish Identity in Scotland and America, c.1750-1832”, offers the first formal assessment of the origins of the global Scottish associational phenomenon and its role in the creation and proliferation of transnational Scottish identities. Through the examination of Scottish clubs in Scotland and America from c.1750-1832, it first seeks to explore why Scottish societies formed, who formed them, why they began to play such a crucial role in constructing and performing Scottish identities, their ability to change over time, and when and why they started to take on different national, cultural, and ethnic characteristics. Second, it seeks to understand what the identity expressed by Scottish associations both at home and in the diaspora can tell about the priorities of their host environments and the versatility of the Scottish identity within different national and transnational constructs. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, it compares the Scottish identity constructed and performed by associations in Scotland to those expressed by Scottish associations in America (the first Scottish associations to form outside of Britain), before and after the American and French Revolutions, in order to determine the shared experience of Scots at home and abroad in using and constructing Scottishness. By addressing these three

lines of inquiry, this thesis demonstrates that while deviating in national distinction, performance, and purpose, Scottish associations shaped the parameters of the rational and romantic image of Scotland that came to define the Scottish identity for both Scots and non-Scots alike.

The following introduction outlines the relevant historiographies related to Scottish associational culture and Scottish identity in the long eighteenth century, the theoretical underpinning of this investigation, and the structure and approach this thesis will employ.

I

The centrality of voluntary associations to the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British-Atlantic experience is far from a new claim. Historians have recognised that Britain and her American colonies experienced an associational explosion in the eighteenth century. According to Clark’s estimates, 25,000 of these clubs met in the English-speaking world with at least 200 meeting in Edinburgh alone.16 As Roney argues, ‘at least sixty clubs and voluntary associations were active in Philadelphia between the mid-1720s and 1775 and by 1770 at minimum twenty per cent of the adult male population was in at least one club’.17 This phenomenon continued throughout the nineteenth century. Sir Walter Scott was right in 1831 when he argued that he lived in the ‘Age of Clubs’.18 Similarly Alexis de Tocqueville was correct when in 1831 he wrote:

Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions, constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, - religious, moral, serious, futile, general

---


or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainment, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; they found in this manner hospitals, prisons, and schools. If it be proposed to inculcate some truth, or to foster some feeling, by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society. Wherever, at the head of some new undertaking, you see the government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure to find an association.19

Two scholars, Clark and Morris, have undertaken comprehensive studies of British associational culture during this period. Through his broad sweeping evaluation of all British clubs and societies that met from 1580-1800, Clark outlined the reasons for the sudden increase in voluntary associations in Britain and her colonies in the eighteenth century. He argued that rapid urbanisation, higher standards of living, the diminished role of the state following the Glorious Revolution of 1688, and the increase in the role of personal improvement and patronage, led to an opening of the public sphere and an increase in British male sociability, which subsequently led to the formation of clubs. According to Clark, clubs provided a vehicle through which Britons could engage with political development, create patronage networks, and assimilate newcomers into urban society.20 Morris’ work complemented Clark’s for the post-1800 period. He argued that after c.1780 British associations became more prolific and acted as an urban response to social, political, and economic change. Through this work, Morris demonstrated that voluntary associations provided a way through which certain groups of men, particularly within the middle classes, asserted their power over British society apart from state control.21 Together Clark and Morris’ studies provide a compelling outline of the reasons for the development and proliferation of societies of all varieties in Britain and her colonies (including Scotland, England, and

America) during this period of inquiry. Yet, with the majority of voluntary associations meeting in English towns and cities, both Clark and Morris tend toward Anglo-centricity, often overlooking the distinct role associations played outside of England. Scottish and colonial British-American clubs, for instance, take a backseat to their English counterparts.

Eighteenth-century Scottish clubs have been considered on their own merit, albeit in a limited way. McElroy’s 1952 Ph.D. thesis and subsequent monograph opened up the topic of Scottish associational culture to modern historians by providing an overview of eighteenth-century Scottish clubs, with an emphasis on what he deemed ‘literary societies’. McElroy recorded and relayed massive amounts of archival material on numerous clubs, providing a sourcebook for any historian wishing to engage with eighteenth-century Scottish club records. Yet, he did not produce an analytical work. He avoided answering important questions about the clubs and societies, such as why they were created, what purpose they served to the Scottish community, how they were influenced by other European societies, and even why they are relevant to historians of the eighteenth century.

Following McElroy’s foray into the world of eighteenth-century Scottish clubs, some historians in the 1970s and 1980s argued for the importance of specific voluntary associations in shaping Scotland’s enlightenment society, particularly as vehicles through which Scots could engage in British political discourse. Phillipson, for instance, argued that the ‘enlightenment’ associations that met in eighteenth-century Edinburgh provided a para-parliament for the new elites in Scottish society following the Union of 1707. He suggested that after the dissolution of the Scottish

---


parliament, voluntary associations, particularly those formed by Edinburgh’s literati, facilitated Scotland’s new political culture. Emerson complemented Phillipson’s work by using clubs to understand the social composition of the Scottish enlightenment, suggesting that it was Scotland’s urban professionals who relied on wider patronage networks that led the way in Scotland’s eighteenth-century intellectual blossoming. More recently, Carr evaluated the inherent masculinity of eighteenth-century clubs in Edinburgh and Glasgow. In her work on gender and the Scottish enlightenment, Carr argued that clubs became important players in the development of a refined ‘North British’ masculine identity within what she called the ‘intellectual-political’ sphere.

Carr, Emerson, and Phillipson have highlighted the important role voluntary associations played in shaping Scotland’s middling and elite political, intellectual, and cultural experiences. Yet, their chosen methodology overemphasises Scotland’s political and cultural assimilation with England. While understanding the close relationship between Scottish and English politics and culture is crucial to understanding Scotland’s relationship with larger British discourses and the formation of dual or hyphenated Scottish identities, this approach has led the majority of eighteenth-century historians to undermine the ‘Scottish’ aspects of Scottish club culture. As Zionkowski argued, ‘Scots clubs are usually declared innocuous mimics of their more cosmopolitan counterparts to the south’. Andrews’ recent work on eighteenth-century Scottish club poets began to address this issue. Andrews wrote a convincing monograph on the Scottish counter-reactions to

---


Anglicisation as evidenced by the club poetry of Ramsay, Fergusson, and Burns.\textsuperscript{28} The ‘Anglicisation’ thesis, however, still dominates the historiography of Scotland’s eighteenth-century clubs.

Scottish clubs in the period between c.1800-1830 have also been largely neglected. While historians often cite their existence as important to Scottish political and social culture in the absence of the state, they tend to pay little attention to the specific role they played, usually taking their importance as a given. Historians who study the political underpinnings of early-nineteenth-century science usually mention intellectual clubs as part of their analysis. The Scottish Academy and Scottish mechanics institutes have received some attention as being havens for Whig ideology.\textsuperscript{29} Cookson used the records of the Highland Society of London and the Caledonian Asylum to argue that the Highlandism, which developed in the nineteenth century, had strongly militaristic Tory undertones.\textsuperscript{30} Yet, as will be shown in Chapter 4, even within these evaluations, clubs and societies are often seen as secondary to the literature produced by figures like Sir Walter Scott or the scientific work of those who published in the \textit{Edinburgh Review}. Moreover, no one has yet produced an analysis of Scottish clubs that traverses the period from c.1750-1832, which has resulted in a disjointed representation of Scotland’s distinct club culture.

American historians have recently begun to identify the important role associations played in shaping both colonial and early-republican societies. In his work on ‘polite letters’ in colonial America, Shields opened up the conversation by arguing that social clubs were places in which members could voice their political opinions under the guise of wit and humour.\textsuperscript{31} Roney complemented Shields’s work by examining the formal club life of pre-revolutionary Philadelphia. Through the analysis of their relationships with other types of sociable interactions, their membership, their economic purposes, and their extra-legal activities, she suggested

\textsuperscript{28} Andrews, \textit{Literary Nationalism}.
that associations were key players (or ‘first movers’) in colonial civil society. Historians have also recently begun to examine post-revolutionary associational culture in America. Koschnik has examined the shape of the political club culture of post-revolutionary Philadelphia, arguing that associations became key political institutions, particularly for the Federalist Party, in America’s new democratic system. Neem has also investigated how and why America became a ‘nation of joiners’ following the Revolution, focusing particularly on Massachusetts’ associational culture. Together these historians underscore the essential role associations played in giving colonial and early-republican Americans a vehicle through which they could engage with British and then American political discourse. They have shown that voluntary associations provided avenues through which groups of Americans, like their counterparts in Britain, could achieve particular political, social, and cultural goals without relying on the state.

The Scottish ethnic societies that formed in colonial and early-national America are often mentioned in these analyses and works on American social and political life. Breslaw examined the similarities between the structure of the Tuesday Club of Annapolis and other Edinburgh clubs and Butler looked at the similarities between the St. Cecilia Society of Charleston and the Edinburgh Musical Society as a means to situate their case studies within broader contexts. Paul undertook a brief case study of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia in her work on credit practices in Edinburgh and Philadelphia. Her work points to the importance the Scottish identity manufactured by the St. Andrew’s Society played in helping situate Scots in colonial Philadelphia credit networks. Aaron Sullivan examined the role ethnic societies, including those with Scottish, English, and Welsh connections,

35 Elaine G. Breslaw, Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Provincial America: Expanding the Orbit of Scottish Culture (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008); Nicholas Michael Butler, Votaries of Apollo: St. Cecilia Society and the Patronage of Concert Music in Charleston, South Carolina, 1766-1820 (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2007), pp. 17-38.
played in supporting the emigrant population in Philadelphia, placing them in the context of colonial and early-national philanthropy. Yet no work to date has set out with the primary objective of examining the role Scottish associations played in American society or in creating and proliferating Scottish or Scottish-American identities.

Notwithstanding colonial America’s prominence in early Scottish associational life, those that focus their studies on Scottish diasporic associations tend to concentrate their attentions elsewhere in the former empire, on localities whose associational structures only emerged in the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Bueltmann, Clarke, and Sullivan’s graduate work, and Bueltmann’s subsequent monograph, for instance, evaluate Scottish associational performances of Scottish regional and ethnic identities in New Zealand. Similarly, Bourbeau and Hinson’s Ph.D. theses examine the role Scottish societies played in shaping Scottish identities in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Canada. In 2009, Bueltmann, Hinson, and Morton produced the first edited volume to evaluate Scottish associational culture throughout the diaspora. The authors and editors of this volume, Ties of Bluid, Kin, and Countrie: Scottish Associational Culture in the Diaspora, recognised and demonstrated the important role diasporic associations played in creating Scottish identities throughout the wider world. Despite its impressive overview, however, the societies that met in colonial and early-national America remain conspicuous by their absence. While mentioned in passing, these societies receive no analytical attention.

This issue, coupled with the fact that Scottish societies are only mentioned in passing in histories that focus on American club culture, has resulted in the mistaken

assumption that Scots first began to create diasporic associations in the mid-nineteenth century in Canada and the Antipodes when (as this thesis demonstrates) the genesis of this phenomenon began much earlier, first in London and then in the American colonies. To add to this, each of these works represents diasporic Scottish associations as distinct. They isolate the societies they study from Scotland and its culture, which furthers the idea that Scottish diasporic associations and the identities they expressed were isolated and different from their Scottish counterparts.

By focusing on the role Scottish associations played for the Scottish communities on both sides of the Atlantic in relation to the political, social, and cultural environments in which they existed, this thesis fills a gap in the present disjointed literature on Scottish clubs. By placing Scottish associations and their Scottishness at the heart of the analysis, it asserts the centrality of Scottish associations in the negotiation of Scottish and Scottish-American identity construction throughout the period from c.1750-1832. It also firmly places the origins of Scottish diasporic associational culture and the creation of a global Scottish identity first in Scotland and then in London and the American colonies, thus providing needed context for the studies that examine Scottish diasporic associations in different places in later periods.

II

As well as expanding and informing the historiography on eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century Scottish club culture, this work also uses associations as a lens through which to understand the construction and performance of Scottish identities in a transatlantic, indeed transnational, context.

Historians have long recognised the importance of Scottish identity and its role in negotiating the significance and stability of the Scottish experience. No clear consensus, however, has emerged regarding the shape this identity took. Lately, the historiography on Scottish identity in the long eighteenth century has concentrated its attention on the adoption of ‘Anglo-Britishness’. Kidd, through his seminal work, Subverting Scotland’s Past, argued that Scotland’s historians from c.1750-c.1830 appropriated England’s history as their own in order to present themselves as ‘North
Britons’ or even ‘Anglo-British’ in identification. He suggested that Scots became ‘disenchanted’ with their feudal past and sought to claim English history as their own. Following this interpretation, Craig has argued that Scots have felt inferior to their southern neighbours and have attempted to emulate English ways in order to be seen as part of a wider British paradigm since the eighteenth century. In her 1980 work, Ash claimed that by the end of the nineteenth century, ‘a general interest in Scottish history had ceased to be the mark of broadly educated Scotsmen and had come instead to be seen as the mark of a narrow parochialism most Scots wished to abandon’. She, like many of her contemporaries, presented this as a paradox since figures like Sir Walter Scott had created such a stir in the Scottish historical consciousness in the early-nineteenth century through his advocating of Scottish distinctiveness and ‘Highlandism’. Kidd, however, has since ‘revisited’ Ash’s claim, arguing that Scotland never had a real interest in furthering their political history and instead favoured that of the English. According to Kidd and other historians of the ‘North British’ phenomenon, while Scotland did have a period of cultural awakening as a response to the early-nineteenth-century radical threat, they were overwhelmingly whiggish in their understanding of themselves and sought to present a British future defined by England’s historical tradition.

At the same time, however, the historiography that places Britishness as its central concern has, for at least the past forty years, tried to separate itself from the Anglo-centric approach. Exemplified by the work of Connolly and Kearney, Britishness is now usually presented as an amalgamation of separate English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, and even colonial identities into one national consciousness, employing what Pocock described in 1975 as the ‘new British’ or ‘four nations’

In practical terms, this approach has led scholars to examine Scotland’s unique experience in the development of Britain and its role in shaping a wider British identification. Scholars, for instance, place heavy emphasis on how the ‘cult of tartanry’, ‘Highlandism’, and the Scoto-centric ‘tartan monster’ was distinct yet compatible with loyalty to the British state. This line of inquiry has also opened up an investigation into the distinct role Scots played in the British Empire. Devine, Fry, and MacKenzie’s comprehensive studies of Scotland’s Empire are complemented by a myriad of case studies demonstrating Scotland’s imperial participation.

In recognising and navigating the problematic history of Scottish identity, many historians, like Ash, have also settled on the view that Anglo-Scottish identity was, at heart, a paradox. In his 1964 work, The Paradox of Scottish Culture, Daiches argued that Scots’ simultaneous assimilation with English culture and expression of Scottish particularism was confused and contradictory. In 1975 Pocock suggested:

Scottish history has been, and may remain, a mere matter of choice in which the acceptance of anglicization, the insistence on the concept of Britain, Lowland localism, and Gaelic romanticism, remain equally viable options and the problem is to reconcile one’s identity with one’s awareness of so open-ended a structure of choice.

---


46 See Pentland, Radicalism, Reform and National Identity, pp. 3-4.


50 Pocock, ‘British History’, p. 615; Campbell et al., p. 2.
In 1998, Finlay argued that the eighteenth century ‘is characterised by cultural confusion and the historian has a great many varieties of Scottishness and Britishness to choose from’. The inability to neatly categorise Scotland’s multifaceted identity has led scholars to use terms like ‘Caledonian antisyzygy’ and ‘cultural schizophrenia’ to describe what they see as Scots’ erratic behavior in the long eighteenth century.

Through the lens of Scottish associations, this thesis seeks to understand Scotland’s identity in relation to wider political and cultural influences and to bring together these contrasting and sometimes contradictory historiographical trends. It evaluates how the members collectively shaped Scottish identity so that it was agreeable with Britishness (or even sought to define Britishness) in both its domestic and imperial frameworks. It also shows how the same Scottish identity could be used in contexts that were not necessarily defined by the Union of 1707, such as the European ‘Republic of Letters’. To add to this, it examines how provincial societies (or societies which represented provincial populations) interacted with wider ‘metropolitan’ identifications even within Scotland. It seeks to demonstrate how Scots used associations to express Scottish identities, which could be adapted in order to fit the priorities of different communities, or even the different priorities of the same community within different contexts.

Of course, the most significant contribution of this original investigation lies in the comparison between these Scottish clubs in Scotland to those that met in America in the pre- and post-revolutionary period. A rich and growing body of literature serves Scotland’s emigrants. Within this historiography, Scots in colonial America and Scottish influences in colonial America have received disproportionate attention. Ever since the groundbreaking William and Mary Quarterly edition that focused on the relationship between Scotland and America first appeared in 1954, historians have evaluated Scotland’s influences on the American colonies and their

52 G. Gregory Smith, Scottish Literature, Character and Influence (London: Macmillan, 1919); Daiches, Paradox. These concepts are described in Andrews, Literary Nationalism, p. 2.
53 For works that evaluate the Scottish diaspora in general terms see T.M. Devine, To the Ends of the Earth: Scotland’s Global Diaspora, 1750-2010 (London: Penguin, 2011); Bueltmann et al., Scottish Diaspora. The recent growth and interest in this thread of inquiry can be seen in the development and success of the Scottish Centre for Diaspora Studies at the University of Edinburgh.
shared experiences. Scholars, such as Hook, Sher, and Landsman, have shown that Scottish enlightenment philosophies, education practices, social practices, and religion (amongst other things) had an enormous impact on the way Americans constructed their cultural, political, and religious outlook and influenced colonial and early-national American development. Scholars have even demonstrated the similarities between the cultures that emerged in Scotland and America during the eighteenth century, often connecting their similar trends to their parallel role in the British Empire.54

While Scottish influences in colonial America have received plenty of scholarly attention, few historians of Scotland and America have examined Scottish identity construction in a colonial and early-national American setting. Scholars who look at the ways in which Scots shaped their Scottish identity outside of Scotland, like those who study Scottish diasporic associational culture, tend to examine later nineteenth-century Scottish colonial ventures such as those in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa rather than colonial America.55 Moreover, scholars who study Scots in America tend to end their evaluation with the American War of Independence. Few have examined how Scots defined themselves in the newly independent country.56

By evaluating the ways in which Scottish associations constructed Scottish identity in both the pre- and post-Revolutionary War period, this study follows the evolution and change in associational expression of Scottish identity in two countries over a significant period, rather than simply focusing on one small period in history

56 For a welcome exception to this rule, see Hook, Scotland and America.
or one geographical locale and its relation to one overarching influence (the British state). By covering the period before and after the American War of Independence, it also evaluates the creation of Scottish identity outside of a British national construct. Indeed, it is the only study to explore the exportability and malleability of late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century Scottish identity in that it could be used as a tool to present a different political loyalty – one completely separate from Scotland’s contemporary political experience in the British union.

This thesis is, therefore, the first to explore the experiences of Scots in Scotland and Scots abroad and the similarities and differences in the Scottish identities they expressed. It is the first that evaluates the origins of what has been viewed as a disparity between the Scottish-American (or even Scottish-diasporic) identity and the Scottish identity expressed in Scotland. It is also the first to demonstrate the shared experience in constructing Scottishness, thus adding significantly to the wider understanding of Scottish identity in both Scotland and the diaspora.

III

Before beginning the primary investigation, it is first important to define the terms and theories that will be used. Identity is a key feature in this analysis. Yet, it is not an easy concept to understand and can be even harder to define, particularly in a Scottish context. As Gleason has suggested, ‘today we could hardly do without the word identity in talking about immigration and ethnicity. Those who write on these matters use it causally; they assume the reader will know what they mean.’57

As Weeks explains, identity is ‘about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others…but it is also about your social relationships, your complex involvement with others’.58

Sociologists have identified four overarching categories of identity expression – personal identity, role identity, social identity, and collective identity. Personal

identity relates to how a person defines himself or herself as an individual. It is individualistic and is unrelated to social interactions, yet it is, at the same time, created in relation to other people. Role identity describes the character one plays in social situations – i.e. father, mother, brother, sister, daughter, son, husband, or wife. Social identity has to do with the role individuals play in certain social groups. It is defined by the similarities and differences individuals have in relation to other categories of people. One can, for instance, be a student, a businessman, a professional, or a labourer. Finally, collective identity (the type of identity most relevant to this thesis) relates to the identities created when people band together to support a particular priority.59 As Elder argues, ‘persons have an identity by positioning themselves relative to other persons and by giving to these relations a meaning that is fixed in time…a group has an identity if it succeeds in defining itself vis-à-vis other groups by attributing meaning to itself that is stable over time’.60

Of course, all of these categories of identity intersect. In fact, one of the central understandings of identity formation and expression that informs this analysis is that individuals and groups can have multiple identities at the same time. In his evaluation of Scottish identity, Smout theorised about the idea of ‘concentric loyalties’.61 He suggested that every individual has numerous identities, which can be used independently or in conjunction with one another. A person, for instance, can be a man, a husband, a father, a professional, a minister, a Lowlander, a Scot, a Briton, and a European all at the same time, or employ each identity individually when the situation calls for it. As Colley also argues, ‘Identities are not like hats. Human beings can and do put on several at a time’.62 ‘Loyalties’ or identities can also change type. In this case, Scottish identity could (and still can) take a personal, social, collective, national, ethnic, or cultural slant depending on when it was employed and who employed it. This thesis aims to show that eighteenth- and nineteenth-century ‘Scottishness’ could also work within (as well as independently

of) other identifications, including Britishness, Europeanness, and Americanness, and that associations provided a versatile yet structured medium through which ‘hyphenated’ or multifaceted collective identities could be expressed along with personal and role identities.

One of the key arguments this work espouses is that through associations, Scots constructed their own identities and shaped the way they were perceived from the outside in response to external pressures and preconceptions. They engaged with the identity placed upon them by others by either accepting or challenging it. Yet, they were also agents in its ‘invention’, or perhaps more appropriately, its ‘construction’ or ‘manipulation’. As such, this work is also influenced by the theoretical concept of ‘performative’ identity, especially in the way that it is presented by Isaac and Butler. Butler’s sociological work has focused on gender performativity, suggesting that gender, rather than simply related to the biological sex of an individual, has to do with the performed differences between women and men. Isaac demonstrated that showmanship and performance played a key role in providing the eighteenth-century Virginian gentry with social and cultural power. This thesis uses the theory employed by both of these scholars in order to better understand ‘Scottishness’. Scottish societies and their individual members were ‘Scottish’ because they defined Scottishness then performed that Scottishness – not necessarily because they were born in Scotland or had Scottish ancestry. When describing public displays of identity, this work often states that the societies ‘performed’, ‘expressed’ or ‘articulated’ their identity in order to demonstrate this important distinction.

In order to be as descriptive as possible, qualifying terms with varying degrees of specificity, such as ‘collective’, ‘national’, ‘ethnic’, ‘cultural’, and ‘representational’, will be used to describe the type of Scottishness being addressed. These terms (particularly the terms ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’) are, however, loaded. As Mandler has argued, “National Identity” is one of those concepts, like “political culture”, which historians have somewhat casually borrowed from the social sciences

---

and then used promiscuously for their own purposes.\textsuperscript{64} Post-union Scotland had a particularly confusing ‘national’ identity, since modern ‘nationalism’ did not exist until about 1790 and did not have any real force in Scotland even during its rise in Europe. Moreover, those who supported the union between Scotland and England had an even wider ‘national’ identity in Britishness, which did not necessarily undermine their Scottish ‘national’ identification.\textsuperscript{65} While cognisant of the complexities of the term, the phrase ‘Scottish national identity’ is employed when referencing the Scottishness that existed in Scotland and was associated with Scotland’s political culture, meaning its unique engagement with British and distinctly Scottish political issues.

Similar issues arise with the term ‘ethnicity’, as Scots could either be seen as part of a wider British ethnic group or even two ethnic groups divided by the Highland line. Furthermore, as McCrone argues, ethnicity in Britain usually referred (and still refers) to race. According to McCrone, ‘if one suggests to the Scots, the Welsh and even (perhaps especially) the English that they are an ethnic or national minority in whatever context, one would get strange looks’.\textsuperscript{66} In 1996, Erikson described ethnicity as ‘relationships between groups whose members consider themselves distinctive’.\textsuperscript{67} In this case, Scottish societies, which had exclusively Scottish memberships or identified themselves as Scots seem to fit the bill. Similarly, Alba argued, ‘Such mundane actions as eating ethnic food, enacting holiday rituals…and participating in ethnic social clubs give meaning to an otherwise abstract assertion of ethnic identity and breathe life into ethnicity as a social form’.\textsuperscript{68} When using this term, this thesis follows Erikson and Alba’s definitions, particularly when attempting to describe Scottishness that did not have any ties to Scotland’s


political culture or the British state. It is important, however, to point out that different groups of Scots could describe and perform their collective ‘ethnicity’ in different ways. Ethnicity, like national identity, should not be seen as a stagnant version of identity expression. It should also not be seen as completely separate from other forms of identity. Ethnicity could be politicised and national in its performance.\footnote{McCrone, ‘Who do you say you are?’, p. 310.}

In order to understand why Scots created and/or joined clubs and societies that performed Scottish identity, this thesis also employs social capital theory and often refers to ‘social capital’. Social capital theory describes ‘investments in social relations with expected returns in the marketplace’.\footnote{Nan Lin, Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 19.} According to this theory, all individuals enter social interactions and relationships, such as those found in voluntary associations, with an agenda in mind. They seek resources (information, reputation, or tangible resources like money) that the individual or group with whom they are engaging hold or have the ability to gain. They then use persuasion, coercion, or authority to convince the individual or group to share their resources. As Lin argues, ‘[social] capital is seen as a social asset by virtue of actors’ connections and access to resources in the network group of which they are members.’\footnote{Ibid.}

Social capital also implies reciprocal trust. Theorists have argued that individuals or groups do not share their resources unless they believe that they will receive something in return. Modern sociologists tend to use contemporary voluntary associations as evidence for this aspect of the theory. Clubs and societies gain prestige through the status of their individual members and the individual members gain prestige by joining socially recognised clubs or societies. Even charities, which have a philanthropic and benevolent ethos, are not exempt from seeking social capital. Charities and philanthropic societies gain their reputation of being charitable, generous, and morally sound by providing aid to underprivileged...
people. Neither the charity nor its individual members involve themselves in social interactions without seeking something in return.72

Social capital theory raises exciting new questions about the elite and middling sort in Scotland, the priorities and agendas of the Scottish emigrant communities in America, and the role the performance of Scottish identity played in both contexts. It raises questions such as what was the motive for membership in Scottish clubs and societies? What reputation did members receive from being part of Scottish clubs and societies? Who was included and excluded from membership; and what agendas were the members promoting? Most significantly, it underlines the importance of associational culture in promoting both individual and institutional goals. By accepting this theory, this work can better examine how the desired resources (social, economic, cultural, and political) of the individual members and collective associations resulted in the Scottish identities they performed taking a particular shape and changing over time.

IV

In order to achieve the above goals, this work uses sources written or created for or by associations, such as minute books, rulebooks, transactions, membership certificates, ticket stubs, and even material goods, as well as sources which reference Scottish associational activities, such as private letters, memoirs, diaries, newspapers, and guidebooks. It engages with sources, which can be found in archives across both Scotland and America in order to better understand Scottish associational culture throughout the Atlantic world. As such, it engages with sources that are well known, such as the records of the Select Society and Poker Club as well as sources that have received little (if any) scholarly attention, such as the various St. Andrew’s Societies that met (and still meet) in America. The text of the thesis is divided into six chapters covering the period from the emergence of the high enlightenment in c.1750 to the death of Sir Walter Scott and the end of the long eighteenth century in 1832.

This range covers concurrent shifts in American political and cultural history from the late colonial period to the end of the Jacksonian era. The first and last consider the ‘usefulness’ of associations in constructing identity and the material tools at their disposal. The middle four are geographically and chronologically constructed.

More specifically, Chapter 1 provides the context for the analysis of Scottish club culture and identity expression that follows. As the first goal of this work is to demonstrate the important role associations played in defining and disseminating Scottish identity in both Scotland and America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the first chapter of this thesis necessarily outlines the aspects of club culture in both places, which allowed them to be so ‘useful’ in this particular endeavour. It employs a broad approach, not limiting the analysis to ‘Scottish’ clubs, as ‘Scottish’ clubs functioned within a much wider transatlantic associational world and should be first understood in context before studied in detail. In so doing, the first chapter also outlines the similarities and differences of Scottish and American associational culture, which influenced the way the Scottish national, regional, and ethnic identities were expressed. In particular, it looks at the structured, exclusive, masculine, and public nature of the clubs and societies that formed in the Atlantic world from c.1750-1832.

Chapter 2 gets to the heart of the analysis of Scottish associational culture and Scottish identity formation and expression. It focuses on how Scots in Scotland in the mid-to-late eighteenth century used clubs to promote Scottish national and regional identities. It challenges the prevalent historiography that argues that mid-eighteenth-century middling Scots were essentially mimics of their English neighbours or performed an identity that was primarily ‘Anglo-British’ in orientation. In order to do this, it begins by examining three of the clubs formed and attended by Edinburgh’s literati – the Select Society (and its off-shoots), the Poker Club, and the Edinburgh Philosophical Society. Through the evaluation of these societies in particular, this chapter demonstrates that while the Edinburgh literati used English models, spoke in English, and sometimes called themselves North British, they did not give up their Scottish identity. The examination of the controversy between the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, which follows, demonstrates that there was in fact great competition
over which associations should represent Scotland. By including an examination of literary societies in provincial Scotland, Glasgow and Aberdeen in particular, this chapter also demonstrates that provincial Scots did the same thing with the identity presented in Edinburgh as Edinburgh societies did with the identity presented in England and Europe. They manipulated a ‘metropolitan’ example to fit their own priorities and present themselves as distinct yet part of a wider civilised world. Finally, an examination of the early Highland societies reveals that elite and even middling Highlanders in Lowland Scotland incorporated aspects of their own independent Highland identity with Lowland and wider British trends in order to better situate their community in the environment in which they found themselves.

Chapter 3 evaluates the Scottish associations in America that met before the American War of Independence. It begins with a case study of one club, the Tuesday Club of Annapolis, which based its structure and identity on an Edinburgh club model. Through this particular case study, this chapter shows that drawing from a Scottish model provided this colonial-American club with a claim toward wider British citizenship. The chapter then continues with an examination of the colonial-American clubs and societies that, while not based on any specific Scottish model, promoted Scottish ethnicity, mainly St. Andrew’s Societies. By doing so, it demonstrates that Scots in America created societies, which promoted Scottish identities that were similar to those performed in Scotland, but manipulated them to fit specific colonial priorities. It argues that the predominant Scottish identity performed by these associations placed the Scottish communities in America as civil, modern, moral, improved, concerned with the wellbeing of the host community, distinctly Scottish, yet at the same time fully British and part of Britain’s imperial mission.

The following two chapters evaluate change over time and the evolution of associational expressions of Scottish identity in Scotland and America. Chapter 4 examines Scottish associations in Scotland from c.1790-1832. It looks at which aspects of Scottish identity changed and which aspects stayed the same during and after the French Revolution, the rise of European romanticism, and the rapid urbanisation, industrialisation, and professionalisation of Scotland’s towns and cities. In order to do this, this chapter examines the evolution of two types of ‘Scottish’
societies, which had their advent in the eighteenth century – ‘enlightenment’
intellectual societies and Highland societies. By comparing these two associations,
which expressed parallel versions of Scottishness in the period from c.1750-1790 but
differed in expression in the period from c.1790-1832, this chapter examines how
Scots used associations to shape new versions of Scottishness in Scotland’s new
political, economic, and social context.

The next chapter, Chapter 5, looks at what happened to Scottish clubs in
America after the American War of Independence. It examines the dramatic shift in
identity formation following this ideological war. This chapter, more than any other,
shows that Scots were able to quickly re-form and deliberately alter the way that
their identity was expressed in order to best promote themselves within their current
political and social climate. How else would these associations be able to use their
Scottishness, which was so attached to British loyalty only a few years earlier, to
present their loyalty to the newly formed United States? When compared to the
romantic and ‘enlightenment’ expressions of Scottishness performed by associations
in Scotland, one can see that Scottish-Americans used the same symbols being
contemporaneously developed in the mother country but for very different reasons.
In fact, they combined symbols of Scottishness with statements of American loyalty
in order to form a Scottish-American identity that was authentic in its own right.
This chapter also incorporates some comparisons with other ethnic groups in order to
show how those societies created by American Scots fit within the wider ethnic
associational system in the United States. It shows that Scots were able to avoid
challenges from the state, which other ethnic societies, like the English and Irish,
could not.

Finally, the last chapter, Chapter 6, examines the material things that Scottish
societies in both Scotland and America commissioned, owned, and/or supported. It
looks at how and why these associations commissioned and consumed material items
to both promote their agendas within a club context as well as subtly influence the
wider public. The basic internal documents of the clubs need to be understood as
only part of the story these associations have to tell. This chapter demonstrates that
when material goods such as print, seals, medals, badges, images, and even food and
drink are thrown into the mix, the amount of effort these associations put into promoting certain kinds of Scottish identity becomes clear.

Through these chapters, this thesis offers new insights into the relationship between Scottish identities at home and in the wider diaspora. Often seen as distinct entities, this thesis emphasises the similarities in the construction of Scottish identity, even in divergent national contexts. Through the study of Scottish associations, which were pivotal vehicles in Scottish identity construction in both Scotland and America, it demonstrates that the Scottish identity manufactured and performed in America had as much validity and legitimacy as that expressed in Scotland. It grew out of the same foundation, followed the same process, and simply followed a different trajectory as a result of the different political, social, and economic environments in which it was expressed and the different communities of Scots that expressed it.
CHAPTER 1

‘And, by these Clubs, it is thought, they were first Civilized’
The ‘Usefulness’ of Private Societies in a Transatlantic Context

In 1751 the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia published a rulebook initiated by the statement:

The Usefulness of private Societies, to answer particular good Purposes, which either had not been, or could not be so well provided for by the publick Acts of a Community, is well known to be fully justified by the Practice of the best of Men in all Ages, and in all civiliz’d Countries. 1

The chapters that follow demonstrate the important role associations played in constructing and proliferating Scottish identity (or identities) in Scotland and America from c.1750-1832. But what was it about voluntary associations that led the framers of Scottish identity in both Scotland and America to decide to use them for this ‘particular good Purpose’? What was it about ‘private Societies’ that made them ‘useful’ on both sides of the Atlantic? In order to answer these questions and fully understand the utility of clubs in Scotland and America as a means for both individuals and groups (of men) to achieve their goals and ambitions, especially in terms of identity formation, an outline of the broader conceptual framework of associational life in both Scotland and America must first be drawn.

In order to do this, this opening chapter begins by examining the organisation and structure of voluntary associations in the British-Atlantic world. By doing so, it shows that they provided an ordered and regulated way for the public to pursue and achieve civic initiatives. Next, it examines the exclusivity of club culture in order to demonstrate that clubs had the ability to delineate who had access to their activities and expressions, and hence a voice in their agenda-setting. Thirdly, it looks at the inherent masculinity of voluntary associations, discovering that associations maintained an authoritative and rational place within a patriarchal society and

---

1 Rules for the St. Andrew’s Society in Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1751), p. 3.
provided a space for homo-social sociability for men with a common interest. Finally, it demonstrates that while clubs deliberately had exclusive membership rolls, those members as individuals, and even more so collectively, had the resources to reach and influence a wide and varied audience. By doing so, it provides the necessary context for the investigations that follow and establishes why Scots chose to create ‘Scottish organisations – in significant numbers’ and use these clubs to create, perform, and present Scottish identities.²

I

Unlike informal social interactions, associations worked toward specific goals and were structured accordingly. Clubs set procedures, collected revenue, and delegated responsibilities. They created and asserted a ‘collective identity’, supported by the act of joining and the use of a common name. Some even gained state support for their actions through charters of incorporation. In essence the internal structure of clubs enabled them to exert an effective external influence.

By the mid-eighteenth century, most associations agreed to a set of written rules created to ensure that the objects of the society were achieved, stability maintained, and order enforced. Depending on the club, rulebooks included anywhere from four rules to thirty or more. As clubs became more formalised from the 1780s, rules regulating activity became more complex. This was especially true for subscription societies, which had to deal with a wide and interconnected array of members. These rules always appeared in the minute books of the societies, and were usually printed in book or pamphlet form and circulated amongst the members. Some even published a summary of their rules in public newspapers and/or magazines in order to give the outside community an indication of the society’s organisation and purpose.³ Most societies also expected their new members to sign the manuscript rules before they could receive their membership certificate.⁴ The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland rules even stated that, ‘The Book of rules and

³ See, for instance, the account of the Select Society rules printed in the *Scots Magazine*, Vol. XVII (Edinburgh, 1755), p. 126.
⁴ See rule XI in *Rules for the St. Andrew’s Society in New-York* (New York, 1770).
orders, and List of Members, shall be upon the Table before the President, or
Presiding Member at all Meetings." Clearly each person associated with the club
was thoroughly informed of its internal organisation, had access to the rules, and was
expected to adhere to them.

The official lists of rules for clubs on both sides of the Atlantic usually
included a statement of purpose. This was frequently under the title
‘Advertisement’, and included a justification of the association’s existence and a
statement placing the society in its larger ‘improving’ context. Phrases such as, ‘To
Encourage genius, to reward industry, to cultivate the arts of peace, are objects
deserving the attention of public-spirited persons’, as recorded by the Edinburgh
Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, and Agriculture, or
‘The Advantages arising to mankind[sic] from learning are so evident, that all
civilised societies, both ancient and modern, have ever given the greatest
encouragement to the promotion of it’, as recorded by the Charleston Library Society
outlined the more specific explanation of the society’s goals. These statements,
rather than frivolous, reinforced the importance of the society to the members and
those others who, for whatever reason, read the rules. As will be demonstrated in
later chapters, these statements of benevolence and social usefulness were used to
ease the minds of persons and politicians, especially those in America following
independence, that were wary of associations as alternative bases of power and
loyalty and therefore potential threats to established government.

Often a rule stating the official name or title of the association followed.
Club names, either explicitly or metaphorically, represented the chief purpose of the
association to both the outside community and to the members themselves.
According to the preface to the minute book of the Poker Club in Edinburgh,
‘[Adam] Ferguson himself is said to have suggested the name “Poker Club” when he
was standing by the fire with a poker in his hand, for it was to stir up an inert country
to a sense of its atrocious wrongs and “to poke” the fire of patriotic zeal in demand
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5 Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Minute Book (1780-1782), Mss.913.41.Solm, APS, 18 December 1780.
6 Rules and Orders of the Edinburgh Society, for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences, Manufactures,
and Agriculture (Edinburgh, 1755?), p. 3; The Rules and By-Laws of the Charlestown Library
Society: and the Act of the Legislature of South-Carolina, incorporating the said society with the
Royal Confirmations, 3rd Edn. (Charlestown, 1770), p. 3.
7 Neem, Creating a Nation of Joiners, p. 5.
for its defrauded rights.' This name spoke to the members who understood the reference to a poker stirring a fire. This was beneficial for a society with a selective membership, as the name did not necessarily need to be understood by the outside community. In contrast, the name of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland described its purpose, the study of antiquities, as well as suggested that it was a national institution representative of all of Scotland. It had a public goal and so it chose to use a descriptive name. In the same way, the name ‘St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia’ described the Society as a Scottish institution particular to that city. Yet, it also linked it to other St. Andrew’s Societies in other cities with similar ‘good’ purposes. By naming themselves ‘The Society of True Highlanders’, this association in Inverlochy suggested that their members were ‘true’ Highlanders while the members of other Highland associations were ‘false’ Highlanders. The overarching purpose of creating a society name, however, was to inspire a unifying and formal identity amongst its members rather than merely appear as an occasional meeting between groups of convivial individuals. It would give the impression, then, that an entire membership supported any action made under the society name, thus enhancing its authority and influence.

In order to make sure that the society’s goals summarised in the ‘Advertisement’ were met, they usually outlined their procedures. This often included a statement of the time and place of meetings and celebrations, election practices, and membership requirements. It also outlined exactly how meetings would function. In 1712, George Buchanan (John Fergus), the secretary of the Easy Club, wrote to the Spectator explaining that ‘we have observed as one of our fundamental laws that one, two, or mo[re] of the Spectators shall be read at every meeting’. The reasoning behind this practice was ‘That in case any scruples or doubts…every one may give his thoughts on’t and thus (as the rubing [sic] of two hard Bodies together will smooth both) we have all been satisfied about the thing each of us by ourselves could not be convinced of.’ Thus, they read the periodical
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8 Poker Club Minutes (1774-1784), De.5.126, CRC, p. 1.
9 This dynamic will be addressed further in Chapter 4.
10 John Fergus (George Buchanan) to the Spectator, 15 August 1712, Easy Club Papers, David Laing Collection, La.II.212, CRC.
11 Ibid.
in a club setting in order to improve their behaviour and ‘easy’ outlook on society. In a similar way, the Belles Lettres Society stated that:

…the Members shall be allowed to choose the Topics of their own Discourses and that the minimum of Time for pronouncing a Discourse shall be twelve Minutes and the maximum twenty five minutes And recommend to the members to study a perspicuous Brevity in their Discourses.\textsuperscript{12}

By placing a time limit on speeches the Belles Lettres Society not only made the members practise their ‘brevity’ and rhetorical skills, but also allowed the Society to function in an ordered manner. While they played a variety of roles (facilitating patronage and friendship networks, providing entertainment, and creating a collective identity, for instance), the stated procedures ensured that the society still engaged with its original purpose.

One of the key organisational elements of associations was their ability to collect revenue in support of particular initiatives. Specific membership fees, dues, and payments were almost always clearly delineated and enforced. This could be used to exclude certain people from joining. Yet, it also provided the financial backing for physical initiatives. The collecting of funds, for instance, allowed the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, the American Philosophical Society, and many of the literary and scientific societies of the nineteenth century to publish and circulate tracts detailing new inventions and ‘improving’ procedures.\textsuperscript{13} The money collected by the Highland Society of Glasgow allowed them to support Highland children attending English language schools and better situate these children in Lowland (or civilised) society.\textsuperscript{14} The Society in Scotland for the Propagating of Christian Knowledge collected funds in order to set up schools throughout the Scottish Highlands and colonial America, which they used to ‘civilise’ the people

\textsuperscript{12} Minutes of the Belles Lettres Society of Edinburgh. Adv.Ms.5.1.6, NLS.

\textsuperscript{13} Early Proceedings of the Society for the Promotion of Useful Knowledge Compiled by one of the Secretaries from the Manuscript Minutes of Its Meetings from 1744 to 1838 (Philadelphia, 1884); Transactions of the American Philosophical Society held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge, Vol. I, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Edn. (Philadelphia, 1789); Essays and Observations, Physical and Literary. Read before the Philosophical Society in Edinburgh, and Published by them, Vol. I (Edinburgh, 1754).

\textsuperscript{14} The Scheme of Erection of the Highland Society of Glasgow: To Which is Subjoined, Additional Regulations, made in 1787 (Glasgow, 1788).
living there and, in turn, to spread the members’ Presbyterian religious views. Club revenue, along with the collection of grants, also provided the financial backing for cultural displays. At its most basic level, the collecting of dues allowed the societies to facilitate fashionable entertainment – paying landlords, buying food and drink, and decorating meeting halls.

Rules regulated the behaviour of the members at club meetings so that ‘collective’ order was maintained. Rules banning religious and political conversation and debate were common. The rules of the Select Society, for example, included, ‘That every Member may propose any subject of debate, except such as regard Revealed Religion, or which may give occasion to vent any Principles of Jacobitism.’ In the same way, in 1770, the ‘Moot’, a debating society in New York, established the rule that, ‘[N]o Member shall presume, upon any Pretence, to introduce any Discourse about party Politics of this Province, and to persist in Discourse after being desired by the President to drop it.’ The point of this was to provide a safe and regulated place for polite discussion and debate, which would not erupt into zealous arguments or violence or undermine the integrity of the society. These were coupled with regulations on physical behaviour – drunkenness and violence in particular. Some even had rules saying that they did not need rules. The Newtonian Club, for instance, had a rule, which stated, ‘That, as this club consists entirely of Philosopher[s], it would therefore be ridiculous to make any laws for its internal police.’ While humorous, this rule in itself suggested that certain behaviour was expected. Rules regarding lateness or absence could also be found in the majority of club documents.

Specific punishments for those who did not follow club procedure were also stated, which further reinforced the rules on behaviour and enforced club cohesion. These punishments could vary. The Tuesday Club of Annapolis, for instance, included a ‘Gelastic Law’ in their regulations. It stated, ‘That if any Subject of what

---

15 An Account of the Funds, Expenditures, and General Management of the Affairs, of The Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge: Containing in a Report, drawn by a Committee of their Number appointed for that Purpose (Edinburgh, 1796).
nature soever be discussed, which levels at party matters, or the administration of the Government of this province or be disagreeable to the Club…the Society shall laugh at the member offending, in order to divert the discourse.\textsuperscript{19} This law fit with one of the main purposes of the society, which was to ‘civilise’ its members through the practising of wit and humour.\textsuperscript{20} It also allowed the Club to diffuse potential arguments, which challenged the stability of the meetings. That said, fines were by far the most common punishment for inappropriate behaviour, lack of attendance, or delinquency. In fact, members could be fined for even small misdemeanours. In 1765, the Literary Society in Glasgow College included in their rulebook that, ‘If any Member shall not be within the threshold of the Room where the Literary Society meets when half an hour past five o’clock afternoon shall strike by the College Clock he shall pay Six pence.’\textsuperscript{21} Fines not only punished the offending member but also added to the income of the association and helped them fulfil their purpose. As such, fines were given out regularly without question. Expulsion was also a common punishment for either not paying dues, not coming to meetings, or gross misbehaviour that did not fit the principles of the association. In 1794, the Caledonian Society of New York included in their constitution a detailed and ‘fair’ procedure to deal with misbehaviour. It stated, ‘If any member shall be guilty of any act, that may injure the reputation of the Society, on proof thereof such member shall be excluded, and forfeit all he shall have paid to the funds.’\textsuperscript{22} No matter the punishment, the members understood that the breaking of rules had consequences. As such, they discouraged members from acting against society norms and challenging the stability or integrity of the association.

Moreover, in order to maintain this internal structure, most societies delegated responsibilities to certain members. This could be done in a variety of ways. Small eighteenth-century societies often rotated their officials. The Select Society, for instance, had a different ‘preses’ at each meeting who introduced the


\textsuperscript{22} Constitution of the Caledonian Society, of the City of New York: Instituted the 13\textsuperscript{th} of October 1794 (New York, 1794), p. 7.
question for the day and was responsible for assuring decorum. The Relief Fire Society of Boston recorded in their minute book that, ‘For the preservation of Order & Decency a Moderator shall be chosen at every Meeting by Ballot; and if any Member has anything to offer to the Consideration of the Society, relative to the Affairs thereof shall address the Moderator.’ The majority of societies throughout this period, however, nominated and elected officials to serve for a fixed period of time. This usually included a president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer. It could also include posts such as printer to the society, poet laureate, and chaplain. At the very least, they appointed a person to handle and collect society funds and keep the society’s records.

Some societies (especially large societies) appointed committees and managers to deal with particular aspects of their missions and to ensure that the members collectively followed their stated procedures. The Relief Fire Society of Boston, for instance, appointed ‘four Members, in their turn, one day at least before every Meeting who shall go & examine the Buckets, Bags, &c. of each Member respectively and report the same at the next Meeting’. In fact, these committees could be appointed to deal with any aspect of club activity, such as revising the rules, liaising with the community, organising events, or even creating lists of toasts. Some even created general standing committees to be used as the voice of the society. In 1815, the Bruce and Thistle Friendly Society of Bannockburn included in their rulebook that:

…a standing Committee, for, general purposes, consisting of eleven members, viz. a Preses, two Box-masters, and eight thereto, who shall act at all times in the name, and on the behoof of the Society; and all acts and orders of such Committee, under the

25 Most Scottish-American societies, for instance, held annual elections on St. Andrew’s day. See Rules for the St. Andrew’s Society of New-York (1770), p. 5; Rules of the St. Andrew’s Club at Charles-Town in South Carolina (London, 1731), p. 4.
26 Minute Book of Rules and Meetings of the Relief Fire Society (1773-1807), BLP, p. 3.
27 See, for example, the report of the sub-committee created to revise the rules of the Celtic Society in Objects and Regulations of the Celtic Society Instituted at Edinburgh 1820; with Copies of the Reports of the Distribution of the Society’s Prizes for 1832 (Edinburgh, 1833), pp. 31-32; The reference to the St. Andrew’s Society of Albany committee formed to write a letter to Alexander Hamilton’s father-in-law after his death can be found in the Connecticut Herald, 14 August 1804.
power delegated to them, shall have like force and effect as the acts and orders of the Society could or might have at any general meeting thereof…

The result was an oligarchical organisation, where a few members completed the vast majority of the society’s work.

While some societies may have created a hierarchical structure for political purposes, club oligarchies were most often created out of necessity. Small clubs with regular attendance could work as direct democracies. Membership lists of large associations (subscription societies in particular), however, often included hundreds of names while the lists of attendees at their regular meetings numbered in the teens. The only time that these associations were able to regularly attract high numbers of attendees was at celebrations when conviviality, most often facilitated by the overflowing punchbowl, was guaranteed. In reality, then, most members joined societies of this nature to reap the unstated social capital benefits of membership, such as the enhancement of reputations, the acquisition of patronage networks, entertainment, and a sense of community, rather than actively engage in its stated purpose. On 26 February 1761, for instance, William Strahan, a Scottish printer in London, sent a letter to David Hall, Benjamin Franklin’s printing partner and founding member of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, stating:

…the Bearer of this, Mr. William Miller, was bred under Mr Kincaid of Edinr. To whose suitable character you are no stranger…I pray you assist him, on his arrival, with your best advice; particularly whom to attach himself to and whom to avoid.

Miller was subsequently included in the list of members attached to the 1769 version of the Constitution of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia. It would not be at all surprising if Hall used the St. Andrew’s Society as a means to introduce Miller into Philadelphian society. For this reason, responsibilities were necessarily delegated to
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28 Regulations of the Bruce & Thistle Friendly Society of Bannockburn (Stirling, 1815), pp. 6-7.
29 William Strahan to David Hall, 26 Feb. 1761, David Hall Papers, Mss.B.H142, APS.
the most active and most committed members interested in promoting the purposes of the organisation that justified (at least nominally) its creation.

This did not in any way diminish the integrity of an association, its structure, or its identity expression. As the Royal Society of Edinburgh explained in their *Transactions*:

Every associated body must receive its vigour from a few zealous and spirited individuals, who find a pleasure in that society of business, which, were it left to the care of the members in general, should be often reluctantly submitted to, and always negligently executed.  

The other members supported the actions of the officials, even if they did not actively participate in them. While members did not necessarily attend meetings or join for the stated mission, instead using societies as a means to bolster their reputation or patronage networks, they still entered a contract with the association through the act of joining and by extension supported its purpose, stated claims, and actions. The oligarchical structure put in place by each association ensured that the society’s goals were met and that the prestige and the public ‘usefulness’ of the organisation were maintained. The members provided the society with financial backing, promoted the society’s reputation, and as a result, acquired the benefits of enhanced social capital. The actions of the officials were almost always brought to the attention of the society as a whole at general meetings and, in turn, voted on for general approval. As such, then, the entire association still had access to the decision-making process.

Another tool used to maintain internal integrity and assist the pursuit of influence were charters of incorporation, which were increasingly employed as the eighteenth century progressed. As Abraham Hume described in 1854, charters made societies ‘official [bodies] publicly and legally recognised’. 31 Charters gave societies the legal ability to buy and sell goods, sue and be sued, receive donations and

---

subscriptions, and function in perpetuity. They also gave state backing to the rules and seal of the society. While voluntary and civic, societies with official incorporations had legal legitimacy and support. As Hume argued, ‘Societies of this kind naturally [took] precedence of all others; and where several [were] in other respects, (or are assumed to be) of equal importance, priority of incorporation is a reasonable ground of distinction.’

It is important to note that official government approval could act as a double-edged sword. The government of both countries, Britain and (after independence) the United States of America, could refuse or revoke charters of incorporation, which had the potential to severely damage a society’s reputation and legitimacy. As Neem argued, ‘Legislators used their power over incorporation to determine who should form an association and for what ends.’ In 1754, the Charleston Library Society applied for a royal charter, which was delayed in passage from London back to the colonies. According to an account recorded in the 1785 rulebook of the Society, ‘this disappointment was attended with consequences almost fatal to the Society; the rules having as yet no legal sanction were but indifferently compiled with’. When an ‘exemplification of that instrument’ did arrive, the Society ‘received new life’.

As will be discussed in the following chapter, the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and the Royal Society of Edinburgh went through great pains to acquire royal charters, which legitimised their existence and purpose. Indeed, in their letter to the King, the Society of Antiquaries stated:

That your Majesty’s petitioners have purchased a house in the city of Edinburgh, for containing their books, papers, and other effects; but, not having a nomen juris, their rights to that property, to the effects at present in their possession, or to what they shall afterwards acquire, cannot be legally established, unless your Majesty is graciously pleased to grant them a royal charter.

32 Hume, Learned Societies, p. 6.
33 Neem, Creating a Nation of Joiners, p. 6.
34 The Rules and By-Laws of the Charleston Library Society: and the Act of the Legislature of South-Carolina, incorporating the said Society, with the Royal Confirmation, 4th Edn. (Charleston, 1785), p. 5.
Without the charter, the Society of Antiquaries could not open a museum or collect antiques, severely undermining their mission. That said, once a society was incorporated it had legal backing for its endeavours.

Consequently, the organisation of associations allowed them to maintain internal stability, but also advance their stated aims. While voluntary, clubs placed individuals into a shared structure, which regulated their behaviour and shaped the way they engaged with the community. Specific procedures, hierarchies of officials, and recognised charters meant that the society could retain and promote a collective identity supported by the members, and sometimes even the state.

II

At their most basic level, voluntary associations were groups of people with common interests, backgrounds, beliefs, or goals who were willing to pool their resources and who wished to gather together on occasion to celebrate their community of interests. They promoted themselves as patrons and places of sociability, friendship, the furtherance of useful knowledge, and the purveyors of the public good. Yet, they also acted as a way to demarcate certain groups in society. Doing so provided social capital benefits to those who joined and gave them disproportionate influence and authority within their communities and beyond.

One way for clubs to claim their authority was to exclude others from having it. Many clubs actively acknowledged their exclusivity. In fact, some societies based their stated purpose on their unique membership. As later chapters demonstrate, by allowing only Scots to join Scottish-American associations, these societies justified their celebration of Scottish culture and their philanthropic relief of Scots in need. They also made sure that only Scots (or those people the society defined as Scots) controlled the identity that they asserted.

Many had nomination and blackball voting systems, which meant that even men with the correct credentials did not have automatic access to membership. According to Alexander Carlyle’s account of the Poker Club, ‘after the first fifteen, who were chosen by nomination, the members were chosen by ballot, two black balls
to exclude the candidate’. 37 This practice continued throughout the period. The Bannatyne Club of Edinburgh included in their 1823 rules, ‘that three black balls shall be sufficient to exclude any person proposed for admission’. 38 The same type of membership and voting requirements existed in America. According to the rules of the St. Cecilia Society of New-York, published in 1797, ‘…three ballots against the admission of a Member shall be sufficient to negative his election’. 39 Most clubs also placed a cap on the number of people who could join. Benjamin Franklin’s Junto Club in Philadelphia limited its membership to twelve, while the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, which acted as a national institution, limited its membership to fifty. 40 Only those men deemed valuable for the society’s mission or worthy of membership had access to its internal workings.

The ceremonious character of many associations, especially small social clubs, solidified this selectivity even further. Societies required members to be initiated, take oaths, sign membership certificates, and participate in toasts. The Cape Club of Edinburgh’s records, for instance, stated:

The novice on making his appearance in Cape Hall, was led up to the Sovereign by two knightly sponsors, and, having made his obeisance, was required to grasp a large poker with his left hand, and laying his right hand on his breast, the oath de fidei, was administered to him by the Sovereign – the knights present all standing uncovered, - in the following words: -

I swear devoutly by this light,
To be a true and faithful Knight,
With all my might
Both day and night.
So help me Poker!

38 ‘Rules of the Bannatyne Club’, in Abbotsford Club Minute Book (1833), MS 2050, NLS.
Having then reverentially kissed the large poker, and continuing to grasp it, the Sovereign raised the small poker with both his royal fists, and aiming three successive blows at the novice’s head, he pronounced, with each, one of the initial letters of the motto of the Club.\textsuperscript{41}

These rituals were used to create a sense of solidarity, which highlighted the ‘us versus them’ aspect of club culture. Other societies used code words and symbols to do the same thing. The Relief-Fire Society of Boston included in their rulebook that ‘So that we may know one another there shall be a watch word…Every Member shall whisper the same at every Meeting when challenged by the Clerk’.\textsuperscript{42} These types of gestures emphasised the fraternal brotherhood that clubs provided, but also accentuated the exclusivity that was inherent in the creation of distinct communities.

Most societies on both sides of the Atlantic did not outwardly state that they restricted their membership based on wealth. Yet, high membership fees and annual dues could be used to price out some men from joining. The first set of rules of the Glasgow Highland Society stated that all members ‘entering, pay of entry-money to the Treasurer, TWENTY SHILLINGS sterling at the lowest, One Shilling to the Clerk, Sixpence to the Officer, and One Shilling sterling yearly, in name of quarter accompts, or Ten Shillings in full of the same, at the option of the intrants’.\textsuperscript{43} This level of dues ensured the exclusion of those without expendable income. Even then they stated that they left it ‘to Noblemen and Gentlemen charitably disposed, to give what greater or more generous entry-money they think fit’.\textsuperscript{44} While those who joined must have expected to pay into the fund as the Society acted as a charity, a twenty-shilling entrance fee still must have acted as a deterrent for many would-be members.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{42} Minute Book of Rules and Meetings of the Relief Fire Society (1773-1807), BPL, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Scheme of Erection} (1788), p. 3.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{45} According to Pulsifer, fishermen, police, brewers, and dock labourers made only £39-52 per annum during the Victorian period. 20 shillings would have been a high price for men in these circumstances to pay. Cameron Pulsifer, ‘Beyond the Queen’s Shilling: Reflections on the Pay of other Ranks in the Victorian British Army’, \textit{Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research} 80 (2002), p. 327.
The Gaelic Club of Gentlemen in Glasgow required its members to also join the Glasgow Highland Society.\footnote{Records of the Gaelic Society of Glasgow (Gaelic Club of Gentlemen), TD 746/1, ML, 7 March 1780.} According to its rules, ‘On the first Tuesday of January, or the first monthly Meeting of the year, every Member shall pay the Sum of Five Shillings, towards raising a Fund, to be at the Disposal of the Society, for promoting the Knowledge of the Gaelic Language, or for relieving distressed Highlanders’.\footnote{Quoted in Charles W.J. Withers, ‘Kirk, Club and Culture Change: Gaelic Chapels, Highland Societies and the Urban Gaelic Subculture in Eighteenth-Century Scotland’, Social History 10:2 (May 1985), p. 191.} Notwithstanding initial membership fees, members of the Gaelic Club and the Highland Society had to pay at least six shillings a year. The price of activities not included in the membership fee and regular dues also acted as a way to limit the kind of people who could join. The Gaelic Club of Gentlemen charged nine shillings from each member for each society dinner; again adding to the hefty price the society already expected them to pay.\footnote{Ibid.} While the clubs needed the revenue to maintain their mission, the cost of membership could also be manipulated to attract a certain kind of member and exclude others.

Many societies openly prided themselves on their ‘elite’ membership. Charleston enjoyed a golden age of culture during the eighteenth century, which, with the exception of the years surrounding the American Revolution, lasted until the second decade of the nineteenth century. The blossoming of Charleston’s commercial age resulted in the formation of elite societies to facilitate new entertainment and the emulation of British fashions.\footnote{Butler has produced an excellent history of the St. Cecilia Society of Charleston. Much of the information on the St. Cecilia Society of Charleston included in this thesis comes from his work. Butler, Votaries of Apollo.} The St. Cecilia Society of Charleston was created in c.1766 as a subscription music society and provided patronage for concerts until 1820.\footnote{Ibid., p. 1} In 1773, Josiah Quincy had the pleasure of attending one of the St. Cecilia Society of Charleston’s annual concerts on the day that the Society celebrated Governor Montagu of South Carolina’s return to London. In his diary he recorded:
The Concert-house is a large inelegant building situated down a yard at the entrance of which I was met by a Constable with his staff. I offered him my ticket, which was subscribed by the name of the person giving it, and directed admission of me by name, the officer told me to proceed. I did and was next met by a white waiter, who directs me to a third to whom I delivered my ticket, and was conducted in. The Hall is preposterously and out of all proportion large, no orchestra for the performers, though a kind of loft for fiddlers at the Assembly.51

While the concert held on that day was a special event, the process Quincy went through to simply enter the concert hall signifies the Society’s exclusivity regarding wealth and prestige. The constable at the front acted not only as a bar to public entry, but also as a visual symbol of the separation of elite and affluent activity from the rest of society. The ticket did not simply have the name of the concert, but was personalised with the names of the patron and attendee. This both signified individualised access, as well as accentuated the benevolence and patronage bestowed upon Quincy by one of the Society members. Later in the same entry, Quincy described the ladies’ ‘loftiness of head-dress’ and the gentlemen ‘dressed with richness and elegance’.52 He also stated that one of the musicians, ‘Abbercrombie can’t speak a word of English and has a salary of 500 guineas a year from the St. Cecilia Society’.53 While providing entertainment, then, the Society also acted as a passageway into Charleston’s elite community.

Butler has shown that the St. Cecilia Society of Charleston drew from the model of the established subscription concert societies in Britain. In fact, he suggested that the Society might have based itself on the Edinburgh Musical Society.54 As MacLeod has argued, ‘the [Edinburgh Musical] Society became the most important single influence on the musical culture of Edinburgh, giving concerts

52 Ibid. 
53 Ibid. It is unclear what language Abbercrombie spoke. His name, however, suggests that he may have spoke Gaelic.  
of music by older composers such as Corelli, Geminiani, and Handel alongside the
newer works of Stamitz, Richter, and others. The price of building a new hall in
1762, hiring professional musicians to play in concerts, and providing entertainment
to members and guests meant that the Edinburgh Musical Society regularly raised
subscription fees. While this also meant that they regularly expanded their
membership limit to gain funds, during every year of its existence lawyers, titled, and
landowning men made up the majority of its membership. It acted as a place for
Edinburgh’s cultural ‘elite’ to mix and enjoy highbrow entertainment. The creation
of cultural societies to demarcate elites in the community was, thus, an
acknowledged transatlantic practice.

Even with the focus on egalitarianism and individualism in the years
surrounding the American Revolution, voluntary associations in America maintained
their restrictive structure. Nomination and voting practices meant that American
clubs acted in a nepotistic manner. Only by knowing the right person or having the
right reputation could one gain access. According to the rules of the St. Andrew’s
Society of Baltimore published in 1806:

When any person is to be proposed for admission as a resident
Member, the Member shall give the Secretary, at a meeting of the
Society, a written notification thereof, mentioning the name of the
Candidate, his occupation and his place of nativity; which
notification shall be read; and at the next meeting he may be
Elected. The Election shall be by ballot; and the consent of three-
fourths of the Members present shall be necessary to the admission
of the Candidate. None but resident members shall be entitled to
vote in the Election or other business of the Society; and none shall
be considered as resident Members until they shall have paid the
fee of admission, and subscribed the Constitution.

Not only did the entrants need to have the correct ethnic background, they also
needed a nomination from a resident member to even begin the joining process. In

55 Jennifer MacLeod, ‘The Edinburgh Musical Society: Its Membership and Repertoire, 1728-1797’
56 See Table 2.3 in MacLeod, 'The Edinburgh Musical Society', p. 30.
57 St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore Minute Book (1806-1915), SC 5181, MSA, 29 November 1806.
addition, they had to state their occupation in order to show that they met the economic and status requirements that the Society held.

Thus, societies attempted to limit the kind of people who had access to their memberships in order to enhance (or maintain) their social standing and increase their authority and legitimacy. Members had the ability to pick who they wanted to socialise with and exclude those they did not. By using ‘unique’ memberships, nomination requirements, expensive fees, and ritualistic ceremonies, the societies made a real effort in creating membership lists filled with people who supported their underlying priorities. As such, the reputations of the societies and their members were maintained and could even be improved. As will be seen in the following chapters, this was an essential aspect of their identity expression, as it allowed the societies to choose who represented Scotland.

III

Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scots and Americans understood associations as a predominantly masculine space. The activities that they engaged in and the topics they discussed adhered to the social conception of masculine and feminine characteristics contemporarily understood in both contexts. As such, they provided what was seen as an appropriate vehicle for the furtherance of masculine initiatives.

One of the key roles of eighteenth-century social and literary clubs was to instruct men on polite and sociable behaviour and to provide them with a safe and friendly space to practise these newly acquired skills. Sociability (the ‘polite’ interaction of people within a social setting) was an understood imperative of the eighteenth-century Scottish and American ‘elite’ communities, as it was believed to lead to a depth of emotion, a sense of community, and mutual support.58 While

eighteenth-century Scottish scholars praised sociable interactions between the sexes, and some associations facilitated this type of sociability, purely male social interactions were seen as vital to male refinement and the cultivation of the ‘civilised’ man. It was believed by many that spending too much time in mixed gendered conversation, while important in small doses, could result in the creation of effeminate men controlled too much by their emotions. A man could only truly become a refined gentleman by engaging in exclusively masculine activities. While the way in which manhood was understood varied regionally in colonial America as a result of religious and economic differences, historians generally agree that colonial men largely drew from the understanding of ‘refined manliness’ contemporarily defined on the British mainland, at least until the American Revolution. Male-only clubs, then, were understood to provide a space for men to be men, and not be negatively affected by the influence of women.

In order to facilitate this masculinity, associations provided structured opportunities for men to engage in primarily masculine activities. While alcohol began to take a less celebrated place in early-Victorian and early-national American society, the result of the growth of temperance movements in both Britain and America, communal and public drinking remained prominent as part of masculine sociability throughout this period. As William and Robert Chambers recorded in

---


their *Edinburgh Journal* of 1847 in reference to alcohol consumption, ‘The fact seems to be, that a kind of Laodicean principle is observable in Scotland, and we oscillate between a rigour of manners on the one hand, and a laxity on the other, which alternately acquire an apparent paramouncy.’\(^{62}\) In America, as in Scotland, manliness was associated with alcohol consumption. As Rotundo argued, ‘in some all-male settings, the pressure to drink was so strong that liquor consumption became a badge of man-hood’.\(^{63}\)

Club members, from small social clubs to large national institutions, engaged in communal drinking accompanied by toasting and the singing of bawdy songs.\(^{64}\) While some, like Johnson’s biographer James Boswell saw this as a contradiction to the cultivation of male politeness (at least when he was not included in the activity), many club members saw it as a way to avoid falling into ‘effeminacy’ and a way to solidify masculine social cohesion.\(^{65}\) As Brown argues, ‘boisterous song provided perhaps the most vibrant fraternal bond in eighteenth-century Scottish culture.’\(^{66}\) Robert Fergusson, for instance, celebrated the masculine conviviality of the Cape Club when he wrote in his poem, ‘The Capeiad in Three Cantos’:

Towards the Cape he takes the Road  
There enters and received the nod  
Of Welcom from his Brother Squires  
Who meet where ere the knight desires  
At unmost Bench with Smut and ale  
The Lads who nights themselves regale.\(^{67}\)

---

\(^{64}\) Peter Thompson, ‘“The Friendly Glass”: Drink and Gentility in Colonial Philadelphia’, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 113:4 (Oct. 1989), pp. 556-559. Additionally, see the toasting and drinking described in Chapters 3, 5, and 6 of this work.  
\(^{67}\) Robert Fergusson, ‘The Capeiad in Three Cantos’, Records of the Cape Club, David Laing Collection, La.III.464, CRC.
His esteem for his ‘Brother Squires’ and the ‘Smut and ale’ shared between them is indicative of the celebration of homo-social masculine entertainment at that time. When coupled with the polite sociability practised in more serious associations, more convivially raucous atmospheres offered men an acceptable balance of masculinities. As Benjamin Franklin wrote, ‘I doubt not that moderate Drinking has been improv’d for the Diffusion of Knowledge among the ingenious Part of Mankind…drinking does not improve our Faculties, but it enables us to use them.’

Similarly, as early as 1729, the Meridional Club of Philadelphia defended its convivial practice by stating that they met ‘to regale themselves for about half an hour over a bowl of punch and thereby to preserve an agreeable unity among themselves, a profitable correspondence in regard to business and a happy decorum in mixt affairs, such as characters, controversies etc’.

The purpose-driven nature of many societies underscored their masculine ethos as well. Literary and intellectual clubs and societies justified their goals and purposes based on conclusions reached by ‘rational discourse’, scientific learning, and professional inquiry, which were understood as methods and subjects of the male sphere. As the preses of the Literary Society of the North Country (supposed by McElroy to be the Perth Miscellaneous Society) stated:

And while thus some of the most useful topics in civil, religious, or commercial life, have engaged our attention, and exercised the power of invention and judgement in debate, we have not been burdened with the whimsical remonstrances, or partial interferences of female associations, like some of our neighbouring establishments.

Moreover, urban volunteerism acted as a celebrated masculine endeavour. When describing the volunteer fire companies of Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin stated, ‘here are brave Men, Men of Spirit and Humanity, good Citizens, or Neighbours,


70 *Gentleman’s and Lady’s Weekly Magazine*, 22 April 1774, quoted in McElroy, ‘Literary Societies’, p. 656.
capable and worthy of civil Society, and the Enjoyment of a happy Government’.\textsuperscript{71} As Greenberg has shown, masculinity proved more important to American fire companies than even class or ethnicity well into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{72} Indeed, it was believed that acting for the public good through voluntary action made them better men.\textsuperscript{73} Public work and intellectual discourse, the purpose of many associations, was seen as the realm of men, which could be compromised by the ‘whimsical remonstrances’ of female participation.\textsuperscript{74}

By the end of the eighteenth century, ‘enlightenment’ culture began to change in Scotland. As Dwyer has argued, from the c.1770s onwards, some Scottish philosophers started to take a less optimistic view of societal progression. The influence of metropolitan ‘foppery’, war on the Continent, American discontent, and increased contempt for Scots during the Bute administration resulted in a less optimistic view of the way Scotland was progressing toward ‘civility’.\textsuperscript{75} This led scholars like Adam Ferguson to discuss what happens when civil society falls apart and subsequently support the maintenance of more traditional masculine values.\textsuperscript{76} As will be discussed further in Chapter 4, the rise of Toryism as a result of the French wars and the development of European romanticism led Scots to celebrate traditional virtues, including martial masculinity and masculine authority. In 1822, for instance, the Celtic Society described their president’s speech by stating, ‘The objects of the association were stated from the chair with clearness, manliness, and chieftain-like eloquence’.\textsuperscript{77} Indeed, throughout the Celtic Society’s speeches, even those published in public newspapers, they celebrated the patriarchal nature of clanship and furthered the idea of female subordination.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{74} Gentleman’s and Lady’s Weekly Magazine, 22 April 1774.
\textsuperscript{76} Adam Ferguson, \textit{An Essay on the History of Civil Society} (Edinburgh and London, 1767).
\textsuperscript{77} Glasgow Herald, 21 January 1822.
\textsuperscript{78} See, for instance, the articles on the Celtic Society published in the \textit{Caledonian Mercury}, 3 February 1821, 6 March 1823.
The politicisation of civic culture in the United States after independence heightened the masculinity of political and intellectual American club culture as well. As Kaplan states, in the early republic ‘to be a political actor was to be a white male, and to be a white male, was to be a political actor’. The post-revolutionary ideas of individual sovereignty and the equality of men resulted in political, commercial, and intellectual civil society organisations taking on a much more politically important, and thus masculine, role. They became, at least in part, the mouthpiece of the new politically legitimate white male ‘bread winner’ population.

This is not to say that women were excluded from all associational activities throughout this period. The Edinburgh Musical Society, for instance, published tracts, which included music for ladies as well as encouraged women to attend their concerts. The St. Cecilia Society of Charleston included a rule, which stated, ‘Every Member is allowed to introduce to the Concert as many LADIES as he thinks proper.’ This, however, was not seen as undermining the masculinity of public social intercourse. John Gregory wrote in A Father’s Legacy to His Daughters in 1774, ‘I have considered your sex; not as domestic drudges, or the slaves of our pleasures, but as our companions and equals; as designed to soften our hearts and polish our manners.’ Hetero-social interactions came to be seen as allowing women to influence men through sensibility, which was considered an important characteristic of the ‘civilised’ gentleman as long as he also participated in homo-social sociability.
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81 St. Cecilia; or, the Lady’s and Gentleman’s Harmonious Companion being a Select Collection of Scots and English Songs; Many of Which are Originals. Together with a Set of Favourite Catches and Glees: Also a Variety of the most Celebrated Toasts and Sentiments (Edinburgh, 1779).
83 John Gregory, A Father’s Legacy to His Daughters (Dublin, 1774), p. 4.
84 Carr, ‘Gender, National Identity and Political Agency’, p. 147.
meant that they were invited to participate in those club activities meant to add sensitivity as part of the masculine nature of the associational community.

Some women also challenged the patriarchal nature of intellectual and political associational culture by creating their own societies, or petitioning to be included in traditionally male-only activities. The Fair Intellectual-Club in Edinburgh published a ‘letter’ written to the Athenian Society in 1720, stating that in 1717 three women decided to form an exclusively female club for mutual improvement. The secretary recorded:

The Honour of our Sex in general, as well as our particular Interest, was intended, when we made that Agreement. We thought it a great Pity, that Women, who excel a great many others in Birth and Fortune, should not also be more eminent in Virtue and good Sense, which might attain unto, if we were as industrious to cultivate our Minds, as we are to adorn our Bodies.  

They created the society, in part at least, to give women the same opportunities for intellectual discourse as men. Yet, they knew that their very existence might be seen as challenging gender conceptions. In fact, they only made their existence known because the secretary broke the Club’s rules and told her ‘lover’ about her club activities. They also concluded their ‘Advertisement’ by stating:

Ignorance of human Nature (whereof Women partake as well as Men) Malice, Weakness or Want of Thought, may occasion a great many Objections against us, such as, that we go out of our Sphere; that we neglect more proper Business &c…We flatter our selves, the Males will not, but if any of our Sex think fit to attack us, we hope to be able to give the World Satisfaction, while we put them to Confusion in our Defences.

In order to deal with possible contempt, the Fair-Intellectual-Club justified its existence by stating ‘we neither go out of our Sphere, nor have acted inconsiderably
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85 An Account of the Fair Intellectual-Club in Edinburgh in a LETTER To an Honourable Member of an Athenian Society there (Edinburgh, 1720), p. 3.
86 Ibid., ‘Advertisement’.
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in what we have done’.\textsuperscript{88} They took great pains to argue that they followed ‘serious’ club procedure. The ‘lady’ secretary recorded, ‘You must have the Charity, Sir, to believe we were very serious and deliberate in our Retirements, while we endeavour to be fully satisfied in our own Minds concerning the Reasonableness and Expediency of what we were to do.’\textsuperscript{89} So, while they maintained the same organisation, exclusivity, and class-based structure as most male clubs by their inclusion of only women, they still acknowledged that they could be seen as entering a ‘sphere’ in which they did not belong.\textsuperscript{90}

In 1775, the Pantheon Society in Edinburgh ‘unanimously agreed to admit Ladies to hear the debates of the Society’.\textsuperscript{91} This, however, only occurred after women used the \textit{Weekly Magazine} to make a case for their participation. In particular, a woman by the name Miss J.S. published a poem titled ‘On hearing the Members of the PANTHEON had resolved to admit no Ladies into their Society’, which read:

\begin{quote}
The eastern prophet did exclude
All women for his heaven;
And in our time a dread concord
By Pantheonites is given,
“That now no fair shall entrance find
“Into the learned hall”
As Sallique law precludes the sex
From ruling over Gaul
But, gods! Beware, perhaps ere long
You Sorely will repent;
We can debar you access too;
‘Tis time then to relent.\textsuperscript{92}
\end{quote}

Rather than stating that women had the intellectual ability to add to the Pantheon debates, Miss J.S. used the Lysistrataesque power women had concerning sex to threaten the male members into compliance. As Carr notes, the way women were

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., p. 3. For more on the Fair Intellectual-Club see Carr, ‘Gender, National Identity and Political Agency’, pp. 269-275.
\textsuperscript{91} Pantheon Debating Society Minutes (1773-1779), MS Gen 1283, GUL, 3 January 1775.
treated in the Society’s debates after 1775, such as being given fruit rather than rum and having allotted seats rather than free access to the hall, indicates that while they were able to be present at debates and participate through voting, inequality was still maintained.\textsuperscript{93}

American women had more access to female-only intellectual club activity than their Scottish sisters through informal ‘reading circles’, benevolent societies, and female mutual improvement associations. Clubs like those created by Hannah Mather Crocker, Annis Boudinot Stockton, Milcah Martha Moore, and Elizabeth Graeme Ferguson circulated manuscripts and letters and held intellectual and political debates. They provided an avenue through which women practised their intellectual agency, expressed views on gender equality, and debated politics within an appropriate social space.\textsuperscript{94} Yet they still worked within a masculine social construct. The Union Club, which consisted of a family of sisters and female cousins living in New York and Connecticut who sent letters to one another, also included male figures like John Turnbull and Timothy Dwight in their correspondence in order to measure masculine opinions on their ideas.\textsuperscript{95} Additionally, these clubs overwhelmingly modelled themselves on male-only associations, but met in female appropriate spaces, namely the home, female academies, and seminaries rather than the tavern or society hall, and did not engage in the public performance of a convivial nature, which characterised the masculine associational domain.\textsuperscript{96} They had to conform to appropriate gender conditions in order not to be seen as a challenge to contemporary understandings of women and men’s place in civilised society.

By the nineteenth century, women on both sides of the Atlantic began to create an associational niche, which allowed them to participate in public life. They, for instance, formed subscriptions societies, which promoted what was seen as

\textsuperscript{95} Kaplan, \textit{Men of Letters in the Early Republic}, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{96} A description of female societies can be found in Mary Kelley, “‘The Need of their Genius’: Women’s Reading and Writing Practices in Early America”, \textit{Journal of the Early Republic} 28:1 (Jun. 2008), pp. 1-22.
female endeavours such as culture, moral reform, or benevolence.\textsuperscript{97} Female auxiliary societies, in particular, acted as a way for women to appropriately, in early-nineteenth century terms, engage in more masculine social and political initiatives. Although they had female members and female officials, however, they still answered to their male counterparts. The Female Servants’ Society, for example, formed in Aberdeen in 1809 to support the male members of the Edinburgh Bible Society.\textsuperscript{98} In fact, according to an editorial note in Dudley’s account of the Society, ‘The first donation of this Society was presented to the Edinburgh Bible Society’.\textsuperscript{99} The Glasgow Ladies’ Auxiliary Emancipation Society formed in 1834 in order to promote the initiatives of the more prominent (and male) Glasgow Emancipation Society.\textsuperscript{100} Women accessed public improving measures and club activity but only in a subordinate way. Even the use of the term ‘female’ in the club names, when one never finds a society with the word ‘male’ in its title, demonstrates that women’s clubs were subsidiary to those formed for men. To add to this, when women’s associations expanded too far into the political sphere, usually through advocating for the abolition of slavery or for female suffrage, they met with strong opposition.\textsuperscript{101}

Nineteenth-century aristocratic Scottish women also occasionally entered primarily male associations, especially those women who acted as landowners in their own right or donated substantial amounts of money to the societies. As a result of their hierarchical standing in society and monetary support, they could function in masculine spaces while at the same time remaining feminine. In 1809, the \textit{Aberdeen Journal} recorded that ‘Miss Ann Preston Campbell, of Fairnton, Perthshire, a lady of fortune and respectability, who had come forward in support of the institution, was unanimously admitted a member’ of the Highland Society of Scotland.\textsuperscript{102} Her

\textsuperscript{97} For more on the growth of women’s societies see Anne M. Boylan, \textit{The Origins of Women’s Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., p. 356.
\textsuperscript{100} Three Years’ Female Anti-Slavery Effort, in Britain and America: Being a Report of the Proceedings of the Glasgow Ladies Auxiliary Emancipation Society, Since its Formation in January, 1834: Containing a Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the American Female Anti-Slavery Society and Valuable Communication Addressed by them, Both to Societies and Individuals in this Country (Glasgow, 1837), p. 4.
\textsuperscript{101} Neem, \textit{Creating a Nation of Joiners}, pp. 105-106.
\textsuperscript{102} Aberdeen Journal, 5 July 1809.
fortune, respectability, and support for the Society allowed her to join a male
dominated association.

Yet, the appropriateness of allowing women into male associations continued
to be debated into the nineteenth century. In 1833, the Secretary of the Highland
Society of Scotland, R. Macdonald, wrote to the Duke of Hamilton:

Under the circumstances My Lord Duke, it has occurred to me, that
it would be a want of courtesy on the part of the Society, not to put
it in the power and option at least, of the consort, of the first
Subject of Scotland, to be Elected an Honorary Member of this
National Institution, provided Her Grace Sanction & Your Graces
approbation were obtained for this purpose: convinced as I am, that
if these were obtained, “The Duchess of Hamilton & Brandon,”
name would be received with Enthusiasm and Her Grace with
acclamation, an Honorary Member of the Society…

While Macdonald offered membership to the Duchess of Hamilton, he addressed his
letter to the Duke rather than the Duchess, and asked for the Duke’s approval.
Unless a woman owned land in her own right and already functioned in the
masculine sphere, women had to answer to their male counterparts. In fact, they had
to answer to males even if they were landed as they depended on men for their
membership.

Despite these significant developments and exceptions, associational culture
remained a masculine domain. When women entered and formed their own
associations they proceeded with caution and were careful to maintain what were
considered feminine characteristics. So, in general, clubs were still primarily seen as
a means by which men could practise male-centred refinement and conviviality and,
in turn, reinforce an attitude of male supremacy and authority. This masculine
structure resulted in the promotion of primarily male initiatives, and underscored the
idea that men were naturally the more rational and convivial of the two sexes. As
will be seen in the following chapters, the masculine orientation of clubs is key to
understanding the male-centred formulation of Scottish identity.

103 R. Macdonald to the Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, 28 December 1833, Douglas-Hamilton
Family, Dukes of Hamilton and Brandon Papers, TD2012/8/C4/899.
Clubs provided an effective and satisfying mix of public and private interaction. They excluded people from joining, yet still sought to influence those beyond their inner circles. They sought to make themselves known in order to increase the reputation of the members as well as influence the wider public.

As Roney has pointed out, ‘among the reasons men joined clubs was the status associated with membership – and that status could only be attained by others knowing, seeing a man in a club’. The physical act of meeting in a public space, such as a tavern or coffeehouse, made even ‘secret’ societies public and allowed for their performance of identity to reach a much wider audience than those who participated in meetings. While clubs often met in private rooms by this period, the other patrons would still have been aware that a meeting was taking place. Moreover, the taverns the societies used were picked not only for their affordability and convenience, but also for their reputations. The St. Andrew’s Society of New York, for instance, held their first anniversary meeting at an establishment called ‘Scotch Johnny’s’; telegraphing to the members and the outside public the ethnic/national leanings of the group. Clubs that built their own purpose-built halls, like the Edinburgh Musical Society (which built St. Cecilia Hall in 1762), or the Carpenter Company of the City and County of Philadelphia (which built Carpenters’ Hall in 1771) made a public statement by physically placing their buildings in prominent areas of the city or town. These halls were also used by other societies because of their prominent position. Carpenters’ Hall was not only home to the Carpenter’s Company but also the Library Company of Philadelphia and the American Philosophical Society who then went on to build their own halls in the same area of Philadelphia. The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland held their first meeting in the ‘Hall of the Society for the propagating of Christian knowledge’ before it opened its own museum in Edinburgh’s Cowgate.
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Most associations used whatever means available to them to influence not just their immediate community but also society as a whole. Many clubs organised events, parades, or competitions as publicity in order to carve out a role in influencing the attitude of a wider public. The Tuesday Club, for instance, paraded annually through the streets of Annapolis wearing badges and ribbons.\(^\text{108}\) Cultural societies made up the majority of the procession for the King’s visit to Edinburgh in 1822.\(^\text{109}\) Philanthropic and reform societies also advertised their existence and moral underpinnings by providing money or opportunities to people in need. In doing so, they engaged not only with their overwhelmingly middle- and upper-ranked members, but also the lower-class people they sought to help. Literary societies held public debates or classes with the intention to educate the public as well as promote the intellectual integrity of the members.\(^\text{110}\) Highland societies held bagpipe competitions and Highland games in order to demonstrate Highland culture and martial prowess.

Print, however, was by far the best way to engage with the public. The uses of print as a material medium through which societies physically displayed Scottish identity to the wider public and bolstered the reputation of the societies and their individual members will be evaluated further in Chapter 6. A brief introduction to associational uses of print, however, is useful at this point in the thesis as well. Literary and improving clubs printed their transactions and circulated them in their communities as well as farther afield. William Franklin referenced information he found in the ‘Select Transaction of the Edinburgh Society’ in a letter to his father from Burlington, New Jersey in 1769, suggesting that the Scottish society must have distributed their documents across the Atlantic.\(^\text{111}\) Moral and philanthropic societies printed sermons and speeches given at society gatherings, which both presented a particular message as well as outlined the aims of the associations.\(^\text{112}\) As early as the


\(^{109}\) This will be explored more fully in Chapter 3.

\(^{110}\) See, for instance, the English elocution lessons sponsored by the Select Society for Promoting the Reading and Speaking of the English Language in Scotland. Scots Magazine, Vol. XXIII (Edinburgh, 1761), p. 390. This will be explored more fully in the following chapter.


\(^{112}\) An example of this type of publication is David Hosack, A Funeral Address, delivered on the twenty-sixth of May, 1818, at the Interment of Doctor James Tillary, late president of the St. Andrew’s
mid-eighteenth century, societies commissioned club histories. The ‘History of the Royal Society of Edinburgh’ was included in its *Transactions*. As early as 1782, William Smellie wrote and published an *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* and sold it at the Society museum to anyone interested in purchasing it. These works allowed the societies to present their identity to an audience much larger than their immediate memberships.

The most advantageous print medium was the periodical press. Newspapers provided clubs of all varieties a public relations platform and a vehicle for advertising their existence and imperatives. Before the 1780s, associations in Scotland and America used local newspapers to publish ‘public notices’ and communicate with society members. Many societies, including Scottish societies, printed their meeting times and places in local newspapers as a means to inform members, and consequently non-members, of upcoming events. Short articles providing quick summaries of meetings and events, and brief editorial criticisms were also included. As evidenced by the image in Figure 1.1, one newspaper could publish numerous associational advertisements on any given day. While these articles, announcements, and advertisements had the practical purpose of reminding members of their responsibilities and activities, they also served to increase the visibility of club activity and spark interest amongst the community. In this way the most private clubs also reinforced their exclusivity. They reminded the public of their existence while at the same time informing them of their restricted activities. Associations could also gain recognition and assert legitimacy by using phrases that highlighted their formal organisation and structure, such as ‘pursuant to their Charter’, ‘appointed by Law’, or referencing clubs officials like ‘Managers’, ‘Directors’, or ‘Treasurers’. By doing so, they enhanced the reputation of the society without offering unrestricted entry to the public.

*Society of the city of New-York...* (New York, 1818); Donald Fraser, *An Essay on the Origin, Antiquity, &c. of the Scots and Irish Nations, with an Impartial Sketch of the Character of Most of the Nations of Europe: To which is added, an oration, lately delivered before the Caledonian Society, in this city* (New York, 1809).


Eighteenth-century Scottish magazines provided an even wider publishing platform for voluntary associations than newspapers. The *Scots Magazine*, the *Edinburgh Magazine*, the *Edinburgh Magazine and Review*, the *North British Magazine*, and the *Weekly Magazine* printed articles related to Scottish club activity, advertisements for public society events, and open letters written either by club members or to the society from people outside its membership.\(^{115}\) Public letters of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and the Royal Society of Edinburgh, for example, were published in the *Scots Magazine*, as its cultural agenda and editorial style provided a vehicle through which associational rivalries could become

Scottish magazines also had a more national agenda, thus providing an even better avenue through which societies with national interests could promote themselves and their objectives.

Political unrest in America resulted in a change in the way that newspapers were used. The Stamp Act and Townshend Acts of the mid-eighteenth century, in particular, resulted in newspapers becoming a mechanism for the expression of public opinion. Journalism started to play a more profound role in national affairs. Freedom of the press also became a hot topic, as many newspaper editors saw the taxing of paper as a way towards political censorship and overbearing governmental control. The American Revolution only intensified the issue. As Nord argues, ‘Throughout the fifty years after 1776 newspapers were usually outrageously partisan, and factional in other ways as well. Newspapers represented and exacerbated all the lines of cleavage in the early Republic.’

The politicisation of the press did not abate following American independence. According to Pasley, ‘many physical political events (such as party meetings or banquets) were held to provide an occasion for printing a statement that some local politician had written in advance’.

American associations took advantage of the fact that newspapers provided an increased avenue for public engagement. They began to couple their public notices and advertisements with full accounts of celebrations, open letters and addresses, lists of members, club histories, lists of toasts, and lengthy articles about their mission. By doing so, societies furthered their mission as well as engaged with contemporary politics.

The character of Scotland’s periodical press also began to change in the age of revolutions. According to William Creech, in 1765 there were only six printing establishments in Edinburgh. By 1792, there were sixteen. The rise of urbanisation, a conscious middle class, and the politicisation of the press, resulting in
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part from the French Revolution, meant, as Harris argues, ‘a growing importance [of the press] as vehicles of publicity to the expanding range of activities and bodies’.  

As Nenadic has shown, the press became a medium for middle class protest in Scotland as an orderly and legitimate way to propose and advocate reform. As Cowan has argued, from the last quarter of the eighteenth century, newspapers started to provide more detail on local issues and public life.

Thus, clubs and societies started to publicise detailed articles about their anniversary celebrations and other events, much like associations in America. The Highland Society of Scotland, for instance, contributed an article of over 1000 words to the 18 January 1800 edition of the *Caledonian Mercury*, relating the events of the Society’s anniversary meeting. It included a list of new members, societal decisions made, the state of the Society’s funds, future endeavours, officers elected, and even where the celebration was held. Scottish associations also continued to use magazines, such as the *Quarterly Review*, or *Blackwood’s Magazine*, because they catered to a more ‘genteel’ clientele. Here, lengthy editorials, such as Scott’s review of the Bannatyne Club published in the *Quarterly Review* in 1831, appeared. Scottish periodicals of all varieties were used as a way to explicitly communicate associational existence, activity, and identity to the Scottish population. As Tocqueville argued, ‘nothing but a newspaper can drop the same thought into a thousand minds at the same moment. A newspaper is an adviser that does not require to be sought, but that comes of its own accord and talks to you briefly every day of the common weal, without distracting you from your private affairs.’ Clubs on both sides of the Atlantic seemed to agree.

Thus, the associational audience was larger than the membership lists would suggest. Public events, competitions, lectures, and published tracts enhanced the societies’ influence and visibility. Newspapers reached a mixed-gender and mixed-class readership as well. This was all underpinned with organisation and structure,
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which maintained the integrity of the expressions associated with the societies. Indeed, this public persona will be the focus of the rest of the chapters in this thesis, as it was what allowed societies to influence the way Scots perceived themselves and were perceived by others.

V

Scottish associations provided an important institution on both sides of the Atlantic by which men and groups could increase their individual reputation and status as well as achieve a common and public goal. Unlike less formal spaces of public sociability, they were structured vehicles for the assertion of masculine influence and authority within both the Scottish and American communities yet still had the ability to adapt. They had the means to exert a public impact rather than simply an internal one. They provided a crucial and effective vehicle through which Scottish ethnic and national identities were created and performed.

Having established the reasons why associations were ‘useful’ in achieving particular aims and creating coherent group identities in Scotland and America, this thesis now turns to the exploration and comparison of the experience of associations in defining Scottish identities in a transatlantic context and the ways in which that identity was constructed and expressed. To begin this analysis, the following chapter examines Scottish associational expressions of Scottish identity in Scotland from c.1750-1790, the period best known as the ‘Scottish Enlightenment’.
CHAPTER 2

‘I could not help remembering that I was a Scot’: Scottish National Identity in Scotland’s Clubs, c.1750-1790

With the union with England finally secure and the Jacobite threat seemingly defeated, Scotland experienced a measure of political stability and economic growth in the period from c.1750-1790.¹ Many Scots began to see the benefit of, or at least the necessity of, playing a role in the expanding British Empire.² With enhanced colonial trade and agricultural migration came developing urban environments. In these urban spaces, professional and business groups expanded to provide needed services to the emerging populations. Lawyers, doctors, professors, merchants, artisans, and their landed patrons all necessarily contributed to the stability of Scottish urban life. The absence of a centralised state mechanism operating in Scotland put further emphasis on these groups to fill the cultural and social vacuum left after the dissolution of the Scottish Parliament and the absence of Edinburgh as an official political capital.³ Thus, to maintain professional standards, develop network and patronage opportunities, and to maintain the institutional underpinnings of prestige, groups of men, particularly those in the professions left after the union, not just in Edinburgh but also in the Scottish provinces, took advantage of this ‘useful’ medium and founded a profusion of clubs and societies and invited (or at the very least allowed) men they deemed as worthy or ‘useful’ to join.⁴

¹ As Shapin has argued for the 1780s, ‘Not since the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 had the cohesiveness of Edinburgh society been seriously threatened by political ideological conflict’. Steven Shapin, ‘Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science: The Founding of the Royal Society of Edinburgh’, British Journal for the History of Science 7:1 (Mar. 1974), p. 16.
While these associations took a variety of shapes, their records suggest that most, if not all of the men who formed and joined them believed that the performance of Scottish national identity (and Scottish regional identities) was important to preserving the social and cultural traditions of Scottishness in the absence of government support. This associational performance of Scottish identities turned out to function as a highly efficient vehicle for these societies to achieve their political, cultural, and economic aims. In forging distinctive and localised, yet also integrated Scottish identities through associations, ‘metropolitan’, provincial, and even Highland Scots sought to better place themselves within the world in which they now belonged.

This chapter explores how and why Scots used clubs to construct and express Scottish identity during the ‘Scottish Enlightenment’. In order to do this, this chapter begins with an examination of the societies founded and joined by Edinburgh’s self-proclaimed intelligentsia, or ‘literati’. It explores how these overwhelmingly professional men in Scotland’s capital used associations as vehicles through which they expressed Scottish identity, and how this identity expression facilitated the achievement of their social, economic, and political priorities in wider British and European contexts. A case study of the controversy between the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland follows, demonstrating that the literati sought to use associations as a means to maintain a monopoly on Scottish identity performance and its definition, and fiercely defended their position when challenged. Next, an examination of societies in the Scottish provinces shows how those outside Scotland’s capital used associations as a way to be included in Edinburgh ‘metropolitan’ culture, but also present their own regional agendas and identities. Finally, a look at the early Highland societies shows how those who joined these societies sought to position their members as well as the people they represented within the wider contexts of nation and empire.

I

Scholars have engaged with eighteenth-century Edinburgh’s club culture. They have argued that the associations that formed in Edinburgh during this period,
especially the literary societies, played a key role in shaping Scotland’s enlightenment discourse.\(^5\) Despite this, Edinburgh’s ‘enlightenment’ clubs, meaning those formed and joined by the self-proclaimed Edinburgh ‘literati’ are often used as evidence for the argument that eighteenth-century Scotland was a cultural and political province of England, which, by the 1750s, had tossed away its own culture in favour of ‘North Britishness’ or even ‘Anglo-Britishness’.\(^6\) The historiography on Scottish national and cultural identity up to this point has tended to present the eighteenth-century Scots who joined these societies as presenting Scotland as inferior to their southern neighbours and seeking in every way to ‘subvert’ their past in favour of a ‘British’ future by drawing from English models.\(^7\)

Such easy dismissal of Scottish identity distorts the interests of those who joined Edinburgh’s ‘enlightenment’ clubs, the distinctiveness they wished to present, and the versatile and representative nature of Scotland’s associational culture. Presenting these clubs as drawing from English examples only tells one side of the story and undermines the complexity of eighteenth-century Scots’ expressions of citizenship. On closer examination, ‘enlightenment’ associations, especially those in Edinburgh, were key in promoting an adaptable and inclusive Scottish identity that provided their members with tools to move fluidly in a variety of external cultural and political contexts. The need to situate Scotland (a Scotland with a distinct and sophisticated history, identity, and culture) as a useful and equal partner in Britain’s imperial mission was crucial. Equally, it was vital that members had an identity that could nurture and propagate the sense that Scotland could provide a useful contribution to the pan-European enlightenment and be considered a cultural citizen of the ‘civilised’ world. At its core, however, these societies maintained and
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reflected the Scottish priorities of their members and sought to re-make, rather than subvert, Scotland as a respected historical and modern entity.\(^8\)

In order to understand the significance of Scottish identity in the eighteenth century, we must disassociate ourselves from its more grotesque cultural trappings in the twenty-first century. For eighteenth-century Scottish elites, patriotism centred on individual and collective development and the refinement of cultural habits. The link between enlightenment societies and identity was entirely natural given the emphasis placed on refinement by the associational world. The individuals who joined these clubs and formulated their agendas, sought to express themselves as civilised actors in a much wider political and cultural sphere than Scotland alone. Enhancing the civility of Scottish identity became, first and foremost, a means of asserting the refinement of club members as they moved into wider national, imperial, and European settings.

There was and is a powerful symbiosis between promoting individual prestige and expressing identity, which influenced Scottish associations in Scotland. The overlap, in this case, was most evident in the concept of improvement. As Mitchison stated, ‘the eighteenth century improvers were true patriots in every sense of the word.’\(^9\) The concept of ‘improvement’ was fundamental to Scottish thinking during this period. ‘Improvement’ meant that knowledge and learning could be used to refine the social and economic conditions of mankind. The term most often used to describe agricultural innovation was also voiced to describe the civilising process. Politeness, sociability, conviviality, rhetoric, learning, language, philanthropy, and wit were all areas that could be improved. The literati sought to present themselves as the driving force of Scottish modernity. To do so, Scotland’s identity and the associations that expressed it would have to reflect the members’ collective quest for improvement.\(^10\)

---


It was certainly the case that Scottish clubs engaged with English examples and promoted what could be seen as English ways. In 1761, Thomas Sheridan gave two high profile public lectures in Edinburgh on ‘elocution’ and the ‘English Tongue’. Within a few weeks of Sheridan starting his lecture series, the Scots Magazine recorded:

Notice was given in the Edinburgh papers of July 27. that on the Tuesday following, the plan of a new establishment for carrying on, in this country, the study of the English tongue, in the regular and proper manner, was to be laid before the Select Society. Mention was made of this by Mr. Sheridan, on the Friday before, in the last lecture of his first two courses.¹¹

Five months later, the same newspaper published an article outlining the ‘Regulations of the Select Society for promoting the Reading and Speaking of the English Language in Scotland’ [SSPRSEL].¹² In these ‘Regulations’ the Society argued:

That it would be a great advantage to this country, if a proper number of persons from England, duly qualified to instruct gentlemen in the knowledge of the English Tongue, the manner of pronouncing it with purity, and the art of public speaking, were settled in Edinburgh; and if, at the same time, a proper number of masters from the same country, duly qualified for teaching children the reading of English, should open schools in Edinburgh for that purpose.¹³

When coupled with Hume’s well-known (or notorious) desire to rid himself of ‘Scotticisms’, it is clear that ‘Anglicisation’, in the sense of being able to communicate in the universal grammar of empire, was an intrinsic part of remoulding Scotland.¹⁴

¹² Ibid., p. 440.
¹³ Ibid.
Closer examination of the SSPRSEL’s parent society, the Select Society, however, suggests that the same members who were worried about expunging Scotticisms from their speech and writing were deeply concerned about the wellbeing of Scotland and the promotion of its place in the world, and used their associations as a tool to deal with both concerns. Expunging Scots words from conversation in specific contexts was not seen as a rejection of Scottishness. Within its ten-year lifespan, the Select Society debated political topics such as ‘Whether the Number of Banks now in Scotland be useful to the trade of that Country?’, ‘Whether the Bounty should be continued on the exportation of low priced Linen made in Scotland?’, ‘Whether the Common practice in Scotland distributing money to the poor in their own houses, or the receiving the poor into Workhouses and hospitals be most advantageous?’, and ‘Whether the provisions in the late Marriage Act are advantageous to a nation?’. According to an article printed in the *Scots Magazine* in 1755, the Select Society sought ‘by practice to improve themselves in reasoning and eloquence, and by the freedom of debate, to discover the most effectual methods of promoting the good of the country’. The Society provided a space in which the literati and political elites of Scotland could converse with each other and, as Carlyle put it, ‘[rub] off all corners, as we call it, by collision, and [make] the literati of Edinburgh less captious and pedantic than they were elsewhere’.

The Select Society was the archetypal association for Edinburgh enlightenment society. Its improving agenda reflected the Society’s membership. When examining this membership, three themes emerge. First, all but two of the members were Scots; therefore the society’s debates invariably dealt with issues
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relevant to Scots. Second, the majority of the society’s members worked in the Scottish professions. Out of a total of 164 members, sixty-one were advocates, twenty-five were soldiers (or had been soldiers), fifteen were doctors or surgeons, fourteen were Church of Scotland ministers, and thirteen were professors at a Scottish university (including Edinburgh, Glasgow, and St. Andrews) at the time of joining. The remaining thirty-six were merchants, painters, architects, writers, and noblemen. With a membership that was largely professional in nature, the Society was keen to promote a collective identity that was rule-bound and highly skilled. To add to this, the majority of Select Society members worked in broader professional settings or within large patronage systems. Politicians, ministers, and professors all sought appointments. The writers, architects, and painters sought individual commissions. Increased reputations, skills, and networks proved vital to these Scots’ place in society. Third, most of the Society’s members physically worked and/or travelled within wider British and/or European environments. The founder of the Select Society, Allan Ramsay Jr., lived and worked in London for fifteen years of his life. In 1740, he joined the Royal Society and published in its *Philosophical Transactions*. In 1743, he joined the Society of Antiquaries in London. His occupation and livelihood was predicated on his ability to work within a London-centred context. Yet, he also studied art in France and Italy and identified himself and his skills as a product of his European education. In the same way, James Adam, the architect and brother of the more famous Robert Adam, went on two Italian tours during the years the Select Society flourished and later joined his brother Robert in his London firm. Francis Home served as a British army surgeon in the 6th Inniskilling regiment of dragoons and worked in Flanders during the War of Austrian Succession. John Anderson served as an officer for the volunteer corps of the British army during the Jacobite rising, travelled to the Netherlands, London, and France and was appointed Professor of Oriental Languages at the University of
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Glasgow the year the Society was founded.23 James Burnett (Lord Monboddo) studied Roman law at Groningen, and regularly visited London and Oxford.24 With members who worked outside of Scotland, in both Britain and beyond, the Society sought to bolster Scotland’s external identity. The Scottish identities being promoted by the Select Society should therefore be seen as supporting these particular aims.25

The Select Society, and the SSPRSEL in particular, served a practical and patriotic purpose – to provide these professional Scots with the ability to function within London and wider British polite society. In fact, this was clearly articulated in the SSPRSEL’s ‘Regulations’, which stated:

As the intercourse between this part of Great Britain and the capital daily increases, both on account of business and amusement, and must still go on increasing, gentlemen educated in Scotland have long been sensible of the disadvantages under which they labour, from their imperfect knowledge of the ENGLISH TONGUE, and the impropriety with which they speak it.26

It should also be remembered that the SSPRSEL was formed during the height of the Seven Years’ War – an imperial war that placed London as the capital of the most powerful European imperial nation. The use of the English (as opposed to Scots) language allowed the professional and diasporic Scots who joined these associations to work within an increasingly Anglophone world. As Livesey argues, ‘the language and institutions of civil society were a set of responses to the tensions and difficulties created for provincial elites in this British empire’.27 Furthermore, as calculated by Emerson, at least thirty of the members of the original Select Society published

significant literary works.\textsuperscript{28} By using the ‘proper’ English language their written outputs could be received in the larger and more prolific (and more profitable) British (as opposed to just Scottish) intellectual arena.

Furthermore, the SSPRSEL should also be seen as an attempt to situate Scotland as part of a European movement focused on linguistic purity, as exemplified by the actions of L’Académie Française in Paris and the Accademia della Crusca in Florence. In attempting to purify the use of language as part of an improving agenda, these Scots, in fact, were not replacing Scots ways with English ways for even the English did not speak this perhaps better termed imperial English or British language, but were placing themselves at the forefront of British linguistic change. In 1761, the same year that he gave his Edinburgh lectures, Sheridan wrote in his \textit{Dissertation on the Causes of the Difficulties which occur in learning the English Tongue}, ‘when a foreigner arrives in London, and enquires for a master to teach him the language of the country, there is no such person to be found’. He went on to say that, ‘On this account it is, that the English are still classed by the people of those countries, amongst the more rude, and scarcely civilized nations of the North.’\textsuperscript{29} In his ‘Heads of Plan for the Improvement of Elocution and for the Promotion of the Study of the English Language’, originally published in 1762, he argued that the English did not ‘have far to seek’ to find a method of rectifying this deficiency. As Sheridan put it, they ‘need only fall in with the new mode introduced into this country [Scotland] of promoting public good, by the institution of societies for encouraging, such arts, sciences, manufactures, and studies as are most wanting’.\textsuperscript{30} He stated, ‘This practice, which was first begun in Ireland, was soon adopted by the sharp-sighted people of Scotland, in both which kingdoms most excellent effects have been produced from it.’\textsuperscript{31} Sheridan suggested that instead of simply following England’s example, the Scots, in conjunction with the Irish, created an associational model, which even the English should follow in order to strengthen

\textsuperscript{28} Emerson, ‘Social Composition of Enlightened Scotland’, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{30} Sheridan, ‘Head of a Plan For the Improvement of Elocution, &c’, in Sheridan, \textit{A Course of Lectures on Elocution}, p. 247.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
Britain’s global reputation. The SSPRSEL, therefore, placed Scotland as key to the civilising and imperial process.

Other offshoots of the Select Society tackled other areas of Scottish improvement. In 1755, only one year after Ramsay founded the parent association and six years before the creation of the SSPRSEL, the Select Society formed The Edinburgh Society for Encouraging Arts, Science, Manufacturing, and Agriculture in Scotland. Through this association, the members boasted, ‘the inhabitants of Scotland may become more diligent in labour and excellent in arts in the concern of all who indeed love their country’. It aimed to support Scotland’s economic growth, even at the expense of England. As the *Scots Magazine* reported:

SCOTS STRONG ALE has justly acquired a great reputation, both at home and abroad; but the trade might be carried to a much greater height. PORTER, which was formerly brought in considerable quantities from England, is now made here by different brewers. In order to increase the exportation of the one, and enable us to supply ourselves with the other, it was resolved that a premium shall be given for the best hogshead of each.

The Edinburgh Society based its structure on London’s Society for Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, which formed in 1754. Its actions, however, demonstrated the desire to promote Scottish (as opposed to English) industry and art. It must also be remembered that the Scots created the archetypal ‘improvement’ association, The Honourable the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland in 1723, on which all others were based. The London Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, and other English improving societies, thus, followed a Scottish example. As such, the actions of the Select Society and its offshoots were actually following (albeit in a roundabout way) a model first established in Scotland. They were not necessarily following England but were rather at the forefront of the ‘civilising’ mission, which promoted Scottish, as opposed to simply Anglo-British, priorities.

33 Ibid., pp. 128.
The Select Society and its offshoots were not anomalies in their patriotic expressions or influence. The literati joined numerous associations of varying shapes and sizes, which promoted similar personal and national goals.\textsuperscript{35} Within two years of the Select Society’s demise, for example, Adam Ferguson formed the Poker Club. As Carlyle stated, the Poker Club, ‘consisted of all the literati of Edinburgh and its neighbourhood, most of whom had been members of the Select Society’.\textsuperscript{36} Unlike the Select Society, however, the Poker Club was formed specifically to support the formation of a militia in Scotland. According to an introduction bound into the Poker Club’s minute book:

After the suppression of the Rebellion in 1746, it occurred to many of the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Scotland, that one of the most effectual securities against the recurrence of dangerous insurrections as well as invasions, would be the establishment of such a military force, as had existed in England ever since the days of Edward I…[which] led to the formation of associations for the purpose of kindling & keeping alive the flame of patriotic feeling.\textsuperscript{37}

Militias in both Scotland and England were abolished following the Restoration of 1660, which gave the power of the military solely to the monarch (The Militia Act, 1663). This almost immediately sparked controversy. Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, a Scottish politician, author, and staunch opponent of the incorporating union, argued that mercenary armies gave too much power to the monarch, resulting in tyrannies.\textsuperscript{38} As Robertson has argued, while the union with England solved one territorial threat to Scotland, it opened up others.\textsuperscript{39} Scots

\textsuperscript{35} For a survey of Scotland’s literary societies, see McElroy, ‘Literary Clubs and Societies’; McElroy, \textit{Scotland’s Age of Improvement}.
\textsuperscript{36} Carlyle, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 420.
\textsuperscript{37} Poker Club Minutes (1774-1784), CRC, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{39} John Robertson, \textit{The Scottish Enlightenment and the Militia Issue} (Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1985), p. 7; John Robertson produced a book-length study of the Scottish Militia debate, which provides much more detail on this subject than is possible to include in this thesis. He argues that much of the debate came from David Hume who argued that a militia supported the natural
increasingly feared the invasion of their coasts, especially during times of political turmoil.40 By the mid-eighteenth century, many Scots, particularly those with Whig loyalties, believed that civilian militias were important for national security. The debate over the militia issue became even more heated in the 1750s, when the government under William Pitt started to plan for a militia in England. Many Scots, especially the Scottish Whigs, demanded that Scotland receive similar consideration.

Scotland’s exclusion from the Militia Act of 1757 was also interpreted by many as depriving Scots of their rights within the British Union. From the perspective of the Pitt ministry, it was potentially dangerous to give the Scots arms and training in light of the 1745 Jacobite rebellion suppressed little more than a decade earlier. Scottish Whigs, however, argued that Scotland deserved to be treated as an equal partner in Union, should have the same opportunities and benefits given to England, and that the Scots no longer posed any real threat to the Hanoverian monarchy or the Treaty of Union. Carlyle even called the ‘45, ‘A trifling insurrection’ in his attempt to support the extension of the bill.41 To the Scots who joined the Poker Club (the same professional and migratory intellectuals mentioned above), Scotland’s militia (or lack thereof) came to represent not only the security of Scotland, but also the relationship between Scotland and England and Scotland’s place in British affairs. Here, in a club, the literati of Edinburgh overtly challenged Scotland’s provincial standing in Britain, rather than succumbed to it.

Some scholars have argued that the Poker Club acted as a convivial club for the Scottish literati, which did little to support their political aims.42 Yet, the records of the Poker Club regularly mention the Scottish militia issue suggesting that it was of immediate concern to the members. On 26 July 1762, for instance, ‘The Meeting
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42 Sher summarised the mainstream historiographical view of the Poker Club when he wrote, ‘it is difficult to know precisely what the Poker did to promote the Scottish militia cause, and it has sometimes been claimed that it did not actually pursue its avowed political agenda’. Richard B. Sher, ‘Poker Club (act. 1762-1784)’, ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/73613 [Accessed 1 June 2012].
Elected the Marquis of Graham and Sir James Johnstone for members, ... with a letter of thanks to the Marquis of Graham for his noble [work] in the business of the Scotch Militia’.\textsuperscript{43} On 10 July 1779, ‘Mr. Nairne and Mr. Adam Ferguson Drank the Scotch Militia The King and all the other Friends of the Militia but not the absent member’.\textsuperscript{44} On 19 July 1782, ‘The meeting agreed that on Friday fortnight a meeting be called on Special business of the Militia, and that Mr. Fortune do advertise in the News Paper’.\textsuperscript{45} In his \textit{Autobiography}, Carlyle explained that the Poker Club members were, ‘zealous friends to a Scotch militia, and warm in their resentment on its being refused to us, and an invidious line drawn between Scotland and England’.\textsuperscript{46} He recorded, ‘the Great Object of those meetings was National, of which they never lost sight’.\textsuperscript{47} Clearly, the Poker Club sought to present Scotland as equal to England and fought hard to support a fully incorporated union between the two countries, which supported the priorities of Edinburgh’s professional class.

Rather than simply advocating a political imperative, however, the Poker Club also embraced a secondary agenda. Like the Select Society, the members wanted to create a community of literary and intellectual Scots who might promote Scotland’s independent external reputation within and outside of Britain. Carlyle took pains in his \textit{Autobiography} to describe the importance the Poker Club played on the international stage. He wrote:

\begin{quote}
When James Edgar was in Paris with Sir Laurence Dundas, his cousin, during the flourishing state of this club, he was asked by D’Alembert to go with him to their club of literati in Paris; to which he answered that he had no curiosity to visit them, as he had a club in Edinburgh, with whom he dined weekly, composed, he believed, of the ablest men in Europe.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

He continued by quoting the Russian intellectual, Princess Dashcoff [Dashkova], who claimed ‘“that of all the sensible men I have met with in my travels through

\textsuperscript{43} Poker Club Minutes (1774-1784), CRC, 26 July 1762.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 30 July 1779.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 19 July 1782.
\textsuperscript{46} Carlyle, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 420.
\textsuperscript{48} Carlyle, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 422.
Europe, yours at Edinburgh are the most sensible.”

General James Murray, whom Carlyle described as ‘a man of fashion and of the world’, similarly declared after attending a Poker Club meeting:

“Ah, Doctor! I never was so much disappointed in all my life as at your club, for I expected to sit silent and listen to a parcel of pedants descanting on learned subjects out of my range of knowledge; but instead of that, I have met with an agreeable[sic], polite, and lively company of gentlemen, in whose conversation I have joined and partaken with great delight”.

The purpose of the club went far beyond the militia debate and party politics. It concerned the relationship between Scotland and England and also the reputation of Scotland abroad. It promoted Scotland’s intellectual community as distinctive and equal, even better than those with whom they maintained political and cultural relationships.

The Edinburgh Philosophical Society (or Society for Improving Arts and Sciences, and particularly Natural Knowledge), founded originally as the Medical Society of Edinburgh in 1731, was another Edinburgh club that found it necessary to promote Scottish intellectual importance in order to advantage its members. This society ran parallel to the Select Society and the Poker Club, but placed its emphasis on scientific discovery. According to the Medical Essays and Observations first printed by the society in 1733, the original Edinburgh Medical Society drew from the model given by the Royal Society of London. It stated:

The glorious Example given to the World, has made such an advantageous Change in Natural Knowledge since the Middle of
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last Century, that the first Fruits of all Labours of this Kind become in Justice due to the first and great Promoters of it.\textsuperscript{52}

When creating the Edinburgh Philosophical Society, Colin MacLaurin (the famous mathematician and natural philosopher) stated in a letter to Sir John Clerk:

Some Gentlemen of your acquaintance have been talking together of forming a society for promoting the Study of Natural Knowledge in this country and for the advancement of the science as much as by their power, in imitation of those that have been established of late in most countries where learning is cultivated.\textsuperscript{53}

The Edinburgh Philosophical Society, from the beginning, sought to provide Edinburgh Scots with a means to engage (as Scots) with the wider European ‘Republic of Letters’ and promote its utility to it.

By the 1750s, the Edinburgh Philosophical Society had achieved considerable success, even though it had gone through periodical periods of decline.\textsuperscript{54} They printed public transactions circulated both internally and externally.\textsuperscript{55} They became recognised as part of a transnational academy and a broader European enlightenment. In a letter to Cadwallader Colden, Benjamin Franklin nonchalantly stated, ‘I suppose you have seen, in the 2d Vol. of the new Philosophical Essays of the Edinburgh Society, an Account of some Experiments to produce Cold by Evaporation, made by Dr. Cullen, who mentions the like having been before made at Petersburg’.\textsuperscript{56}

Similarly, Franklin wrote to Lord Kames saying, ‘I congratulate you on your Election as President of your Edinburgh Society…This is a fresh Instance; for by Letters just received, I find that I was about the same time chosen President of our American

\textsuperscript{52} Medical Essays and Observations, Published by a Society in Edinburgh, Vol. I, 4\textsuperscript{th} Edn. (Edinburgh, 1752), pp. iii–iv.


\textsuperscript{54} Emerson, ‘The Scottish Enlightenment’, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{55} See Medical Essays and Observations (1752).

Philosophical Society established at Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{57} The Society attracted honorary members and correspondence from places like Philadelphia, Paris, Leyden, and Berlin.\textsuperscript{58} In 1762, the Society debated Franklin’s famous essay, ‘Method of Securing Houses from the Effects of Lightning’ and invited him to become an honorary member.\textsuperscript{59} In the same vein, many members of the Edinburgh Philosophical Society were given honorary memberships to other philosophical societies throughout Europe.\textsuperscript{60} The Society worked to advance the intellectual and philosophical reputation given to Scotland, as well as provide a network of contacts for its members both to gain patronage, personal repute, and respect outside of Scotland’s borders.

However, as with the Select Society and Poker Club, it would be a mistake to see this mid-century club as only working within a European intellectual or political context and not Scottish. While it claimed that it based its structure on English and European clubs, the Edinburgh Philosophical Society also modelled itself after earlier Edinburgh clubs, which sought to promote Scotland within union. It drew from Edinburgh societies like the Rankenian Society (c.1717), the aforementioned Honourable Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland (1723), and the Edinburgh Medical Society (1731).\textsuperscript{61} It focused much of its attention on regional improvements. From the beginning, Maclaurin attempted to include Scottish antiquarian studies in its remit as well as to invite Scottish nobles as active participants in its activities.\textsuperscript{62} The Edinburgh Philosophical Society was responsible, for instance, for the mapping of many places in Scotland, which included correcting the very poor surveys of the North-East of Scotland and the Orkney and Shetland Islands.\textsuperscript{63} Members dedicated papers and publications to Scottish weather, Scottish
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\textsuperscript{60} Emerson, ‘The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, 1748-1768’, p. 175.
\textsuperscript{61} Emerson, ‘The Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, 1737-1747’, p. 156.
\textsuperscript{62} Phillipson, ‘Culture and Society’, p. 441.
medicine, Scottish agriculture and botany, the standardisation of weights and measures in Scotland, and even Scottish historical and antiquarian ideas.\textsuperscript{64} In 1763, John Gregory even gave a discourse on the state of music in Scotland to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society. When describing Scottish music he stated:

In Scotland there is a species of music perfectly well fitted to inspire that joyous mirth suited to dancing, and a plaintive Music peculiarly expressive of that tenderness and pleasing melancholy attendant on distress in love; both original in their kind, and different from every other in Europe. – It is of no consequence…whether [this music] be simple or complex, according to the rules of regular composition, or against them; whilst it produces its intended effect in a superior degree to any other, it is the preferable music; and while a person feels this affect, it is a reflection on his taste and common sense, if not on his candor, to despise it.\textsuperscript{65}

By discussing ‘Scottish’ subjects, both cultural and practical, in their professional meetings and in their printed transactions, the Edinburgh Philosophical Society placed Scotland and its history and culture as unique, interesting, central, and in all ways equal to other cultures, rather than as simply a subsidiary outpost of Europe and England.

Thus, in the eighteenth century, Edinburgh’s literati took great pains to create associations that promoted a Scottish national identity (or Scottish national identities), which supported the priorities of their primarily professional and migratory memberships. They sought to present Scotland as distinct yet also useful co-equal partners in both Britain and the international ‘Republic of Letters’.


While in the latter half of the eighteenth century Edinburgh’s literati deliberately used clubs in order to position Scotland as having a distinctive, equal, and useful role within Britain and Europe, what exactly that distinctive Scottish identity was and how it should be presented and performed was still a matter of debate. The literati of Edinburgh who joined societies like the Select Society, Poker Club, and Philosophical Society, in fact, feared the creation of other rival societies that might undermine their efforts. While Hugh Blair, a member of all three of the above-mentioned societies, commended student societies that met privately in order to practise the skills approved by the professoriate and literati, he felt wary of those that worked without what he viewed as proper supervision. In a lecture on Belles Lettres, he stated:

As for those public and promiscuous societies, in which multitudes are brought together, who are often of low stations and occupations, who are joined by no common bond of union, except an absurd rage for public speaking, and have no other object in view, but to make a show of their supposed talents, they are institutions not merely of an useless, but of a hurtful nature. They are in great hazard of proving seminaries of licentiousness, petulance, faction, and folly. They mislead those, who, in their own callings, might be useful members of society, into fantastic plans of making a figure on subjects which divert their attention from their proper business, and are widely remote from their sphere of life.\(^6^{6}\)

Rather than simply creating spaces for localised identity expression, the societies understood the important role they could play in representing Scotland on the global stage. The heated controversy which arose between the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland in the year 1782 suggests that, by the 1780s, an inner struggle had arisen in the Scottish metropolis over which society should maintain a monopoly on its cultural expressions – a society limited to the literati and professionals of Edinburgh or a more all-encompassing association.

filled with, as David Allan puts it, ‘disinterested patriotic amateurs’. The story of this conflict also highlights the importance placed on voluntary associations at the time and their ability (or at least perceived ability) to influence the way Scotland was viewed both inside and outside of its geographical borders.

The Society of Antiquaries, formed in 1780 by David Steuart Erskine, the 11th Earl of Buchan, was created primarily to collect, study, and exhibit the historic antiquities of Scotland. It was based on the model of the Antiquarian Society of London, of which Buchan was a member, but directed its focus on Scotland and its ancient past. From the beginning, the Society attempted to authenticate Macpherson’s Ossian, create a map of the ‘Gaelic Topography of Scotland’, study and document Scotland’s medieval and early-modern history, and collect as many antiquarian pieces as possible. At the Society’s first meeting Buchan stated:

Some inquiries may seem useless or frivolous to some persons. But is there any thing, Gentlemen, of this nature, that can be considered puerile by those who truly love their country? … a work of that nature…would be a most interesting performance to every true Scotsman, and might tend to inspire us with sentiments more congenial to the free and noble nature of the people with whom we are now united.
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His goal was thus to create a patriotic and emotive collection, which presented Scotland as an independent country with an ancient and rich history of its own within Great Britain. It provided a way for Scots from a variety of backgrounds to engage with Scotland’s history.

This type of association did not necessarily undermine the Edinburgh literati’s cultural and intellectual imperatives. The Edinburgh Musical Society, which had an elite and professional membership base, included Scots’ songs in its more cosmopolitan repertoire. Allan Ramsay, Jr., the founder the Select Society, was the son of Ramsay the poet who wrote Scots poems. Yet, Buchan had a secondary aim. He decided to also include the study of moral, physical, and philosophical subjects in the Society’s creed. According to Smellie, this was because ‘the penury of Scottish Antiquities, it was thought, would neither afford sufficient scope to the researches, nor gratify the tastes of such a number of men as were necessary to carry the views of the Society into execution’. It was just as likely, however, that Buchan decided to include these subjects out of spite and political scorn.

Buchan had supported William Smellie for the post of Professor of Natural History at the University of Edinburgh in 1779. Smellie, however, lost to William Robertson’s candidate, Rev. John Walker, who also had the support of Henry Dundas, who for all intents and purposes was the political ‘manager’ of Scotland. In order to challenge Walker’s position and the University’s decision, Buchan decided to give Smellie a public forum to give his lecture. On 4 September 1781, Buchan proposed to the Society, ‘that the said Superintendent [Smellie] if he chuses may give Lectures in the Society’s Hall to the Members or others on the Philosophy of natural History and rural aeconomy’. Only when the other members of the Society of Antiquaries pointed out that this would interfere with Walker’s lectures
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did Buchan temporarily back down. On 2 October that same year, however, Buchan gave a speech in which he stated:

As Mr. Smellie our Keeper of the Museum of natural history may give Lectures any where and at any time except in our Hall without our permission I see no necessity at this time for entering on the Second part of the motion relating to Lectures on the Philosophy of nature and rural aeconomy more especially as the University of Edinburgh and Doctor Walker might take it in ill part before the Course which the public Professor is to take has been submitted to view. When that Course long and ardently expected by the Scots Republic of Letters shall have made its appearance, it will be easily known how to steer in the Course which is the subject of our present Consideration.\(^\text{76}\)

While feigning understanding, Buchan’s desire to challenge the University was strong.

Unsurprisingly, a rivalry developed between Buchan on one side and Robertson and Walker on the other. Robertson not only saw Smellie’s lecture series as an attack on Walker and the patronage system, but also believed that the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland undermined the University as the primary institution for the study and presentation of natural history. It threatened the University as the focal point of Edinburgh culture.\(^\text{77}\) Walker certainly believed that this institution undermined his personal position and patronage networks as well. In 1781, he wrote to Buchan concerning Smellie’s lecture series, stating, ‘I should never object to any person doing this as an individual; but to do it under the protection of a numerous society, containing so many respectable members is what, to be sure, I cannot see without regret.’\(^\text{78}\) Robertson also believed that the creation of the Society of Antiquaries’ museum took away key artefacts from the antiquarian collections of the University’s Natural History Museum, which had been created by Sibbald and Balfour (the founders of the Medical School) and was being remodelled and improved by Walker. The Antiquaries’ museum also threatened the collections of

\(^{76}\) Ibid., 2 October 1781.
the Advocates Library, which had been previously maintained by David Hume and the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh. Edinburgh’s literati were cognisant that the Society of Antiquaries constituted a serious challenge to the identity they had worked so hard to create.

The conflict intensified when the Antiquarians’ petitioned for royal patronage. Robertson and Walker believed that a royal charter would give the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland legal legitimacy and recognition and give them more impetus to compete against the already established cultural institutions of the city. It would give cultural dominance to Buchan and his friends through the primacy of the Society of Antiquaries. It would also put Scotland’s intellectual study in the hands of (from those who opposed Buchan and the Society of Antiquaries’ point of view) unqualified individuals. In order to stifle the Antiquarians’ petition for a royal charter, Walker and Robertson decided to establish an alternative voluntary association, namely the Royal Society of Edinburgh, which would, according to Walker’s initial proposal, absorb the Antiquarian Society and seek its own royal patronage. According to Walker’s proposal, the collections of the Society of Antiquaries would be included in the collections of the Advocates Library and the University Museum. It would place the Society of Antiquaries under the institutional umbrella of the literary and intellectual societies of Edinburgh, which were seen to have maintained a high level of professionalism and, in turn, reinforce Scotland’s carefully situated identity. In addition, the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, which already celebrated international acclaim yet was beginning to suffer as a result of low attendance and output, would be subsumed into the Royal Society of Edinburgh. The public presentation of Scotland’s intellectual and cultural identity, then, would be once again controlled by a voluntary society regulated by Edinburgh’s intellectual and professional community.

81 John Walker, Proposal for establishing at Edinr, a Society for the Advancement of Learning and Usefull Knowledge, 2 March 1782, David Laing Collection, La.III.352/1, CRC. 
82 Ibid.
83 Minutes of General Meetings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh from its Institution, June 23 1783, to July 6 1791, Royal Society of Edinburgh Papers, Acc.10000/1, NLS, p. 13.
In 1782, Robertson and the Earl of Buchan held a meeting to discuss the two societies. Following this meeting, Robertson called a Senatus Academicus to be held on St. Andrew’s Day to discuss the matter at the University.\textsuperscript{84} William Cullen sent a letter on behalf of the Edinburgh Philosophical Society to Dundas in support of the Royal Society proposal. The Faculty of Advocates also sent a letter to Dundas stating that the Society of Antiquaries would ruin their antiquarian collections and manuscripts and hurt the interests of the Faculty.\textsuperscript{85} The main argument of those in favour of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, especially Robertson, was that two major literary societies could not be maintained in Scotland simultaneously. They argued that the proposed Royal Society of Edinburgh, which was to be filled with gentlemen and professionals rather than laypersons, would be more effective in situating Scotland within the British and European intellectual community.\textsuperscript{86}

In response to this, Buchan wrote a long and strongly worded letter to Dundas arguing against Robertson’s claims.\textsuperscript{87} He also wrote a letter to his friend, William Charles Little, stating that Robertson’s attack on the Society of Antiquaries belittled Scotland. He stated:

I told [Robertson] that I found a despicable spirit of Despotism prevailing in this Country, which wished to damn every Plan of public utility which was promoted by persons guilty of the greatest Crime which could be perpetrated by the Subjects of the present administration...St. Andrew’s Day, Sir, is a Day propitious to a hardy Scot, and if the Flower of this Country is to be tarnished by a Senatus Academicus on such a Day, I shall renounce it as my Country & plead the Proverb that being born in a Stable does not

\textsuperscript{84} Earl of Buchan to William Charles Little of Libberton, Esq., 26 November 1782, Letters of the Earl of Buchan, Gen. 1429/16/4, CRC; Shapin, ‘Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science’, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{86} Smellie, \textit{Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland}, Part II, pp. 13-15; Andrew Dalzel even stated that Buchan ‘admitted such a number of ragamuffins into the Society of Antiquaries, that the respectable members are resigning very fast, and joining the University and Faculty of Advocates in an application for a Royal Charter for a new Society’. Andrew Dalzel, \textit{History of the University of Edinburgh from its Foundation}, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1862), Vol. I, pp. 39-40; Emerson, ‘The Scottish Enlightenment’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{87} Smellie, \textit{Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland}, Part II, pp. 18-28.
make a man a Horse. And certainly, Sir, if I were a Horse I would not consent to be governed by a Mule.\footnote{Earl of Buchan to William Charles Little of Libberton, Esq., 26 November 1782, CRC. This is also interesting as the Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs, 5th Edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780199539536.001.0001/acref-9780199539536-e-1381?result=1 [Accessed 14 July 2014], states that this proverb is sometimes attributed to the Duke of Wellington.}

In addition, he threatened to call for a government ‘visitation’ of the University, as his brother, Henry Erskine, was to succeed Dundas as Lord Advocate and could request such an audit.\footnote{Dalzel, History of the University of Edinburgh from its Foundation, Vol. I, p. 40; Shapin, ‘Property, Patronage, and the Politics of Science’, p. 35.}

The debate between these two societies illustrates the on-going duality in expressions of Scotland’s identity. Buchan used proto-nationalistic rhetoric to support the cause and independence of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and attacked the literati as lukewarm supporters of Scottish interests.\footnote{I have described Buchan’s rhetoric as ‘proto-nationalist’ because he was neither against the union nor for the popular sovereignty of Scotland. He did believe, however, that England was not living up to their side of the bargain. E. of Buchan. David, Anniversary Discourse, 15 November 1784, Earl of Buchan Papers (1778-1809), Adv.MS.29.3.14, NLS.}

He famously stated at the second anniversary of the Society, ‘As a Man I felt myself a citizen of the world, as a friend to peace to liberty & to science which cannot exist asunder I considered myself as an inhabitant of an United Kingdom, but as a citizen I could not help remembering that I was a Scot.’\footnote{Buchan, Anniversary Discourse, 15 November 1784, NLS.} The Royal Society of Edinburgh, on the other hand, defined itself and Scottish identity within a broadly British and European perspective. This difference in rhetoric may suggest that the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland was a parochial Scottish institution and that, in turn, Robertson, Walker, and the other members of the Royal Society of Edinburgh were not concerned with Scotland but with Britain and European culture. However, it should be remembered that the literati and the professoriate of Edinburgh were worried that the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland – a society run by what they believed to be an eccentric Whig aristocrat with power to undermine established institutions – would undercut their pre-eminence in Edinburgh culture and the political stability that they enjoyed. Without a professional emphasis in the articulation of Scottish identity, they feared that the rest of the world would view Edinburgh society as amateurish and
nationalistic. The literati’s ‘patriotic’ rhetoric had to be more subdued, nationally moderate, and more Britain and European-focused if the literati and the professoriate were to gain respect and patronage from England and the wider European intellectual community.

It is also important to note that there is nothing here to suggest that Robertson, Walker, or others associated with the Royal Society of Edinburgh believed that Scottish antiquarianism and historical study was not of national importance. On the contrary, the original outline of the Royal Society of Edinburgh was to include two groups of members, one which focused on ‘Sciences of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Medicine, Natural History, and what relates to the improvement of Arts and Manufactures. The second shall have for its department the Enquiries relating to Antiquities, Philology and Literature.’

Both societies thought that improvement and scientific (or natural) discovery and the preservation of Scotland’s literary and historical past was of utmost importance in regards to the presentation of Scottish achievement. The problem was not the celebration of Scotland’s past and enlightened future or Scottish distinctiveness, but an associational competition over who should present this identity on the public stage. It was clear to all involved that associations, their membership, and their public activities, played a crucial role in forming, defining and presenting Scottish accomplishments – and thus identity – both to Scots and the wider world.

The controversy between the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland demonstrates the importance those living at the time placed on associations and the influence that they had (or were seen to have) on the way Scotland was viewed. It had to do with how Scotland was to be situated and which communities had access to its identity expression. In the end, both societies received royal charters on the same day, 6 May 1783, granting them equal merit in the quest for recognition.

---

Thus far, this chapter has examined Scottish clubs based in Edinburgh. As Scotland’s ancient capital, Edinburgh had a cultural and intellectual pull, which other provincial Scottish towns could not sustain. It deserved its reputation as a ‘hotbed of genius’ as it played host to most of Scotland’s professional and literary men and political culture.\(^9^4\) It not only had an important university, but also the Faculty of Advocates, the Scottish book trade, and a large enough urban infrastructure which allowed it to have a burgeoning social and political scene. The clubs created by the Edinburgh literati, as described above, became the most influential in defining and promoting an ‘enlightened’ Scottish identity. Before mid-century, clubs in the provinces were few and far-between.

By c.1760, however, clubs and societies of the same nature as the Select Society, Poker Club, Royal Society of Edinburgh, and Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, as well as associations with more cultural expressions of patriotism, began to form in provincial urban centres with increased haste – reflecting rapid provincial urbanisation. Those outside of Edinburgh began to engage with the ‘enlightenment’ culture of the Scottish metropole and present their place within wider political and intellectual constructs. Social clubs, musical societies, debating societies, and improving societies could be found throughout Lowland Scotland by the end of the century.\(^9^5\) Towsey has shown that even small towns set up subscription libraries, which brought ‘metropolitan’ Scottish enlightenment texts to the provincial populations.\(^9^6\)

As would be expected, many provincial societies, especially those with a literary or improving focus, drew from Edinburgh models. The Literary Society of Glasgow, created in 1752, drew directly from the example of other debating societies instituted in Edinburgh during that time. The Aberdeen Philosophical Society, or Wise Club, created in 1758 modelled itself on the example of the Edinburgh Philosophical Society. The Dundee Speculative Society, created in 1774, was based


\(^9^6\) Towsey, *Reading the Scottish Enlightenment*. 
on the Speculative Society of Edinburgh, a debating club for University of Edinburgh students that still maintains its secret and exclusionary status today. Many ‘improving’ societies were created throughout Scotland in places such as Ormiston, Ayrshire, Cupar, Dunfermline, Dumfries, and Galloway, which were based on the earlier The Honourable the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland, which was originally situated in Edinburgh.

There was also significant overlap between literary societies in Scotland. Hume, for instance, was a leading member of the Glasgow Literary Society. Thomas Reid joined the Glasgow Literary Society following his appointment to the chair of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow University and read papers that he had already circulated in the Aberdeen Philosophical Society. William Cullen, a leading member of the Edinburgh Philosophical Society, joined and gave papers at the Glasgow Literary Society’s meetings. Alexander Carlyle, a member of the Select Society and Poker Club, was admitted to three different Glasgow clubs. According to the rules of the Glasgow Literary Society:

The President shall have the power of bringing three Visitors into the Society provided the Orator that is the person who is to give the discourse or question shall consent and the Orator shall have the power of bringing in three without asking the consent of any person and each of these six shall be admitted by producing a written order to the Secretary for that purpose. But this law concerning six visitors shall extend only to the members of this College and to the Inhabitants of Glasgow it being competent to the Society to admit any number of strangers they shall think proper.

While exclusive, the Society welcomed outsiders, suggesting that they wanted others to experience the intellectual culture of Glasgow, exemplified by its Literary Society. Holcomb argues that provincial literary societies did not articulate a Scottish viewpoint or have any real impact, basing her argument on their lack of printed

---

transactions or active improving missions. It is certainly true that the Edinburgh Philosophical Society made more of an effort to exert an external identity than any other literary society in Scotland. Holcomb’s analysis, however, misses the fact that these associations provided Scots in the provinces a space to engage with the Scottish and British imperial sphere. The Aberdeen Philosophical Society debated, ‘Whether Slavery be in all cases inconsistent with good Government?’, ‘Whether the current coin of the nation…ought not to be debased by alloy or raised in its value so as there shall be no profit made by exporting it?’, ‘What are the Natural Consequences of high national Debt & whether upon the whole it be a benefite[sic] to a Nation or not?’, ‘Whether Paper Credit be beneficial to a Nation or not’, ‘and ‘How does it appear to be equitable, that the Subjects of a State, should be taxed in proportion to their respective fortunes, & not equally over head or by any other rule’. By debating these questions the societies not only acted out their citizenship as Britons, but also situated themselves and their provincial populations as important players in British imperial politics. As Harris has argued, provincial Scotland started to express a new self-confidence through its urban provincial elites.

Rather than just being mimics of Edinburgh, however, provincial clubs also incorporated their own regional priorities into their performance of national identity. Provincial towns and cities, including Glasgow, Aberdeen, Perth, and Dundee, did not have the same social composition as Edinburgh and this was reflected in the associations in these places. The university, for instance, was central to the ‘enlightenment’ culture of Glasgow and Aberdeen, while it was only one of the leading institutions in Scotland’s capital. In fact, the advocates usually outnumbered the professors in Edinburgh’s literary societies. Reflecting this, nine out of the original thirteen members of the Glasgow Literary Society worked as professors at Glasgow University. In the same way, only one of the original members of the
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Aberdeen Philosophical Society did not work at Marischal College Aberdeen.\textsuperscript{105} If, as has been argued, clubs acted as the physical embodiment of regional and national identity, or at least the identity that those within the clubs sought to express, than the university was projected as an important symbol of these provincial towns.

Glasgow became more prominent during this period because of the wealth that resulted from empire. As Hook and Sher have argued, colonial wealth, ‘provided opportunities for the development of notions of enlightened progress and improvement in all aspects of the polite civic culture of an increasingly civilized modern world’.\textsuperscript{106} By the time the Literary Society was created in Glasgow, the Cochrane Political Economy Club had been in existence for ten years. In the 1740s Andrew Cochrane created a club with ‘the express design…to inquire into the nature and principles of trade in all its branches, and to communicate knowledge and ideas on that subject to each other’.\textsuperscript{107} In 1751, Adam Smith joined its numbers and added significantly to their discussions and debates. It has even been stated that the Political Economy Club provided the stimulus for Smith’s \textit{Wealth of Nations}.\textsuperscript{108} Within its meetings, the literati and the merchant class combined to discuss topics such as, ‘What are the effects of paper money on prices? on the currency?: on the exchanges with other countries?’. Smith also read a discourse in 1755 on ‘natural liberty in industrial affairs’.\textsuperscript{109} The literary debating societies in Glasgow, while frequented and administered by those associated with the university, were certainly influenced by Glasgow’s commercial culture.

Like those in Edinburgh, however, the identity that provincial societies asserted was taken seriously, especially if the ‘wrong’ people started to engage in literary debate. The membership of the Dundee Speculative Society, the first debating society in Scotland to admit women (one year before the Edinburgh Pantheon Society described in Chapter 1), came under attack in letters published in


\textsuperscript{106} Hook and. Sher (eds.), \textit{The Glasgow Enlightenment}, p. 4.


\textsuperscript{108} McElroy, ‘The Literary Clubs and Societies of Eighteenth Century Scotland’, p. 117.

the *Weekly Magazine*. When describing the Society, the author of the first letters stated, ‘Here the young men are trained up in oratory and graceful deliverance, and afterwards become an ornament to the great council of the nation’.\(^{110}\) The author of this letter (most likely a member of the Society) described the association as key to the creation of the men who embodied Scotland’s national identity. A letter then followed, a rebuttal by someone under the pseudonym B.C., which described the Society as:

Consist[ing] of men without education, and even without that natural vigour of understanding that might make their want of education a subject of regret – whose reading has been confined to the perusal of an invoice – and whose compositions have not extended beyond the drawing out of an account.\(^ {111}\)

When describing their inclusion of women in debates, B.C. argued:

The disputes of such untutored rhetoricians may afford entertainment to the tribes of females who have honoured them with their presence, but can scarcely be regarded as a model for those whose eloquence has a more important destination.\(^ {112}\)

As with the controversy between the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, those in the provinces feared associations that undermined the professionals’ agendas (be that political- or gender-based) and their role in representing their region or even nation.

Each of these clubs engaged with the cultural identity expressed by associations in Edinburgh, but attempted to incorporate their own voice into a broader Scottish and imperial cultural, political, and intellectual debate. In the same way that clubs in Edinburgh sought to perform a national identity, which presented Scottish professionals as integral to the British and European communities, Scots in
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\(^{111}\) Ibid., p. 223.

\(^{112}\) Ibid.
Scottish provincial cities and towns attempted to position their professionals and intellectuals as essential through the use of associations.

IV

Highland societies, because of their later association with Highlandism, the subject of much of Chapter 4, are some of the most compelling of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century Scottish associations. Yet their genesis dated to the opening decades of the eighteenth century. From c.1720-1790, four Highland societies existed in Scotland; the Highland Society of Glasgow, the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen, the Highland Society of Scotland, and the Buchanan Society of Glasgow. Each of these societies had a different agenda. The Buchanan Society, a friendly society formed in 1725, acted as a philanthropic association, which only provided membership and support to people with the name ‘Buchanan’ or a version of the same. The Highland Society of Glasgow, created in 1727, placed most of its attention on providing education and apprenticeships to the children of Highlanders, of any name, living in and around the City of Glasgow. Its Scheme of Erection, written in 1787, nowhere states that the Highland Society should play a role in the preservation of Highland culture, but that ‘there was observed with concern, that there were a great many of that denomination [Highland] in the place, and that numbers of their children, though found to be of good genius, were yet lost for want of education’.  

The Gaelic Club of Gentlemen, founded in 1780, was focused primarily on displays of Highland culture and tradition. It was founded, ‘To remind them of Ossian, the melodious and noble prince of poets, as well as to converse as friends in the bold and expressive language of heroes in ages past, the Highland gentlemen of Glasgow have resolved to meet statedly as a society.’

The Highland Society of Scotland in Edinburgh, based on the model of the Highland Society of London, was focused on the preservation of Gaelic as well as Highland agriculture.
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113 Scheme of Erection (1788), p. 3.
114 Quoted in John Strang, Glasgow and its Clubs; or Glimpses of the Condition, Manners, Characters, & Oddities of the City, during the Past & Present Century (London and Glasgow, 1856), p. 129.
and improvement. It was founded in 1784 in order to ‘promote the regeneration of rural Scotland including the preservation of its poetry, language and music’.¹¹⁵

The latter two societies fit the template of Highland romanticism that has become such a focus of the historiography on Scottish culture. This focus, if taken out of its wider context, however, tends to obscure the priorities of the earlier societies and, indeed, the imperatives of even the most histrionic cultural societies. These societies, rather than being viewed as exceptional, should be seen as endorsing a similar Scottish identity to those representing provincial Lowland Scotland. They promoted an identity, which reinforced the priorities of their members, but were also competing for space within the developing idea of a representational Scottish identity. They did this by conforming to a wider social ideal, yet at the same time maintaining their distinction.

The first Highland society actually made very little effort to present an external collective identity, at least until the 1790s. The Buchanan Society was a philanthropic institution made of workers and tradesmen rather than the urban professions or the literati. The original members included a vintner, a tailor, maltmen, and low-level merchants.¹¹⁶ Rather than providing for all Highlanders, the Buchanan Society worked primarily as an insular association whose primary goal was to provide boys with the name Buchanan (and associated septs of that name) with apprenticeships or educational opportunities in addition to offering support to elderly members who were unable to take care of themselves.¹¹⁷ Nowhere in the early records of the Society was there any promotion of the Gaelic language or Highland culture.

As a society of working migrants, they were adamant that their ‘poor boys’ learned English and integrated themselves into the Glaswegian environment. On 12 November 1760, the Society recorded in their minute book that:

The said day a petition for Dougall Buchanan son of John Buchanan deceased Tenant in Easter Mains of Buchanan was given in praying the benefit of an apprentice fee from the Society

¹¹⁶ Buchanan Society Minute Book (1725-1803), TD1242/1, ML, 5 March 1725.
¹¹⁷ Ibid.
as one of their poor boys, The Managers called him in and examined him, and because he is very deficient in Reading English They agree that he shall immediately go to the Reading School in Glasgow find the best Master to be taught reading English for at least three months from this date and towards paying his school wages and maintaining him for that space.  

Most destitute ‘urban’ Highlanders made little effort to preserve their original language and customs. Parents pushed their children to learn and study English in order to assimilate. As Withers argued, this was not out of any contempt for the language but was a means of participating in modernising Lowland society. It was a way for these children to enhance their standing in an English-speaking world and to give them human, cultural, and social resources to be used as social capital. Gaelic, like Scots, was pushed away in order to promote the use of English, the assumed language of civility and progress. The priorities of these Highlanders were with economic stability. The charter they obtained from the Glasgow Town Council said that they sought to be viewed as ‘promot[ing] virtue and industry’, but the promotion of their own selves and clients maintained a primacy throughout the Society’s existence. In the early and middle decades of the eighteenth century, for these Highlanders, it was not a matter of culture or identity, per se. It was a matter of survival.

The Highland Society of Glasgow, founded in 1727, had a similar purpose and narrow focus. It also sought to give Highlanders in Glasgow the necessary skills to function within Lowland society. According to Article XVIII of its rules, ‘the Society should pay the expense of teaching the boys English, Writing and Arithmetic; and Book-keeping to such as shew a superior genius’. Another article stated that society money went toward ‘Cloathing the boys’ they sent to school.  

Nevertheless, the line between philanthropic activities and cultural promotion was very fine indeed, particularly if the membership included more elite and
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professional men. Societies such as the Highland Society of Glasgow began to promote cultural exceptionalism, in many cases as a by-product of their philanthropic works. The Highland Society of Glasgow supported those ‘born in the Highlands, or…descended from Highlanders’. The membership consisted of merchants, manufacturers, and professionals rather than low-paid tradesmen and, as was the case with the Edinburgh literati, needed to present its members as loyal Britons who were nevertheless different, with those differences adding value to Britain’s cultural, social, and economic development. According to an entry in the Scots Magazine in 1758:

> All the money the society receives, as entry-money, quarterly payments, donations, legacies, &c. is lent out on bond, and the interest is applied for educating at school, and putting to trades, the sons of highlanders, and of those who are descended from or are branches of highlanders, and for other charitable purposes. Every well disposed person in city or country, is invited to concur with and assist the society…The society has been particularly useful of late, when the parents of so many poor highland children are in the King’s service in America.

By referencing Highlanders in the America theatre of the Seven Years’ War in particular, the Society presented the Highland community as integral to the British establishment, yet also distinct from it.

In the period following the Seven Years’ War, there was an increasing demand for the celebration of Highland exceptionalism as Highlanders became associated with the extension of the British Empire. The Highland Society of London formed in 1778 in order to support the cause of the Highlanders and support their distinctive culture. Most of the early members were natives of the Highlands who had moved to London for professional opportunities. Their physical position in London allowed them greater scope and influence in presenting their ‘Highland’ Scottish identity, as they already worked within a wider British metropolitan context. As Nenadic has argued, ‘the capital city was a route to empire that shaped both personal fortunes and cultural identity, which included an identity as Scots as well as
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Great Britons’. In turn, with the Highland Society of London already promoting an accepted ‘Scoto-Britishness’ in the capital, those in Scotland had more space to present their own cultural distinction without undermining their place in Lowland and British society. Even the Gaelic language re-emerged with potent symbolic value. As Withers pointed out, thirteen of the fifteen managers of the Ingram Street Chapel, which gave sermons to Highlanders in the Gaelic language, were also members of the Highland Society of Glasgow. While these Gaelic chapels incorporated English into their services, especially when teaching children, they promoted Gaelic culture and the furtherance of the Gaelic language.

The Glasgow Gaelic Club of Gentlemen, founded in 1780, emerged during a period in which it was beginning to be more acceptable to promote a romanticised patriotic identity. According to Strang, the Glasgow Gaelic Club of Gentlemen was one of the first societies to procure a charter from the Highland Society of London:

...which, among other privileges conferred on them by their patent, delegated specially to this fraternity the power of awarding the annual prizes given by the London Society at the Tryst of Falkirk for the encouragement of bagpipe music; and during many years, it appears, a committee of the Gaelic Club proceeded to that great gather of men and bestial, to adjudge the valuable medal appropriated for the best pibroch.

In 1788, ‘it was agreed that each member should henceforth appear, at all stated meetings in a tartan short-coat, under the penalty for non-compliance of the usual punishment of the day’. They concerned themselves, specifically, with Highland history, whether factual or mythical, and attempted to portray the Highlands as culturally rich.
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In order to gain membership to the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen, a candidate had to be:

…[possessing] of one or other of the following qualifications: [speak] the Gaelic Language; is a native of the Highlands; is descended of Highland Parents; [have] Landed Property in the Highlands; [be] married to a Highland Lady; [have] served his Majesty in a Highland Regiment; or [be] otherwise connected with, or particularly interested in, the Highlands. ¹³⁰

They also had to ‘be a Member of the Glasgow Highland Society’.¹³¹ The same men who promoted ‘Anglicization’ through sending children to English language schools also openly celebrated the Gaelic language and Highland culture.¹³² This was not paradoxical. It represented the use of different societies to promote different agendas and interests at different times. Like the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen placed importance in historical displays and antiquities as well as enlightenment ideals of improvement. Its members promoted cultural distinctiveness and Scotland’s progression toward modernity simultaneously.

The Highland Society of Edinburgh was the first Highland Society in Scotland outside of Glasgow. Similarly to the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen, the Highland Society of Scotland was interested in cultural displays, described itself as a ‘sister’ society to the Highland Society of London, fiercely protecting the authenticity of Macpherson’s Ossian, and protecting the Gaelic language. They were also at the same time preoccupied with education and agricultural improvement.¹³³

Unsurprisingly, these aims did not necessarily chime with the interests of the vast majority of Highlanders. The Highland Society of Edinburgh represented its members and the identities they wished to cultivate. It is this that provides powerful evidence of the contingent nature of identity and the importance of clubs in promoting certain types of identity in support of certain populations. The support

¹³⁰ Records of the Gaelic Society of Glasgow (Gaelic Club of Gentlemen), ML, 7 March 1780.
¹³¹ Ibid.
¹³² Strang, Glasgow and its Clubs, p. 130.
given by the Highland Society of Edinburgh toward Gaelic is a case in point. In a memorial given to the Society, Dr. Donald Smith proposed:

...without fee or reward, first to give a Latin translation strictly literal of some of the most curious monuments now in the possession of this society...in order to discover to the lettered of Europe at large the state of learning, manners, and arts among the Scots at different period of their history.

Secondly, as your Memorialist some time ago had proposed a Compleat course of Lectures on civil History and upon the antiquity & language of the Celtic nations; a prospectus of this last having long been in the possession of the Secretary of the Gaelic Society, the Memorialist ardently wishes for an opportunity of delivering those Lectures to a respectable audience of such gentlemen, who have some knowledge of, and, retain a respect for, the Language & History of their native country and by that means he flatters himself that the venerable remains of this very antient language might be transmitted with lusture to future ages, tho’ the use thereof in common speech should in a short time cease entirely.

For this purpose therefore with all due respect and submission he proposes that if by the interest of the society of by such other means as they may judge advisable an appointment of a Professor of Civic History of the Celtic Nation could be obtained in either the University of Edinr or Glasgow. The Memorialist would immediately undertake that duty either with or without any Sallary.134

If Dr. Donald Smith’s perception of the Gaelic language is seen as representative of the rest of the Society in the 1780s, then the members of the Society viewed Gaelic and promoted Gaelic as a piece of Scottish antiquity, an interesting language to study and learn, and a means to examine the state of civility in the Scottish Highlands.

Nor did the Highland societies of eighteenth-century Scotland represent all Highlanders. With the exception of the Buchanan Society, they had high membership fees and excluded Highlanders of lower income. They were institutions for middling and elite Highlanders to present themselves as moral, intellectual, improved, and cultural. They were a means through which the Highlanders who joined these societies could maintain their connections to their migrant community,

134 Memorial of Dr. Donald Smith to the Highland Society of Scotland, David Laing Collection, La.II.474, f.78, CRC.
engage with Lowland cultural priorities, as well as promote their own Highland
distinction. The expressions of national identity used by the Highland societies were
heavily calculated to promote certain agendas. In this respect, they were no different
to the other societies discussed in this chapter. Together, these societies all reveal
the desire of Scots to be seen as culturally distinct from England but also worthy of
being part of Britain and the wider ‘civilised’ world. This was significant not only to
Scotland during the period after 1790, but also to the world beyond the British
archipelago as will be seen in the following chapters.

V

This chapter has only touched on a small number of the associations that
formed in Scotland during this period. This analysis could easily have included more
aristocratic societies like the Caledonian Hunt, cultural societies like the Edinburgh
Musical Society, and convivial societies like the Cape Club. The conclusions
however would be much the same. Groups of middling and elite Scots in the
eighteenth century began to use associations as a means to promote particular forms
of Scottish identity, which suited their collective priorities during a period in which
Scotland’s civil society gained power and significance. As the selectiveness of the
Poker Club and Select Society, the controversy between the Royal Society of
Edinburgh and the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, the attacks on the Dundee
Speculative Society, and the membership of the various Highland societies
demonstrate, associations gave certain groups authority over Scotland’s identity.
Those who joined societies sought to present Scotland (or a Scottish region) in a way
that allowed their specific community to distinguish itself as distinct yet useful and
beneficial to wider political, cultural, and professional contexts, especially within
Scotland, Britain, Europe, and the British Empire. They each engaged with wider
influences and shaped their Scottishness to fit within wider constructs, yet ultimately
constructed and performed Scottish identities that most supported the priorities of
their specific memberships.
CHAPTER 3

‘Scoto-Britannico-Americanus’:
Scottish Clubs and Scottish Identity in the British-American Colonies, c.1745-1776

In 1771, James Habersham, a prominent Englishman living in colonial Georgia, wrote to a business associate in London saying:

Tomorrow I am to dine with a Merry Saint, St. Andrew, I am a Member of the Society, and I am told our Friend John Graham will preside there, I am of Opinion, he will send many of the Saints Votaries away with Sare Heads. I do not mean our Friend John likes Sare Heads, because I know him to be one of the most temperate and at the same time one of the best Hearted Men in this Province, but for the Honor of his Saint and Country, I think he will on this occasion particularly exert himself.¹

The previous chapter evaluated Scottish societies in Scotland. It argued that eighteenth-century voluntary associations provided middling and elite Scots with an important vehicle through which they could form and articulate Scottish identities that were distinct, yet also integrated into larger metropolitan, British, and European contexts. They provided avenues through which Scots, particularly professional Scottish men, could shape Scottishness so that it was versatile enough to provide for their political, social, and economic needs. This chapter expands this argument to the other side of the Atlantic. It examines how and why Scots in the British-American colonies from c.1745-1776 used ‘Scottish’ clubs to construct and perform Scottish identities. It explores the beginnings of Scottish associational culture and identity construction outside of the British archipelago and evaluates the relationship these clubs maintained with the Scottish and British homeland.

In order to do this, this chapter examines two different types of Scottish associations in the American colonies. It starts with a case study of a society created

by a Scot in Annapolis, Maryland, which was based specifically on an association that met in Scotland. It looks at how and why the colonial Britons who joined this club, particularly its founder, drew from a Scottish as opposed to English cultural model. The chapter then examines the identity expressed by Scottish ‘ethnic’ societies, meaning those associations that explicitly claimed Scottish ethnicity and/or described themselves and their members as ‘Scottish’. It evaluates the role the Scottish identities constructed and articulated by these clubs played in promoting the integrity, reliability, and loyalty of Scots (or those who defined themselves as Scots within the confines of Scottish associations) in the British-American colonies. Ultimately, this chapter argues that Scots (and their supporters) in the colonies, like their counterparts in Scotland, used ‘Scottish’ associations to construct and articulate Scottish identities, which supported the specific concerns of their memberships in relation to the wider environments in which they met.

In 1954, John Clive and Bernard Bailyn acknowledged eighteenth-century Scotland and colonial America’s cultural similarities. In their article ‘England’s Cultural Provinces: Scotland and America’, they wrote, ‘The society in which the achievements of [colonial Americans] were rooted, though obviously different from that of Scotland in many ways, was yet significantly related to it.’ They suggested that the study of the similarities between Scotland and America during the second half of the eighteenth century shed light on the catalysts that led to the Scottish Enlightenment, and America’s simultaneous cultural and intellectual blossoming. By doing so, they came to the conclusion that the similar intellectual achievements and prowess of many Scots and colonial Americans were the result of Scotland and colonial America’s peripheral standing in relation to metropolitan London. Both of these ‘English provinces’ as they called them, were alike because they sought to imitate English culture, were physically removed from the metropole, were led by men who were the social inferiors of the aristocratic leaders of England, were either

---

patronised by English officialdom or influenced by London society through Scottish representation in Westminster, and simply felt inferior.\(^3\)

Some scholars have provided more nuanced interpretations of Scotland and America’s cultural relationship. Hook, Sher, and Smitten, among others, have argued that Scottish enlightenment philosophies, educational models, and Presbyterianism influenced colonial American development.\(^4\) Landsman, in particular, challenged the prevalent centre-versus-periphery thesis directly. In his work, *From Colonials to Provincials*, he argued that by the mid-eighteenth-century Scots and Americans viewed themselves as ‘integral parts of the British and European cultural world, participants in the dramatic cultural advances of the age, and meriting on their own all of the rights and privileges of a member of a European culture and a British empire’.\(^5\) According to Landsman, provincial (i.e. Scottish, Irish, and Welsh) influences on American culture resulted in a colonial (or in his words ‘provincial’) identity that was neither Anglicised nor local, but proudly imperial and British.\(^6\) During the past sixty years, however, most historians of Scotland and/or colonial America have subscribed to some version of Clive and Bailyn’s ‘Anglicisation’ thesis, arguing that both Scots and Americans looked to England as the apex of civility, the centre of the British world, and a cultural model from which to draw.\(^7\)
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\(^3\) Ibid., p. 206.
\(^4\) Hook, *Scotland and America*, pp. 17-46. See all articles included in Sher and Smitten (ed.), *Scotland & America in the Age of Enlightenment*.
\(^5\) Landsman, *From Colonials to Provincials*, p. xiii.
The numerous clubs and societies based on Scottish models created in the British-American colonies certainly suggest that Scotland as well as England provided a ‘civilised’ model that could be used for the colonies’ civilising process. The Charleston Musical Society had strong connections to the Edinburgh Musical Society. Benjamin Franklin’s American Philosophical Society maintained contact with members of the Scottish enlightenment community, particularly those associated with the Edinburgh Philosophical Society. The records of the Tuesday Club of Annapolis, in particular, lend credence to Landsman’s argument. The members of this club based its structure on a Scottish ‘enlightenment’ social club in order to improve the Club members and colonial Maryland in general. It provided them with a politically stable, inclusive, and sociable model, which adhered to many of the colonial communities’ imperatives. Yet, the records of this club also suggest that it went further than simply drawing from a useful ‘provincial’ prototype. Instead, the members sought to contest London political and cultural authority in favour of more encompassing Britishness by explicitly arguing that their club was an extension of Scotland’s club culture. Scottish club culture and its identity became a tool that the Tuesday Club used to claim British political inclusion (as opposed to colonial citizenship) for the members of the Club and the British-American colonies in general.

The actions of the members of the Tuesday Club, as in all clubs at their foundation, reflected the political, intellectual, and cultural priorities of its founding member. Born in Edinburgh in 1712, Dr. Alexander Hamilton exemplified the quintessential eighteenth-century Scottish gentleman and member of the ‘literati’. His father, William Hamilton, served as a moderate Church of Scotland minister, as a professor of divinity at the University of Edinburgh, and as a regular moderator to the general assembly. Shortly before his death in 1732, the University elected him as its principal. Alexander’s brother, Gavin, not only worked as a successful Edinburgh printer, but also served as a local bailie and later as a manager of the Edinburgh Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Sciences, Manufactures, and


Agriculture and as a director of the Society in Scotland for the Propagating of Christian Knowledge. Another of Hamilton’s brothers, Robert, followed in his father’s footsteps, becoming the minister of Cramond, and, in 1754, earning the chair of divinity at Edinburgh University.

In 1729, Alexander, at the age of seventeen, graduated from the University of Edinburgh with his MA degree. He served his medical apprenticeship with David Knox, and studied medicine at the University under Robert Eliot and Alexander Munro. In 1734, Hamilton, and four fellow students formed a student Medical Society, which in 1778 became the Royal Medical Society of Scotland. In 1737, at the age of twenty-five, he graduated with his medical degree from Edinburgh University. In that same year, he joined the convivial Whin Bush Club. Hamilton and his family were immersed in enlightenment Edinburgh’s political, social, intellectual, and Scottish associational culture.

Nevertheless, after graduating with his medical degree, Hamilton could not find ample employment in his native city. Eighteenth-century Edinburgh could not absorb all the doctors graduating from its medical school at that time. His older brother John had already made the transition to the colonies and established a successful practice as a doctor in southern Maryland. So, in 1738, Alexander did what many of his countrymen did at that time. He took advantage of Scotland’s
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14 For an excellent biography on Alexander Hamilton see Breslaw, Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Provincial America.
16 Breslaw, Dr. Alexander Hamilton Provincial America, p. 64
incorporation as England’s partner in the British Empire and moved to the British-American colonies, namely the city of Annapolis, Maryland.\textsuperscript{17}

Given his enlightenment background, Hamilton, not surprisingly, considered Edinburgh as a learned, civilised, and cultured British metropolis. He certainly did not see it as a culturally inferior British outpost. Upon arriving in Annapolis, however, he found a city with a population of approximately 10,000 people, which, in his view, was primitive in culture, extreme in temperature, and turbulent in politics.\textsuperscript{18} In his words, Annapolis constituted a ‘barbarous and desolate corner of the world’.\textsuperscript{19} He appreciated certain individual families as welcoming enough, but viewed the Annapolis social scene, especially the nascent associational culture there, as generally rude and obsessed with drink.\textsuperscript{20} As late as 1743, Hamilton wrote to his brother Robert in Edinburgh that Annapolis men only excelled in the ‘arts of Swearing and drinking punch & drams, horse-raceing, bullying, and cozning’ and only had knowledge of the tobacco trade.\textsuperscript{21} When men he met in Newcastle, Pennsylvania ‘inlarged upon the immorality, drunkeness[sic], rudeness and immoderate swearing so much practiced in Maryland and added that no such vices were to be found in Pennsylvania’ he did not contradict them as he ‘knew that the first part of the proposition was pritty true’.\textsuperscript{22} He suffered intense homesickness, which was only abated by visits to see his brother, John, in southern Maryland and in his receipt of letters from home.\textsuperscript{23} Ill health and frequent scares of contracting new world diseases such as malaria and yellow fever further exacerbated his discontent with Annapolitan life.\textsuperscript{24} By 1743, he began putting his affairs in order in anticipation

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] Ibid., pp. 63-73. Dobson has estimated that by 1785, 150,000 Scots had emigrated to the American colonies. David Dobson, \textit{Scottish Emigration to Colonial America, 1607-1785} (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1995), p. 4.
\item[19] Alexander Hamilton to Robert Hamilton, 29 September 1743, Dr. Alexander Hamilton Letterbook, Dulany Papers, MS.1265, MDHS.
\item[20] Alexander Hamilton to Robert Hamilton, 8 November 1743, quoted in Breslaw, \textit{Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Provincial America}, pp. 75-6, 147.
\item[23] Breslaw, \textit{Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Provincial America}, pp. 74-88.
\item[24] Hamilton records in his travel diary that a man in Trenton asked him, ‘if Hamilton att Annapolis was dead or alive. “Here he is,” says I, “bodily and not spiritually.” He told me the reason why he enquired was there was about twelvemonth agoe, one Dr [Adam] Thomson from Maryland had been
\end{footnotes}
of his returning back to Scotland. On 29 September 1743 he even had Jonas Green, the local printer, publish a broadside stating, ‘The Subscriber intending soon for Great-Britain, desires all Persons indebted to him to discharge their respective Debts; and likewise such as have Demands upon him, to come and receive what is due.’

He unquestionably saw Maryland, unlike Scotland, as an inferior colonial outpost rather than an incorporated part of Britain.

By 1743, though, his opinion of colonial-American life began to change. At the urging of his friend Stephen Bordley, Hamilton ran for local office and won a seat on the Annapolis Common Council, which gave him more financial security and social prestige in his new city. It also placed him within the colonial political system and introduced him into the town’s decision-making elite. A year later, in 1744, he travelled throughout New England for ‘health and recreation’. Along the way he supped with numerous clubs, often introduced to them by other imperial Scots of his acquaintance. While in Boston he even met with the ‘Scots’ Quarterly Society’ (also known as the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston). He experienced the burgeoning British-American civil and political society and experienced communities of learned people in the ‘civilization’ rather than ‘settling down’ stages of colonial development, re-establishing his original faith in colonial-British society. Rather than as an uncivilised backwater, Hamilton started to view Annapolis and its inhabitants as having the potential to be ‘improved’ because of the clubs he encountered. More importantly, he started to see Annapolis and its inhabitants as fully British rather than simply colonial.

In 1745, with the aim of introducing Annapolitan society to what he perceived of as suitable social and polite standards for an integrated settlement of the
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25 Alexander Hamilton, Advertisement. September 29, 1743. The Subscriber intending soon for Great-Britain, desires all persons indebted to him to discharge their respective debts... (Annapolis, 1743).
26 Alexander Hamilton to Gavin Hamilton, Nov. 13, 1743, Alexander Thomson of Banchory Papers, THO 4, fol. 2, NCL; Breslaw, Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Provincial America, p. 106.
27 Ibid., p. 178.
29 Ibid., p. 275.
31 Landsman, From Colonials to Provincials, p. 52.
British Empire, Hamilton created the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club of Annapolis. Rather than mimicking an English or colonial society, Hamilton looked to the Scottish tradition, creating a club, which in his words was ‘no other than the same [Whin Bush] Club transmigrated to America’. The overall structure of the Tuesday Club had clear connections to the Scottish club culture Hamilton experienced in Edinburgh. Four out of the first eight members were Scots. The Club called its meetings ‘sederunts’, a term used in Scotland to describe sittings of the Court of Session, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and meetings of various satirical clubs. It used pseudonyms for club members, which harkened to Scottish club tradition. It also used the categories of ‘long-standing’ and ‘honorary’ to describe modes of membership, which Hamilton unambiguously stated he took from the Whin Bush model.

Like enlightenment clubs in Scotland, the Tuesday Club engaged in wide-ranging transnational scientific discussions. Debates and lectures often dealt with currently popular scientific issues and colonial ‘philosophers’ frequently visited Tuesday Club meetings. Adam Thomson, the Scots doctor who caused uproar in Philadelphia by promoting and experimenting with the use of small pox inoculation, the precursor to live-culture vaccines, for instance, visited the Club on at least 15 April 1746 and 30 September 1746. On 11 September 1750, the Club entertained

35 It is unclear whether the club used the pseudonyms during club meeting or if Hamilton created the pseudonyms when writing his satirical *History*. The Easy Club of Edinburgh is understood to have been the direct precursor to the Whin Bush Club. Its members called themselves by historical English and then Scottish patron names. Whether used at Tuesday Club sederunts or not, the use of pseudonyms in his *History* had Scottish connections. ‘The Fundamental Laws of the Famous Modern Society Called the Easy Club’, in Burns Martin, John W. Oliver, Alexander M. Kinghorn, and Alexander Law (eds.), *The Works of Allan Ramsay*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1972), Vol. V, p. 29.
37 Breslaw, *Dr. Alexander Hamilton and Provincial America*, pp. 241-51; *Records*, pp. 26, 36; Dr. Adam Thomson wrote a discourse on the use of inoculation for small pox. Adam Thomson, *A discourse on the preparation of the body for the small-pox: and the manner of receiving the infection: As it was deliver'd in the publick hall of the Academy, before the trustees, and others, on Wednesday, the 21st of November, 1750* (Philadelphia, 1750). Dr. Alexander Hamilton wrote a defense of Dr. Thomson’s discourse. Alexander Hamilton, *A defence of Dr. Thomson's Discourse on the preparation of the body for the small pox, and the manner of receiving the infection: wherein every thing that has been yet advanced against it is fairly examined; particularly Dr. Mead's censure of Dr. Boerhaave's opinion concerning a specific antidote, and Mr. Kearsley's remark* (Philadelphia, 1751). As will be
two ‘Eminant Scholars and Philosophers’, Revd. Dr. Archibald Spencer and Revd. Dr. Towers, who spoke on newly discovered insects. On 22 January 1754, Benjamin Franklin even visited the Club. The Scottish club model allowed for the Tuesday Club to engage in the wider transnational learned community, i.e. the ‘Republic of Letters’.

Tuesday Club members, like those who joined Scottish enlightenment clubs, used their society as a vehicle to improve themselves and their environment’s politeness and sociability. They practised their speech-making and epistolary writing. They appointed a poet laureate, Jonas Green, who wrote and recited poetic verses and anniversary odes, as well as read letters between members aloud at sederunts. They held balls and processed through the town, showing off their ‘clubbability’. The Club became the centre of musical performance in Maryland, holding concerts and composing songs. It also provided an arena for the improving of its members’ wit, humour, and use of satire. Hamilton, in his capacity as secretary, filled the official record with fanciful anecdotes. The Tuesday Club held mock trials to punish minor offenses, such as writing too much in the records or even sneezing. In 1750, the members proposed conundrums and voted on the answers given. In c.1754, Hamilton wrote a three volume satirical history of the Club titled

seen in the following section, Thomson also joined the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia and became a founding member of the St. Andrew’s Society of New York.

41 For an evaluation of Tuesday Club prose see Somerville, The Tuesday Club of Annapolis (1745-1756) as Cultural Performance, pp. 45-80.
46 Breslaw, ‘Introduction’, in Records, p. xvi; Mock trial of Negro Peter can be found in Records, p. 408; History, Vol. III, pp. 140. It is unclear who Negro Peter actually was. He could have been a slave or servant.
the *History of the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club*. In it, he told humorous tales of club exploits and debates.\(^{47}\)

More importantly, however, the Scottish club model became a vehicle through which the members of the Tuesday Club openly claimed equal British citizenship and political identity. As Shields and Breslaw have argued, clubs on both sides of the Atlantic projected their political activities as either innocent or ludicrous in order to prevent any need for the religious or political establishment to worry or interfere while at the same time making covert statements concerning contemporary British political culture.\(^{48}\) Hamilton himself said about his satirical *History*, ‘I will not Indeed so easily grant you that it is an unmeaning one, since it bears an exact resemblance to many other farces in human life, esteemed (tho they are not really so) of a more Serious nature’.\(^{49}\)

The Tuesday Club satirised on relevant political issues, such as luxury, taxation, sovereignty, and divine right through fictitious club play. They set themselves at the head of a fictitious North American club empire, which had control over other clubs in the colonies, such as the Eastern Shore Triumvirate and a fictitious society in New York.\(^ {50}\) They even had a ‘foreign’ agent in London.\(^ {51}\) In his *History*, Hamilton wrote, ‘There is but a trifling difference between the histories of the smallest Clubs, and those of the Great Empires and kingdoms’.\(^ {52}\)

They parodied, and thus commented on the skewed imperial relationship between Scotland and England. Within the satirical *History* and more accurate *Records*, Hamilton positioned Charles Cole, the Tuesday Club president, as an authoritative Englishman who overpowered the rest of the club, especially the Scots. On 21 January 1755, the records stated that the secretary, Hamilton, sought to change the minute from a previous meeting. It stated, ‘the Secretary Said “he would dash it out with a St. Andrew’s Cross,”’ but the president declared, he would have nothing to
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\(^{47}\) *History*, Vol. I-III.

\(^{48}\) Shields, *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters*, pp. 176-189; Breslaw, ‘Wit, Whimsy, and Politics’.


do with St. Andrew, or anything belonging to him’. On another occasion Hamilton recorded:

…knowing [the president’s] enthusiasm for old England, and every thing pertaining to that Happy Country. He told his honor to “favour him at least for country’s Sake that he was his countryman, and the only old Englishman now in the Club, beside himself, and his honor’s attorney, the rest of the members being either Country born or Scotch men.” To that his honor made reply, “that he Set no value upon that, and that he always Judged a man by his behaviour, and not by his country.” This was an excellent Sentiment, and came from his honor unawares…The Secretary then got up to speak…but his honor dashed him at once, by telling him, “that he might Spare his trowble for, that he did not understand his broad Scotch pronounciation & dialect. They followed British parliamentary structure. Hamilton recorded, ‘…what great State the Club now take upon them, in adopting the parliamentary Stile, and copying after the proceedings of the august Senate of Great Britain; But this, they thought they had a right to do, as being a Club composed of British subjects…’

Within the History and Records, Hamilton and the Club even made explicit claims for British citizenship, liberty, and loyalty. Hamilton recorded:

...we may pritty surely conclude from thence, that all the Longstanding members were Stanch whigs, and averse to all Jacobitish principles and maxims, a happy Circumstance, and what has contributed much, among other concurring causes, to the prosperity and Stability of this ancient and honorable Club, we have all of us reason to pray, that this noble Spirit of Liberty, may grow and continue among us, and, that no bribery, corruption and Luxury, may gain footing so far, as to extinguish so noble, heroic and generous a disposition.

The Tuesday Club acted as a vehicle through which professional and elite Britons in the colonies that did not have immediate access to the British parliament engaged

---

53 Records, p. 529.
with local, British, and British imperial politics, or at the very least presented themselves as key to the British imperial process.

The Tuesday Club, however, did more than just draw from a Scottish model in order to engage with a transatlantic ‘provincial’ discourse. It explicitly claimed ‘ancient’ Scottish connections and identity. In his *History*, Hamilton created a fictitious lineage connecting the Tuesday Club in Annapolis to its Scottish antecedents. He argued that the original Whin Bush Club had formed as early as 1440 in ‘Lanneric’ and had a long and fruitful history. He created a fictitious timeline of Whin Bush members, which included fabricated Scottish historical characters such as ‘Congallus de Rutherin’, ‘Dongallus Auchtermughty’, ‘Jervais Dalgleish’, and ‘Mungo Macafferty’, as well as recognisable Scottish historical and contemporary figures such as David Lindsay, Zachary Boyd, Harbottle Grimston, and Allan Ramsay (who we know actually joined the original Whin Bush Club). He gave a detailed account of the Whin Bush Club’s induction ceremony, including a part in which the inductee had to prove their connection to Clydesdale. When describing the foundation of the Tuesday Club, Hamilton wrote, ‘I would not have my readers here to misunderstand me, they were not so much the founders of the Ancient and honorable Tuesday Club, as the Settlers and revivers of that Club in America, for the time of their foundation is uncertain, They being as ancient as the ancient and Venerable Tuesday (or whin-bush) Club of Lanneric’.

Within his *History*, Hamilton gave George Neilson, a Jacobite who fought in 1715 and was transported after the battle of Sheriffmuir, credit for bringing the Whin Bush Club model to Annapolis and argued that the Tuesday Club was a continuation of a society of his creation. Although no records of Neilson joining a ‘Royalist’ club or a ‘Red House Club’, as described in Hamilton’s *History*, exist, records do exist of Neilson engaging with a ‘Scots Society’ in Annapolis. A *Maryland Gazette* article published in 1728 recorded:
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60 Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 74-93.
Annapolis, December 10: Saturday the 30th of last Month, being St. Andrew’s Day, was observ’d here, by the Gentlemen of the Scots Society, as usual. The Rev. Mr. Adams, of Somerset County, preach’d a Sermon suitable to the occasion; after which, the Gentlemen of that Society, accompany’d by his Excellency the Governour, the Hon. Charles Calvert, Esq; and most of the Gentlemen in Town, proceeded to the House of Mr. George Neilson, there was a handsome Entertainment provided, at the Expense of the said Society.\footnote{Maryland Gazette, 10 December 1728.}

This suggests that Hamilton saw the Tuesday club, if not explicitly then implicitly, as a ‘Scots Society’. Even if Neilson’s ‘Red House Club’ did exist, it was still situated as a product of Neilson’s Scottish influences. Hamilton’s History certainly satirised the Whin Bush Club and Neilson’s relationship with Annapolis culture. His account, however, should not be seen as an attack on Scotland or Scottish clubs, but rather as an affectionate ribbing of an admired institution. Hamilton relished his days in Edinburgh’s club scene. In 1739, Hamilton wrote to his brother Gavin asking him to ‘be so good as Remember me to all the Members of the whin-bush Club,…Inform them that every Friday, I fancy myself with them, drinking two penny ale, and smoking tobacco, I Long to see those merry days again’.\footnote{Alexander Hamilton to Gavin Hamilton, June 13, 1739, Dr. Alexander Hamilton Letterbook, Dulany Papers, MS.1265, MDHS.} Although few records exist for the original Whin Bush Club, Allan Ramsay’s poem ‘To the Whin Bush Club’, demonstrates that the society saw satire and wit as an essential part of their creed. He wrote:

\begin{quote}
…Native of Clydesdale’s upper Ward,  
Bread Fifteen Summers there,  
Tho, to my Loss, I’m no a Laird  
By Birth, my Title’s Fair  
To bend wi’ ye, and spend wi’ ye  
An Evening, and gaffaw;  
If Merit and Spirit  
Be found without a Flaw.  
Since dously ye do nought at Random  
Then take my Bill to Avisandum.\footnote{Ramsay, ‘To the Whin-Bush Club’, in Poems, pp. 291-292.}
\end{quote}
Indeed, the Whin Bush Club may have satirised their own history and provided the template from which Hamilton drew. When placed next to the Cape Club’s induction ceremony described in Chapter 1, the Whin Bush Club induction described by Hamilton, which included putting a cap on the applicant’s head, putting ‘furz’ in his buttonhole, and having him sign the club rules, seems plausible.  

As Breslaw argues, ‘the club’s long history (considerably stretched by Dr. Hamilton in his fanciful “History”) provided people newly arrived with a cultural legacy and a set of traditions’ and a sense of cultural belonging. It certainly provided the members of the Tuesday Club with a claim toward Old World civility and culture. By situating the Club as anciently Scottish, the members of the Tuesday Club presented the American community as a continuation of mainland Britain. More importantly, however, by claiming Scottish associational ancestry and Scottish cultural identity and basing themselves on a Scottish model, the Tuesday Club, like their Scottish counterparts, challenged London cultural supremacy and claimed wider British citizenship for themselves and the colonies in general, and supported Scottish civility. As Landsman argues, ‘Freedom from the domination of metropolitan interests provided provincials with the political and moral authority to claim the rights and privileges of imperial citizens and to view themselves as full-fledged contributors to the security and prosperity of the empire.’ As Scottish societies in Scotland already presented themselves as equals within wider British and European political, intellectual, and cultural structures, they provided important models for a colonial community, which sought to do the same thing. Creating a society, which professed a Scottish connection, allowed these British-Americans members to claim British liberties for themselves and England’s other, and in their view co-equal, imperial partner. By creating a voluntary association for this purpose, Hamilton and his fellow club members were able to have a larger impact on colonial British society.
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66 Landsman, From Colonials to Provincials, p. 180.
Scots did more than just draw from Scottish associational models. They also formed societies centred on Scottish ‘ethnicity’. By the start of the American War of Independence, a Scottish ethnic society met in almost every port city in the British-American colonies. In 1657, the first Scottish emigrant association met in Boston, Massachusetts. The Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston aimed to relieve the ‘Poor of the Scots Nation who came to these Parts, on their Lawfull Occusions or Shipwreck’d or otherwise reduc’d to want by Sickness, or Losses’. In 1729, at least thirty-four Scots came together to form the first St. Andrew’s Society in Charleston, South Carolina. Like the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston, they sought to provide philanthropic relief to those in need. In c.1737, a St. Andrew’s Society met in Savannah, Georgia with the goal of lobbying the Georgia Trustees for political reform. In 1744, a Scots Society of New York formed and functioned as a benevolent society on the model of the Scots’ Corporation in London and the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston. In c.1747 an ethnically exclusive philanthropic society by the name of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia formed in its namesake city. In 1756, Dr. Adam Thomson created the St. Andrew’s Society of New York based on the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia’s image. In 1764, members of the Scottish community in Savannah created a new St. Andrew’s
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69 Rules of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charles-Town in South Carolina (1731).
70 John F. McGowan, Robert W. Graves, and William Murray Davidson, History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, Georgia (Savannah, Printed by the Society, 1972), pp. 5-9.
72 There is some disagreement over when the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia was founded. The official records start in 1749, but the Society currently argues that they were meeting before the minutes started to be recorded. As such, the Society now understands their founding to be in 1747. Edgar S. Garder, The First Two Hundred Years, 1747-1947, of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia (Philadelphia: Printed by the Society, 1947), pp. 20-23.
73 George Austin Morrison, History of the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York, 1756-1906 (New York, 1906), pp. 7-8
Society, which, like most other St. Andrew’s Societies that met at that time, provided charitable relief to members of their community.\textsuperscript{74} This sequential creation of so many Scottish ethnic societies resulted from the social and political situation in which eighteenth-century Scots in America found themselves. A society for Scots who travelled to the English colony of Boston in the mid-seventeenth century must have proved expedient. Seventeenth-century Scottish emigrants often joined joint English, Irish, and Scottish colonial ventures and usually did not intend to create ethno-centric communities when they arrived in North America.\textsuperscript{75} The Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston, which provided monetary assistance to those emigrants who suffered from ‘shipwrecks’ or ‘sickness’, necessarily provided security to Scots who undertook insecure ventures without proper financial support. Moreover, as Budde has suggested, in 1657, the year that the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston first formed, the indentures of the Scots captured by Cromwell’s army at the Battle of Dunbar in 1650 and the Battle of Worcester in 1651 and subsequently sold to the London Company of Undertakers to work in the Massachusetts ironworks began to expire. A Scottish ‘box society’, may have served an important, indeed essential, role in ensuring these Scots’ survival.\textsuperscript{76}

The anomaly in the above list in terms of structure and purpose, the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, Georgia, or as they called themselves the ‘St. Andrew’s Clubb and Tippling Society’, was the most political of the St. Andrew’s Societies formed in colonial British-America before the Revolution.\textsuperscript{77} Led by Patrick Talifer, William and Hugh Sterling, Thomas and John Bailie, Andrew Grant, Hugh Anderson, Thomas Christie and Elisha Dobree, the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah advocated for the creation of a plantation and slave-based economic system in Georgia on the model of South Carolina. They threatened the Georgia

\textsuperscript{74} Georgia Gazette, 15 November 1764; McGowan et al., History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, Georgia, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{75} Dobson, Scottish Emigration, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{77} Thomas Jones to John Lyde, 18 September 1740, Egmont Papers, Phillipps Collection, University of Georgia Libraries, No. 14205, p. 134, quoted in McGowan et al., History of the St. Andrew’s Society Savannah, Georgia, p. 6.
Trustees led by James Oglethorpe, who supported the prohibition of slavery in the colony.\footnote{David Lee Russell, \textit{Oglethorpe and Colonial Georgia: A History 1733-1783} (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2006), p. 30; Milton Ready, ‘The Georgia Trustees and the Malcontents: The Politics of Philanthropy’, \textit{The Georgia Historical Quarterly} (1976), pp. 264-281.} In 1740, the Trustees pushed the leaders of the St. Andrew’s Society out of Georgia and into South Carolina. Yet, this did not stop their political barrage. A letter to William Stephens, the Trustees’ secretary in Georgia, from a Mr. Matthews, for instance, stated:

\begin{quote}
I know not how to behave, otherwise than by avoiding all
Conversation with a Man, who from the time of the St. Andrew’s Club existing, had on all Occasions vilely’d and traduced my Character, singling me out (to use his Own Expression) for a Butt to discharge his Venom at, and since the demolition of that Club, whose house has been the Rendezvous of all our Malecontents.\footnote{E. Merton Coulter (ed.), \textit{The Journal of William Stephens: 1741-1743} (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1958), p. 35.}
\end{quote}

As well as sending letters and petitions to Oglethorpe and the Trustees’ representatives in the colonies, Talifer, Hugh Anderson and David Douglas (all members of the St. Andrew’s Society) wrote and published \textit{A True and Historical Narrative of the Colony of Georgia in America}, which they satirically dedicated to Oglethorpe.\footnote{Pat. Talifer, Hugh Anderson, and Da. Douglas, \textit{A True and Historical Narrative of the Colony of Georgia, in America, From the First Settlement thereof until this present Period: Containing The most authentick Facts, Matters, and Transactions therein: Together with His Majesty’s Charter, Representations of the People, Letters, &c. And A Dedication to His Excellency General Oglethorpe} (Charles Town, 1741). In it they attacked the Trustees for their management (or mismanagement) of the Georgia colony.

The point of this Scottish society was to suggest that all Georgia Scots supported a change in Georgia’s governmental and economic policies regarding slavery. By calling themselves the ‘St. Andrew’s Society’, they may have attempted to sarcastically reference the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, which was overwhelmingly made up of men associated in some way with the plantation system and slave economy. While the association supported a larger movement of ‘malcontents’, it crumbled in 1742, partly because they could no longer meet in
Georgia. Unfortunately for other colonial Scots in Georgia, its notoriety for ethnic factionalism continued in Georgia even after the Trustees turned the colony over to the British government in 1752.  

By the mid-eighteenth century, Scots appeared as a suspect group throughout the British-American colonies. While many colonial-American intellectuals saw the usefulness and calibre of Scotland’s enlightenment philosophies, educational patterns, learned works, and club models, many colonial Americans saw the Scottish population in America as clannish and overly ambitious. A *Virginia Gazette* article published in 1774, for instance, stated:

A Scotchman, when he first is admitted into a house, is so humble that he will sit upon the lowest step of the staircase. By degrees he gets into the kitchen, and from thence, by the most submissive behaviour, is advanced into the parlour. If he gets into the dining room, as ten to one but he will, the master of the house must take care of himself; for in all probability he will turn him out of doors, and, by the assistance of his countrymen, keep possession forever.

Colonial Americans often portrayed the Scots as a money-grubbing ethnic community who did not have any real attachment to colonial life or concern with the colonies’ wellbeing. To make matters worse, during and after the Jacobite rebellion, many colonists saw Scots, even those of Presbyterian Lowland descent, as politically subversive and unsupportive of the British monarchy and union. The Bute administration (1762-1763), which promoted unpopular measures like retaining

---

81 For an overview of the destructive nature of the original St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah see McGowan et al., *History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, Georgia*, pp. 5-9.
84 *Virginia Gazette*, 20 October 1774; Hook, *Scotland and America*, p. 48.
a standing army in the colonies following the Seven Years’ War, only added to this colonial scotophobia.\footnote{Ibid., p. 183; Kidd, ‘Integration: Patriotism and Nationalism’, p. 378; Foster and Haefeli, ‘British North America in the Empire’, p. 57; Hook, Scotland and America, pp. 51-61; Nenadic, ‘Introduction’, in Scots in London, pp. 23-24.}

In order to succeed socially and financially, most urban Scots deliberately assimilated into wider colonial communities when not involved in Scottish associational activities.\footnote{Olwell and Tully, ‘Introduction’, in Cultures and Identities, p. 9. Here I use the term ‘urban Scots’ because many Scots, particularly Highlanders, emigrated to rural areas and/or moved west to the American frontier.} They did not live in ethnic enclaves.\footnote{See for instance, Nenadic’s evaluation of how Scots assimilated into eighteenth-century London society in Nenadic, ‘Introduction’, in Scots in London, pp. 20-22. Paul has also shown that Scots lived throughout Philadelphia’s twelve wards, Paul, ‘Credit and Social Relations’, p. 241.} They socialised for the most part in mixed ethnic groups.\footnote{T.M. Devine, The Tobacco Lords: A Study of the Tobacco Merchants of Glasgow and Their Trading Activities, 1740-90 (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1975); Sher, Enlightenment.} Like Scots in Scotland, most spoke and wrote in English as opposed to Scots or Gaelic. While Scots certainly created intricate business and information networks, they did not formally advertise these ethnic connections to the wider colonial community.\footnote{Paul, ‘Credit and Social Relations’.}

Even the Tuesday Club in Annapolis included a diverse membership and described the individual members as ‘British’ rather than ‘Scottish’. Like those who joined societies in Scotland, the livelihoods of mid-eighteenth-century urban Scots in the British-American colonies depended on patronage networks, credit, and reputation.\footnote{Pennsylvania Gazette, 11 June 1741; Paul, ‘Credit and Social Relations’, p. 213; Benjamin Franklin, Poor Richard’s Almanack: Selections from the apothegms and proverbs, with a brief sketch of the life of Benjamin Franklin (Waterloo, IA: The U.S.C. Publishing Co., 1914), p. 22.} Each member would have subscribed to the message published in the Pennsylvania Gazette in 1741, which stated, ‘a good reputation is the most infallible means of success in our aims and endeavours’, or as Franklin wrote in the Poor Richard’s Almanack, ‘Glass, China, and Reputation, are easily crack’d, and never well mended’.\footnote{Pennsylvania Gazette, 11 June 1741; Paul, ‘Credit and Social Relations’, p. 213; Benjamin Franklin, Poor Richard’s Almanack: Selections from the apothegms and proverbs, with a brief sketch of the life of Benjamin Franklin (Waterloo, IA: The U.S.C. Publishing Co., 1914), p. 22.}

Scottish ethnic societies, including the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston, by mid-century, provided a vehicle through which Scottish colonists, like their counterparts in Scotland, could manufacture a Scottish identity that challenged these negative preconceptions and supported their desire to have a ‘good reputation’. The key here is to understand Scots ethnic associations in colonial America in comparison to the Highland societies, which met in Scotland at the same time and
the identities they performed. Both types of societies represented diasporic communities in environments in which they had negative reputations. Highland societies in Edinburgh and Glasgow represented the otherwise stereotypically portrayed barbaric, primitive, and Jacobitish Highlanders and Scottish ethnic societies in the American colonies represented what many saw as clannish, subversive, and greedy Scots. As the previous chapter demonstrated, Highland societies provided a way in which middling and elite Highlanders living and working in the Scottish Lowland cities could promote Highland assimilation to Lowland cultural priorities, yet at the same time maintain their own sense of exceptionalism on the basis of their distinct culture and inherent traits. In the same way, colonial Scottish ethnic societies provided an avenue through which the members could shape (or re-shape) Scottish identity so that it upheld the social, cultural, and economic imperatives of the colonial community, countered unfavourable preconceived notions, claimed unfettered British loyalty and incorporation, and yet maintained a distinctive character.

The shape the majority of colonial Scottish ethnic associations took reflected these aims. With the exception of the politicised Savannah society, all Scottish ethnic societies acted primarily as charities. They offered financial assistance to men and women, usually of Scottish descent, who fell on hard times. They gave pensions to widows of Scotsmen, provided clothing to those who did not have anything appropriate to wear, paid doctors bills or had sympathetic doctors treat the individual for free, raised money for burial plots, provided scholarship to poor yet intellectually bright boys, and gave one-off donations to people who had temporary setbacks, especially during times of known crisis.94 While these societies certainly provided needed assistance to the destitute Scottish community (which continued to grow as emigration increased), engaging in these charitable works also presented the Scottish colonial community to the wider population as moral and philanthropic – traits that appealed to wider colonial sensibilities. The first charter of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia stated ‘that particular benevolence of mind which shows itself by charitable actions in giving relief to the poor and distressed, has been justly esteemed

94 Records of these transactions litter the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia’s minute books. St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), Mss.361.Sa2, APS; St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1786-1833), Mss.361.Sa2, APS.
one of the first rate moral virtues'. While the societies did not espouse any specific religious views, as members attended services at churches of varying denominations, they certainly presented the Scots as doing their ecumenically approved Christian duties.

The Highland societies of Edinburgh and Glasgow claimed that they could perform Highland distinction without fear of political repercussions because the Highland Society of London already performed ‘Scoto-Britishness’ in the British metropole. Scottish colonial societies did the same thing by claiming connection to the Scots’ Corporation of London. The St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, for instance, stated in its rulebook printed in 1769, ‘we observe, even among the Natives of different Countries in the same Kingdom, that when they come to reside in the great Metropolis, London, they form themselves into the like Societies, for local and particular Charities for those who were born near them’. The Scots’ Society of New York, even explicitly included in their 1744 advertisement, that they were ‘particularly encourag[ed] thereto by the Success of a Scots Society in London, established by a Charter of King Charles II…which…has ever since without Interruption been continued and promoted, to the compassionate and seasonable Relief of many’. By mimicking the charitable aims of the Scots’ Corporation, which already had royal recognition and respect, they justified their association on ethnic and national grounds.

In order to deal with accusations that the Scots were ‘clannish’ and that Scots emigrants did not support the broader colonial population, Scottish societies referenced the importance of kin networks in supporting those who fall on hard
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95 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, Charter, 1749.
97 For more information on the Scots’ Corporation of London, see Taylor, A Cup of Kindness.
99 Rules and Orders Agreed Upon by the Scots Society in New-York (1744). Also see Rules and Orders Agreed upon by the Scots’ Society in Boston, New-England, For the Management of their Charity (Boston, 1745); ‘Rules and Order Agreed Upon by the Scots’ Society in Boston, New England, for the Management of their Charity (1770)’, in The Constitution and By-Laws of the Scot’s Charitable Society of Boston, (Instituted 1657) with a list of members and officers, and many interesting extracts from the original records of the society (Cambridge, MA, 1878), p. 47.
...the love of the native Soil, which is inseparable from every human Breast, will make their Countrymen more ready than others to administer to their Relief; and that possibly some may be found among them with whom they are connected by Blood; who may have known some of their Relatives, or at least, who may have better Opportunities of being assured, from local Circumstances, that they are not Imposters.101

Indeed, this rulebook continued by stating that a society for Scots run by Scots was natural and the best means through which to keep the Scottish emigrant population from burdening wider colonial poor relief efforts. It claimed ‘since few Men, after answering the Calls of the Public, can be able to contribute, in all extraordinary Cases that may happen, it is certain that when particular cases become the Care of particular Societies, the whole will be better provided for’.102 Furthermore, almost all societies had a clause in their rulebooks that stated that while they provided for the Scots community, they had no ‘Desire or Expectation of being excused from contributing towards the publick Provision for the Town-Poor in general.’103

In 1764, members of the Scottish community in Savannah, Georgia decided to form a new St. Andrew’s Society in that city. Unlike the previous politically potent society by that name, this new St. Andrew’s Society was billed as a philanthropic society, much like the other St. Andrew’s Societies already in existence in other colonies. Those who created this association attempted to reinvigorate the reputation of Scots in Georgia after the previous Scottish society had aggravated the scotophobia in that place. In order to attract members, they published an advertisement in the Georgia Gazette, which stated:

102 Ibid., p. 4.
103 *Rules and Orders Agreed upon by the Scots’ Society in Boston* (1745).
Several gentlemen having taken under consideration the great advantages that arise to the poor and indigent from charitable societies, have agreed to enter into a society, at Savannah, on the 30th day of this instant November, and to meet at the home of James Machenry, at ten of the clock of the forenoon of that day, when the rules proposed for regulating the society will be communicated to every gentlemen of whatever nation or profession soever, who may be desirous to become a member of the same. N.B. Every poor person without distinction will be entitled to the charity of the society.104

As would be expected, the new St. Andrew’s Society came under immediate attack. In response to the original advertisement, a man under the name ‘A Commoner’ wrote, ‘the love of any one part of the nation of which one is a member in preference to another part of the nation, may be said to be a vice, and a thing to be discouraged as a foundation for party and disturbance’.105 By making this statement, ‘A Commoner’ implied that Scottish ethnic associations were anti-British and politically dangerous by the mere fact that they maintained ethnic distinctiveness. ‘Scoto-Britannico-Americanus’, an anonymous member of the newly formed St. Andrew’s Society, rebutted by arguing that ‘they met as Scotchmen’ but ‘there was less idle factious distinction or party among us then than has prevailed of late’.106 Even the name that the member of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah chose to use as a pseudonym, ‘Scoto-Britannico-Americanus’ is indicative of the tripartite identity that the Society, and indeed every Scottish ethnic society from the 1750s until (and for some even during) the American Revolution, attempted to present.

As with all Scottish societies in Scotland and America, colonial-American Scottish ethnic societies asserted that their associations represented Scottish identity on the whole. Most of the Scots who joined came from the wealthier professional and merchant classes. As a point of reference, the original membership of the St. Andrew’s Society of New York included approximately seventeen merchants, ten military officers, seven doctors, four lawyers, four ship captains, three politicians,

104 Georgia Gazette, 15 November 1764; McGowan et al., History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, Georgia, p. 10.
105 Georgia Gazette, 49 November 1764.
106 Ibid., 13 December 1764, 20 December 1764, 3 January 1765; McGowan et al., History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, Georgia, p. 11.
one stay-maker, and one minister. In 1744 the Scots’ Society of New York explicitly stated that it was ‘some Gentlemen, Merchants and others of the Scots Nation’ who had formed the society in that year. The associations clearly attempted to create a connection between Scottish identity and the middling ranks.

Ancestral requirements for Scottishness differed between Scottish ethnic societies and could even be overlooked if the potential member supported the association’s wider mission. While they originally desired that only Scottish immigrants could join, by 1751 the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia started to include men of Scots parentage and, by 1769, Scots grand-parentage. While this certainly helped in raising membership numbers and funds, it also allowed the Society to include more prominent men on its membership rolls and be more connected to the colonial establishment. In 1750, James Hamilton, the Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania, expressed his desire to become a member of the Society, even though he was born in Maryland to a Scottish emigrant father. The Society overlooked their stated requirements and unanimously agreed to his membership and even voted him into the role of President of the Society that same year. Similarly on 30 November 1754, the same association unanimously accepted Robert Hunter Morris, the new deputy governor of Pennsylvania, as a member and ‘at the same time, his honour was unanimously chosen President of the Society’. Morris, under the original membership requirements, would also have been excluded from joining.

After the issues that arose from the original St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah, it is unsurprising that the new St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah had inclusive membership requirements. By including men of English and American ancestry, the Society furthered its claim that it did not support ‘idle factious distinction’. By defining all of the members as ‘Scotch’, even if they came from a

110 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, 30 November 1750.
111 Ibid., 30 November 1754.
different background, this Scottish ethnic society incorporated figures that supported their priorities into the Scottish community.

Honorary membership became a tool through which the societies could define colonial-American Scottishness as distinct yet loyally British and in touch with the local colonial priorities as well. In the year 1757, the 77th Foot, Montgomery’s Highlanders (originally numbered as the 62nd Regiment), were raised by Archibald Montgomery in response to the emerging conflicts in the North American theatre of the Seven Years’ War and deployed to Charleston, South Carolina. The first troops arrived in that city on 3 September 1757. Two and a half months later, on 30 November 1757, forty-six officers associated with Montgomery’s regiment were accepted into the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston as honorary members. Only three officers, Ensign Alex Grant, Ensign Ronald MacKinnon, and the surgeon Allan Stuart are not included on the membership list. The influx of officers in 1757 to the membership roles of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston marks the highest number of entrants before the Society was re-established after the American War of Independence, with the exception of those who joined in the first year.

In 1759 three officers associated with the 77th Foot joined the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, including Lieutenant James Duff who was already a member of the Charleston Society. Many other Scots commissioned in the British military also joined the Philadelphia St. Andrew’s Society. This trend is further supported by the list of Honorary Members attached to the 1770 edition of the Rules for the St. Andrew’s Society in New-York. Out of the 115 honorary members listed, sixty-eight were military officers, among them Major General James Abercrombie, the commander-in-chief of the forces in North America and Colonel Simon Fraser of Lovat who raised and commanded the 78th Foot or Fraser’s Highlanders. When this list is cross-referenced with MacBean’s Biographical Register of Saint Andrew’s
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115 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, 28 February 1759.
Society of the State of New York, it becomes clear that the majority of these officers joined the Society in an honorary capacity when they were in New York between 1756 and 1763, much in the way that the 77th Foot overwhelmingly joined the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston when they were in that city in 1757.\textsuperscript{117}

This influx of Highland soldiers into Scottish societies signified much more than a welcoming of fellow Scots by these associations, but a strategic tactic in the negotiation and performance of Scottish identity in relation to colonial priorities. The imperial soldier in Highland dress embodied the identity the members of these societies sought to express – one that was outward looking, protective of Britain, the British Empire, and the individual colonial communities, yet also culturally distinct. These soldiers maintained their essentially Gaelic origin and cultural identity, while at the same time being fully accepted and integrated into the British fiscal-military state. By including the officers of these British and imperial yet Scottish regiments into the Scottish societies in America, Scottish ethnic associations made an important claim of allegiance and nationhood. To make their British and imperial loyalties even clearer, out of the three officers in the 77th Regiment that were confirmed Jacobites, Lieut. Donald Macdonald, Ensign Ronald Mackinnon, and Ensign Alex Grant, only Lieut. Donald Macdonald joined the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston in 1757.\textsuperscript{118}

Along with charitable work, the societies also facilitated entertainment, sociability, and conviviality, like their counterparts in Scotland. Each society earmarked a large portion of their funds for society gatherings, especially anniversary celebrations. As early as 1732, an article describing the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston stated:

\begin{quote}
The 30\textsuperscript{th} of Nov. last being St. Andrew’s Day, and the Anniversary Meeting of St. Andrew’s Club his Excellency the Governor, Robert Wright, Esq.; Chief Justice, Capt. James Lloyd, Alex Skene, Eleazer Alan, Wm. Saxby, Esqrs. And above 40 other members residing in this Province, met at the house of Mr. Henry
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{117} MacBean, \textit{Biographical Register}. The officers joined the Society as ‘Honorary Members’ most likely because they could not be counted as residents of New York.
Gignilliat, where a handsome entertainment, of about 40 Dishes, was provided for Supper.\textsuperscript{119}

Through these celebrations and gatherings, the societies performed Scottishness as civilised, polite, British, and distinct.

An article published in \textit{New York Mercury} in 1757, which described the first anniversary celebration of the St. Andrew’s Society of New York is also worth examining in detail. It stated:

On Wednesday last, being Saint Andrew’s Day, the Residents and Honorary Members of the New York St. Andrew’s Society held their Anniversary Meeting at Scotch Johnny’s…After which, as there happened to be a great many Scotch Gentlemen belonging to the Army in Town, upwards of Sixty Members in all din’d together in a most elegant manner. Most loyal and patriotic Toasts were drank on the Occasion, heartily, yet soberly.\textsuperscript{120}

By broadcasting that the Society held an anniversary meeting on St. Andrew’s Day at ‘Scotch Johnny’s’, they informed the public about their Scottish ethnic connections and Scoto-centric club activity. By referencing the ‘Scotch Gentlemen belonging to the Army’, they underscored the importance of the Scottish regiments to the British imperial security. By calling them ‘Scotch’ instead of ‘Highland’, the Society presented the Highland regiments as representing all of Scotland, as they supported the identity the overwhelmingly Lowland Scottish membership wished to portray. When stating that ‘loyal and patriotic Toasts were drank…heartily, yet soberly’, they claimed loyal allegiance to Britain.

Rather than hiding their ancestral background, the men that joined Scottish ethnic associations in the British-American colonies, like their counterparts in Scotland, accentuated their ethnic and cultural difference in the face of mounting scotophobia and used these associations as the tools to diminish it. They sought to control the outward expression of Scottish identity through membership practices,

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{South Carolina Gazette}, 9 December 1731; Easterby, \textit{History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, South Carolina}, p. 25.

societal activities, published statements, and the careful choosing of specific symbols so that it promoted the political, social, and economic values of the broader colonial-British-American community and challenged negative stereotypes about Scots in America. In many ways, then, the Scottish clubs that performed Scottish distinctiveness actually served as vehicles through which middling Scots could accentuate their colonial and wider British assimilation and loyalty.

III

Scottish associations played an integral role in shaping Scottish identity and the public face of the Scottish community in the British-American colonies. Most urban middling emigrant Scots during the eighteenth century did not present themselves as ‘Scottish’ in everyday life. They did not wear distinct ethnic clothing. They did not live in ethnic enclaves. They also spoke English and usually worked and socialised with other colonial Britons. For some middling Scots in the colonies, the only time they publicly performed a Scottish identity was when they participated in Scottish associational culture.

As Chapter 1 demonstrated, men created associations in both Scotland and America in order to collectively achieve specific goals and provide a vehicle through which members could acquire some desired resource, whether that resource be political, social, cultural, or economic in nature. The Scottish identities Scottish societies in colonial America performed were, therefore, meticulously constructed through these associations so that they supported the social, economic, and political priorities of their ‘Scottish’, yet at the same time British and colonial members. Some societies in colonial America modelled themselves on Scottish associations in Scotland in order to civilise the colonies and present the members as civilised themselves. Some claimed Scottish ancestry in order to challenge the idea that the colonies, and thus the colonists, were somehow less British than Britain’s other ‘provinces’ or even England. They were even joined by members from other British backgrounds to further this goal. Scottish ethnic societies constructed Scottish identities, which made political statements, challenged scotophobia, and facilitated the creation of economic networks. Scots in colonial America also used associations
to manufacture a representational Scottish identity, which connected Scottishness with the ideal colonial Briton, but also defined the Scottish community as a distinct group with its own recognisable culture.

When the clubs that performed Scottish identity in mid-eighteenth-century Scotland and the clubs that performed Scottish identity in colonial America are studied together, then, it becomes clear that Scots in both places had similar objectives when it came to Scottish identity construction. Scots who created the first Scottish societies in America largely drew from the example of their Scottish counterparts, but moulded their associations and identities so that they supported their own specific goals. This was the same dynamic that led Edinburgh’s ‘enlightenment’ societies to perform a distinct Scottish identity that was still fully incorporated within wider British and European trends and provincial Scottish societies to engage with the identity expressed by clubs in Edinburgh but at the same time shape that identity so that it supported their own regional priorities. They simply followed the same process.

The following two chapters evaluate the role associations played in constructing Scottish identity in the period following the American and French Revolutions. They look at how the associations and the identities they expressed changed and subsequently diverged in national loyalties.
CHAPTER 4

‘Clap your kilted hips with joy’:
The Evolution of National Identity in Scotland’s Clubs, c.1790-1832

Industrialisation, urbanisation, and population growth resulted in increased social problems in Scottish cities in the period from c.1790-1832. According to Macleod, between 1755 and 1790 Edinburgh’s population grew from less than 50,000 to over 70,000 people and between 1750 and 1801 Glasgow’s population grew from 32,000 to 77,000.1 The American and French Revolutions also threatened Scottish stability. They precipitated increased calls for political reform in Scotland and, in turn, a heightened fear amongst Scottish conservatives who supported the British constitution as it presently stood.2 As Morris argues, ‘the middle class’ s and elite’s “social, economic and political power needed to be continually defended and extended against the threats of disease, food scarcity, crime, public disorder, labour organisation and radical ideological and political action”’.3

Rather than challenge Scottish associational culture, a period of heightened associational activity was triggered by this change. Civil society organisations began to take on an even greater role in controlling society and Scotland’s political and social culture. Associations ranging from political societies, moral reform societies, coercive associations, cultural associations, and friendly societies to sporting clubs formed in order to deal with these emerging social issues and give their members some enhanced influence over Scottish society. Scottish identity remained a tool associations used for this purpose. Most, if not all, societies shaped their performance of ‘Scottishness’ to fit the needs of their particular membership and to assert certain political and social goals. The societies, which had their beginnings
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during the mid-eighteenth century, even re-cast their structure and identity expression in order to fit within this new environment.

This chapter examines the ways in which Scottish societies in Scotland from c.1790-1832 shaped and performed their ‘Scottishness’. Rather than evaluate all societies, this chapter examines two types of Scottish associations that flourished at this time, intellectual (or what may be better described as ‘late-enlightenment’) societies and Highland societies, and the ways in which they performed Scottish identity. By focusing on these associations in particular, this chapter follows the evolution of two trends whose geneses began in the eighteenth century. It shows how associations in Scotland adapted their structure and identity performance to fit the changing political, social, and economic landscape of their homeland and promote the new (and old) priorities of their members.

I

As Chapter 2 demonstrated, in the mid-eighteenth century, most literary and intellectual societies had a wide-ranging purpose. Their overarching goal was to bring together groups of men for mutual improvement, the discussion of relevant scientific, philosophical, and political topics, and to create communities of ‘enlightened’ individuals (which they described as the ‘literati’) to represent Scotland on the British, imperial, and European stage. While exclusive in membership practices, they were inclusive in subject matter and sociable in nature. This worked well during a period when Scotland’s intelligentsia was relatively small, the urban environment was less crowded and had not yet experienced massive industrial growth, and the wealth generated from the growing British Empire was not as pronounced.

With the changes in the political and social structure of Scottish society came changes in the structure of Scotland’s intellectual associational culture, especially in Edinburgh. From the 1790s, many intellectual or ‘enlightenment’ associations met to discuss professional and specific subjects rather than focus on wide ranging ‘useful knowledge’. By 1830, those in Edinburgh associated with the law who previously met in generalist debating societies like the Select Society, could meet in
the Juridical Society (1773), the Scots Law Society (1815), the Faculty Law Club (1828), or the Church Law Society (1827), which only debated topics specifically related to the law profession. Medical professionals who previously would have met in the Edinburgh Philosophical Society could now meet in the Gymnastic Society (1786), the Harveian Society (1782), the Physico-Chemical Society of Edinburgh (1819), the Edinburgh Phrenological Society (1820), and the Edinburgh Medico-Chirurgical Society (1821). Even antiquarian and historical societies became more expert-based. In the 1820s, ‘bibliomaniacs’ as they called themselves met in historical printing societies like the Bannatyne Club (1821) and the Maitland Club (1828). More general societies like the Royal Society of Edinburgh (1783) and the Wernerian Natural History Society (1808) still survived and even flourished, but they tended to emphasise natural sciences rather than a wide and varied subject area.

The professionalisation of intellectual societies served a practical purpose. Many of these associations began to act as vehicles for professional development and advancement in particular fields. Medical societies, for instance, increasingly discussed specific case histories, different surgical or medical procedures, and gave discourses on different diseases. They acted as a way to make sure that there were professional standards. The Aberdeen Medico-Chirurgical Society and the Medical Society of the North even published lists of doctors’ fees to be distributed to the public in order to regulate costs and to keep professional rivalries at bay. They also, in a period when medical practitioners could practise without medical degrees, defined who was actually a recognised member of the medical profession. This system was not just limited to doctors. Only members of the legal profession could enter the Juridical Society, for instance. According to the preface of their printed *Complete System of Conveyancing*, ‘the knowledge of Law and of Conveyancing, was the original design of this institution; an object which, being in itself important, has been invariably prosecuted by the Society’. They argued, that ‘there were few
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5 Ibid., p. 33.
writers of eminence in Edinburgh whose practice was not known to one or other of the members’.\textsuperscript{9} Being a member of this association provided one with professional credibility.

During this period of increased professionalisation and structured learning civil society institutions, including associations, started to be used as indicators of Scottish achievement and intellectual prowess to an even greater extent than they had previously. This can be seen in many societies’ printed membership lists. Rather than simply including the names of the individual members and their occupations, many Scottish intellectual associations, especially those in Edinburgh, began to include their other professional and associational references. G.A. Borthwick, for instance, was referenced on the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh 1824 membership list printed in their Transactions as ‘Borthwick, G.A., M.D. F.R.S.E. and L.R.C. of Physicians, Member of the Medical Society of Emulation of Paris, Physician to the Royal Dispensary, and Surgeon to the Western Eye Dispensary; 83 George Street.’\textsuperscript{10} Associations were also referenced in guidebooks, which became popular during this period as a result of increased Scottish tourism.\textsuperscript{11} These books regularly gave accounts of Scotland’s intellectual associations in order to provide a positive report of Scotland’s place in the world.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, as Nenadic demonstrates, the Raeburn prints most often engraved, bought, and displayed were of ‘men who were closely linked to the organisations of Scottish civil society in the church, the law, education, and medicine’, namely the same men who populated Scotland’s intellectual associations.\textsuperscript{13} In 1809, the Scots Magazine’s descriptions of the Wernerian Natural History Society and the Caledonian Horticultural Society came under the heading ‘Scottish Literary Intelligence’.\textsuperscript{14}

The wealth and size of professional societies came to be seen as a mark of distinction, when previously it was small societies like the Select Society and Poker

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{10} Transactions of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1824), p. xviii
\textsuperscript{14} Scots Magazine Vol. LXXI (Edinburgh, 1809), p. 923.
Club that wielded the most clout. Thus, by the 1790s, small societies began to amalgamate with more prominent societies. By 1813, the Chirurgo-Medical Society, the American Physical Society, the Hibernian Medical Society, the Chemical Society, the Natural History Society, and the Didactic Society all joined the Edinburgh Physical Society in order to create one large and wealthy association, which could have greater visibility and create a larger footprint.\footnote{Hume, The Learned Societies, pp. 172-173.} According to Abraham Hume’s account of the Physical Society, the number of members grew from 440 in 1788 to 1300 in 1830.\footnote{Ibid., p. 173.} Similarly, in 1833, the Dialectic Society, the Diagnostic Society, the Scots Law Society, the Hunterian Medical Society and the Royal Physical Society, while keeping their individual identities and specialities, came together to form ‘The Associated Societies of the University of Edinburgh’.\footnote{History of the Speculative Society of Edinburgh From its Institution in M.DCC.LXIV (Edinburgh, 1845), p. 10.} In the {	extit{Edinburgh Encyclopaedia}}, David Brewster evaluated the Scottish improving societies’ size, wealth, and printed outputs in order to ascertain the state of Scotland’s advances in science and the arts.\footnote{David Brewster, The Edinburgh Encyclopaedia, Vol. XVI, 1st American Edn. (Philadelphia, 1832), pp. 736-738.} Smaller societies started to be seen as insignificant. According the {	extit{Edinburgh Literary Review}} published in 1829, ‘societies of more juvenile character are so numerous, that we must decline even attempting to catalogue them’.\footnote{Edinburgh Literary Journal (1829), p. 362.} Similarly, after giving a long account of the associations which met in Edinburgh, an {	extit{Encyclopaedia Britannica}} entry stated, ‘There are various other societies and clubs, which have been established from time to time in the Scottish metropolis, but they are of a character too unimportant to require notice in this place.’\footnote{The Encyclopaedia Britannica or Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and General Literature, 7th Edn. (Edinburgh, 1842), p. 424.}

Their meeting places were indicative of a self-conscious and collective shift toward performing Scotland’s civic culture and identity as technocratic and institutional as well, reflecting the changing priorities of Scottish intellectual culture. The intellectual associations of the mid-eighteenth century often met in taverns or public halls. By doing so, they promoted themselves as convivial, sociable, and (at least to a certain extent) public. When meeting for a convivial purpose, late-
eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century intellectual societies continued to rent rooms in local taverns. Yet, as time passed and as associations grew, their general meetings increasingly took place in purpose-built buildings or the buildings owned by other associations and institutions, which the members viewed as of a similar calibre. Most of the buildings that they inhabited were also specially designed to fit the needs of the society, further supporting the professionalism of Scotland’s intellectual community. According to the *New Picture of Edinburgh* (1816), the Royal Medical Society was able to:

…erect a commodious building, which consists of three rooms, each measuring 30 feet by 20, exclusive of smaller apartments. The weekly meetings of the members are held in one of the large rooms; in another is contained their natural curiosities, anatomical preparations, and valuable collections of medical books; and the third is destined for the purpose of making chemical experiments.\(^{21}\)

As stated in Chapter 1, these buildings must have made a strong statement in Scottish society by their prominent placement in Scotland’s urban spaces. As Chernoff argues, ‘identity relates well to buildings, given their public nature and their ability to be universal yet particular at the same time’.\(^{22}\) They became the physical embodiment of what the societies sought to express.

Most societies, while presenting themselves as professional when engaged in intellectual pursuits, still maintained a convivial side usually brought to the fore at annual dinners. In 1829, Mr Bowen ‘observed, that some stoical persons found fault with scientific institutions for meeting at the festive board; but it was the custom of their countrymen to unbend the mind once a year at least at a convivial meeting’.\(^{23}\) Sociability, conviviality, and conversation remained important. These regular dinners, however, also brought most of the members together, as by this point regular
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23 *Caledonian Mercury*, 23 December 1829.
meetings did not usually attract full attendance. They also provided the subject for subsequent newspaper articles that further publicised the image the members of these societies wished to project.

The toasts given at these celebrations, which were regularly printed in newspapers and periodicals, usually promoted Scottish institutions and learning. According to an account of the ‘Dinner of the Royal Medical Society’ published in the Caledonian Mercury in 1823, the Society’s chairman toasted the University of Edinburgh stating, ‘Wherever science has beamed her genial ray, the University of Edinburgh is known. It has been my lot to visit many parts of the world, and wherever I have met with men of learning and knowledge, there have I heard the University of Edinburgh spoken in terms of admiration and respect.’

In his account of the Speculative Society, which had a strong connection to the University of Edinburgh, Alexander Bower described the fiftieth anniversary in 1814. He wrote:

Some of the most distinguished characters in the country were assembled. The meeting presented the utmost harmony and conviviality, and it may be truly said, that perhaps there never was a meeting of the same number that concentrated so much talent, literary, political and scientific.

Indeed, the conviviality was promoted as facilitating intellectual camaraderie and the bringing together of Scottish professional ‘talent’, which were, of course, the most talented men of all. By bringing together the most accomplished of Scotland’s citizens and shaping the many toasts given (which would then be widely printed and publicised) these associations were able to exert their influence on the wider public perception of Scottishness.

By the 1790s, the period of relative stability and freedom of philosophical inquiry enjoyed by the Scottish literati in the previous fifty years, which had given them the opportunity to produce challenging and sometimes radical philosophical works, had come to an end. In fact, many historians agree with David Allan that
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between 1790 and 1830 ‘the Scottish Enlightenment died with a whimper’.26 Even contemporaries saw the intellectual enlightenment as deteriorating. As the Whig lawyer Henry Cockburn wrote in 1856:

On looking back at those times, it is impossible not to be struck with the apparent absence of enlightenment public views and capacities all over the community. I do not recollect a single Scotch work of any permanent, or almost of any respectable temporary, value, which even the excitement of that age produced…Indeed the suppression of independent talent or ambition was the tendency of the times.27

Knowing this to be the case, post-1790 intellectual societies began to celebrate the historical tradition of the Scottish intellectual community of the mid-eighteenth century and promote the philosophical output of the earlier period of the Scottish Enlightenment to advance their conception of Scottish identity. They, for instance, began to commemorate illustrious professional Scottish men, usually elderly or dead, either associated with the societies or the societies’ subject area.28 The Royal Society of Edinburgh included various biographical sketches of past (usually founding) members in their printed transactions, and included summarised accounts of these biographies in articles printed in newspapers and other periodicals.29 The Gazetteer of Scotland, written by Robert Chambers, made a point to state that the Glasgow Literary Society ‘begun about the middle of last century,

29 See, for instance, the summary of the biographical sketch of Professor Robison printed in the *Caledonian Mercury*, 16 September 1815.
and some of its most distinguished members have been Doctors Adam Smith, Trail, and Reid, and Mr John Miller, Professor of Law. Many of the societies compared their present members to those of the past. At their annual dinner held in 1829, the chairman of the Royal Medical Society stated, ‘and though we reflect with pleasure upon such men as Cullen, Black, and others, yet it is more pleasing to think that we have men no less eminent filling the chairs at present’. This was particularly important as the universities of Cambridge and Oxford were quickly replacing Edinburgh and Glasgow as the centres for learning in the British Empire. Thus, Scottish intellectual societies emphasised their continuity with a glorious past during a period when Scotland’s pre-eminence in learning was perceived as threatened.

Of course, the societies manipulated these histories to fit their own ends. In their biographical sketches, they not only gave accounts of the prominent individuals’ life and works, but also combined the celebrated aspects of the early enlightenment with contemporary social and moral values. These included principles such as industry, virtue, and public service – important values of an urbanised and industrialised society. The fifth volume of the Royal Society of Edinburgh’s Transactions included a biography of Joseph Black (1728-1799), which began by stating:

Joseph Black, the person to whom these minutes relate, successively Professor of the University of Glasgow and of Edinburgh, Member of this Society, and other royal and public institutions in Europe; having made important discoveries, and having laid the foundations of many others, towards erecting a fabric of science, which has since been raised to a considerable height; and having been himself distinguished for modesty, felicity of manners, as well as correctness of understanding, and ingenuity of research, - will, it is hoped, be thought worthy of notice in these accounts.

31 Caledonian Mercury, 23 December 1829.
32 Allan, Virtue, Learning and the Scottish Enlightenment, p. 231.
33 Ibid., pp. 231-241.
Through this biographical account, the Royal Society of Edinburgh not only presented Black as an exemplar of the Scottish medical profession, but also as moral and civilised according to early-nineteenth-century standards. As Black had been a member of the Society, the other members of the Royal Society claimed ownership over his memory and promoted it as exemplifying themselves and Scots in general.

The longevity of associations, even manufactured longevity, became an important symbol of Scotland’s professional achievement and pre-eminence in learning as well. Like the Tuesday Club, many Scottish societies lengthened their history to include the history of other earlier Scottish institutions or associations in order to suggest a longer chronology than the societies themselves could actually assert. The history of the Royal Medical Society, published in 1820, begins with a detailed account of the medical school at the University of Edinburgh and the Royal Infirmary as well as biographical information on eminent physicians associated with those institutions before addressing the formation of the Medical Society itself. Indeed, one must read through twelve pages of the history before encountering any direct reference to the Medical Society. By presenting their history in this way, they claimed the history of the University, an institution of considerable international fame, as the origins of their own. Other publications, particular guidebooks, provided histories of associations in order to promote Scotland’s achievement as well. The account of the Royal Society of Edinburgh in Stark’s *Picture of Edinburgh* includes descriptions of an association for Greek and Roman Literature, the Medical Society, the Select Society, and the Edinburgh Philosophical Society before mentioning the Royal Society, which also artificially lengthened the history of the contemporary association. They clearly wished, and thought it important to present themselves as a continuation of Scotland’s intellectual golden age.

Another important aspect of eighteenth-century enlightenment club culture that was retained and even strengthened was their performed connection with other
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like societies in metropolitan centres in Britain, Europe, and America. In the Royal Society of Edinburgh’s *Transactions* published in 1823, the Royal Society of Edinburgh provided a long list of presents the Society received from other associations since 1811. These included works from London, Cambridge, Manchester, Leeds, St Petersburg, Vienna, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Calcutta, the Netherlands, Turin, Utrecht, and even Paris. The preface to the first *Transactions of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh* recorded, ‘It appeared to many of the practitioners and teachers in medicine in this city, that an association among themselves, similar to those which have conferred so much benefit on medical science in London and Dublin, was very desirable for their own gratification and instruction’. Again, this should not be seen as an attempt to undermine their Scottishness or be seen as simply Anglo-British or European. Instead, by continuing to claim an institutional connection with other intellectual societies, particularly those in Britain, the associations sustained Scotland’s reputation as being a key player in a national and transnational community of knowledge. While primarily Scottish, it must be remembered that Scottishness was meant to be incorporated within a British and European context. By referencing these outside societies, Scottish associations underscored their external recognition, further supporting a prestigious view of the Scottish identity.

Some associations even claimed that their creation provided the model for other British and European establishments. The Edinburgh School of Arts claimed, for instance:

…several Institutions of a similar nature have been formed in different towns, both in England and in Scotland; and we flatter ourselves with the belief, that the good which our School of Arts has done, has not been confined to Edinburgh alone, but that its example has had some degree of influence in directing the public attention to a most valuable accession to those public seminaries…
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Similarly, Francis Jeffrey wrote in his biographical sketch of John Playfair, printed in the *Glasgow Mechanics’ Magazine*, that Playfair was:

…among the first, if not he first, who introduced the beautiful discoveries of the later continental geometers to the knowledge of his countrymen, to have their just and true place, in the scheme of European knowledge, to those improvements by which the whole aspect of the abstract of sciences has been renovated since the days of our illustrious Newton.\(^{42}\)

Local and national politics, especially during the French wars and what has been deemed the ‘Age of Reform’, undoubtedly impacted on the way intellectual societies, especially scientific societies, presented themselves and Scotland. It also caused concern amongst those of opposing political persuasions. As Jacyna argues, engaging in science ‘could be a political act – an aspect of the *vita activa* not merely of a *vita comtemplativa*’.\(^{43}\) The intelligentsia was split on party lines. What had once been a fairly coherent group of ‘literati’, who described themselves as Whigs because of their overwhelming support for the Hanoverian monarchy, became politically divided. Places of free-discussion and freethinking also caused the government considerable unease, as they feared that they could turn into hotbeds of radicalism.\(^{44}\) As Duncan argues, ‘establishment intellectuals in Britain, Whigs as well as Tories, interpreted the [French] Revolution as a catastrophic saturation of the whole of social life by politics.’\(^{45}\)

The issues that could arise in intellectual voluntary associations as a result of this political divide can be seen in the debates of the Speculative Society in the early 1790s. On 2 March 1790, when Robert Ferguson asked the Society ‘Has the late Revolution in France been equally glorious, and will it be attended with consequences equally beneficial, to that country, that the Revolution in 1688 has been to this?’, the Society voted yes by six votes to five.\(^{46}\) When the Society was

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 449.


\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 26.


\(^{46}\) *History of the Speculative Society of Edinburgh* (1845), p. 378;
asked, ‘Will the late Revolution in France have a beneficial effect upon the interests of Great Britain?’ at the next meeting held on 6 April, the Society voted yes seven votes to one.47 Similarly, when asked if ‘there ought to be any privileged ranks in society’, the vote was negative by eight votes to five.48 This is unsurprising as many Britons in both Scotland and England supported the French Revolution during its early years, believing that the French people were following the British example set by the Glorious Revolution.49 After the overthrow of the Ancien régime in 1792-3 and the outbreak of war between Britain and France in February 1793, however, anyone who still called for reform or supported the French revolutionaries ran the risk as being seen as a traitor. It is therefore unsurprising that in 1794, the Society voted unanimously against the question ‘Is the French Revolution likely to be productive of the extension of civil liberty in Europe’, and in December of that year decided that it would be in the best interest of the Society ‘to be cautious in admitting, as subject of discussion or debate, the political topics of the day’.50

In 1799, some Whig members with strong political leanings tried to end the ban and incorporate what James Loch called ‘democratical’ subjects into the Society’s debates.51 This resulted in twenty-eight members offering their resignations.52 It also led both the University Senatus Academicus and the Town Council (both of which answered to Dundas) to create a committee to enquire into the Society’s dealings. While the committee decided that the Society did not pose any real threat to the British establishment, it did draw up a statement suggesting that the Society ‘guard with the utmost care against everything which may have the smallest tendency to weaken their attachment to the principles of the Civil & Ecclesiastical Constitution of their Country’.53 This episode was so traumatic that it resulted in the Society being seen, in the words of its early-nineteenth-century historian, as ‘an object of political prejudice’.54

47 Ibid.
48 Ibid., p. 380
50 Ibid., pp. 28-29, 382.
53 Quoted in Jacyna, Philosopie Whigs, p. 27.
Other intellectual societies had clear Whig or Tory political agendas, and used their memberships and actions to promote these imperatives. The Royal Society of Edinburgh, as it had from the beginning, continued to be made up of what could now be described as Tory members. They attempted to present Scotland’s intellectual elites, via this organisation, as exemplified by those who supported Scotland’s existing patronage system. In 1820, when the Royal Society of Edinburgh voted Sir Walter Scott as president, Scott wrote to Viscount Melville stating, ‘I have been chosen President of the Royal Society here which keeps one feather out of a Whig bonnet’. They attempted to incorporate Tory politics with scientific inquiry in order to present Scottish learning as conservative by nature.

On the other hand, some professional intellectual societies subscribed to the cold, intellectual, and sophisticated ‘scientific’ whiggery exemplified by the Edinburgh Review. When proposing a new intellectual society, the Academy of Physics, Henry Brougham told his Whig accomplice and fellow founder of the Edinburgh Review, Francis Horner, that it was an:

…absolute necessity [to create] a society of investigation, considering the degraded state of mathematical & mechanical Philosophy, the inefficacy of debating clubs to prevent its fall & chiefly the abominable politics, trifling pursuits & vile aristocracy which sway the R. Societies of London & Edinr.

As Jacyna argues, Brougham and his Whig friends used the Academy of Physics as a philosophical departure from what they saw as Tory corruption. Societies like the School of Arts of Edinburgh (or Mechanics Institute) and the Academy of Physics attempted to extend professional and intellectual learning to the wider merchant and working classes. The School of Arts claimed that it was:

…founded for the purpose of giving instruction to operative Mechanics, in such branches of physical science as are of practical
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application in their several trades; to give them an opportunity of obtaining that systematic education in the principles of their business, without which, in the higher professions, no man can rise to eminence, or obtain a higher reputation than the notoriety of an empiric.\textsuperscript{59}

As Berg suggests, these Whig institutions married technology with political economy, and suggested that bringing technological knowledge to Scotland’s artisans boosted the nation’s wealth.\textsuperscript{60} By doing so, they made clear statements of support for political reform.\textsuperscript{61} Yet, it should also be noted that the curriculum and control, at least until the 1830s, was always in the hands of the men of the professional and ‘higher ranks’ of society. Thus in actual terms they differed little in shape from their Tory counterparts.\textsuperscript{62}

As in the previous century, which community had access to Scotland’s centres of intelligence and therefore control over Scotland’s projected image was not only a personal and professional worry for club members but also a political and national concern. This was a continuation of the previous issues surrounding who had the monopoly on Scottish intellectual identity expression, and who had influence in defining it. It was the same issues, which plagued the Royal Society of Edinburgh in the 1780s, and even the Dundee Speculative Society in 1777. It was, however, magnified during this new period of political division and turmoil. Both Tories and Whigs used associations to claim Scots knowledge as their own.

Nevertheless, certain aspects of the Scottish identity performed by intellectual associations did not change and continued in most, if not all, of these societies irrespective of their political leanings. Intellectual improvement remained a concern and was still a matter of Scottish pride. Each society presented itself as at the forefront of professional and intellectual development. Indeed, they presented themselves as the continuation of the early enlightenment institutions, which

\textsuperscript{59} Glasgow Mechanics’ Magazine (1825), p. 9.
facilitated the intellectual output of figures like Hume, Robertson, Smith, Cullen, and Black. Their expressions of Scottish identity, while distinct, were still determinedly wrapped up in Scotland’s participation in Britishness. This was especially shown through their support of the professions (particularly those enshrined in Union) and their promotion of the good their societies did for wider British learning, often describing their scientific treatises as national work. The goal of most intellectual associations continued to be to present Scotland as the best within Britain and the world and essential to British intellectual and professional achievement, reflecting the priorities of those who joined them. In fact, the Scottish ‘enlightenment’ identity voiced by these associations in the period from c.1790 in many ways expressed an even more confident embrace of Scotland’s cultural pre-eminence than the more inclusive associations. They simply manipulated their expression of Scottish intellectual identity in relation to changes in Scotland’s political, social, and economic situation.

II

At the same time, there was a growth in Highland societies in Scotland. In the mid-eighteenth century, Glasgow only had three Highland societies – the Buchanan Society, the Highland Society of Glasgow, and the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen. By the 1830s, however, Glasgow had twelve Highland and Gaelic societies. By the end of the century it had over fifty. In 1814, the Dundee Highland Society formed for ‘the preservation of the dress and antiquities of the ancient Caledonians, also for Raising a fund for relieving distressed Highlanders at a distance from their native homes and such other Benevolent purposes the Society may deem proper.’ In 1822, the Dundee Caledonian Society formed for ‘the preservation of the dress and several of the antiquities of the ancient
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63 As Pentland argues for the period from c.1820-1833, ‘Among political elites debate did not take place between out-and-out Anglophile assimilationists and Scottish patriots. Rather, protagonists articulated different types of patriotism and all claimed to be acting in the best interests of Scotland by seeking justice within the Union.’ Pentland, Radicalism, Reform and National Identity, p. 193.
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Caledonians…and to afford relief to its members when necessity required." There was also an Aberdeen Highland Society created in 1820, which for the first few years of its existence only celebrated Highland culture. Robert Wilson in 1822 wrote:

.... [the] Aberdeen society formed on the 26th October, 1820, consisting of about 12 members. The number, at present, is between 60 and 70. From want of funds, few of the objects of the society have as yet been effected, except the appearing of the members in the full costume of the Gael at their public meetings, and the granting of a bursary to the best Gaelic scholar, which took place this year. The Marquis of Huntly is president.

In 1820 Sir Walter Scott and David Stewart of Garth created the Celtic Society of Edinburgh with the object to ‘encourage the preservation of the ancient garb, and other characteristics in the Highlands of Scotland’ as well as provide premiums for educational improvements in Highland districts. Highland, Gaelic, and clan societies also formed in Inverness, Inverlochy, Dunkeld, Stirling, St Fillian, Braemar, and Perth.

Before evaluating their new cultural expressions of ‘Scottishness’, it is first important to examine the ways in which their expressions remained the same. Most Highland societies, especially the Highland Society of Scotland continued to promote scientific inquiry into agricultural improvement. Historians often separate Scottish cultural identity from enlightenment scientific identity in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century. Emerson, for instance, argued, ‘[John] Walker was a man who lived far more in a European world of ideas…he did not have a primarily Scottish orientation.’ But this is a false dichotomy. Being part of the European world of ideas did not preclude a Scottish orientation; it was an integral part of it. In fact, in 1789 Walker became an honorary member of the Highland Society of Edinburgh. While the Highland Society of Edinburgh supported his improving and
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intellectual persona, it also associated him with a society, which was overtly and culturally Scottish. Members joined societies in order to expand their social networks, their professional clout, and/or their political influence. In short, they each joined to gain social capital. Presenting a culturally Scottish, as opposed to purely intellectual orientation, did not conflict with their transnational, intellectual, and public agenda. This was particularly the case if the political objectives of the society fit those of the individual, which in the case of Walker they certainly did. The two processes could and did work simultaneously in the Scottish context.

The older Highland societies presented themselves as part of Scotland’s enlightenment culture in that they promoted Lowland agendas and wider ideals of improvement and modernisation. These agendas remained in the nineteenth century. All Highland societies continued to present the Highlands as lacking the sophistication and civilisation that Lowland Scotland and England celebrated after the Union of 1707. It was still viewed by many of the men who joined these societies as backward and primitive. Indeed, Highland societies used Highland primitivism to their advantage. In 1816, for instance, the Highland Society of Scotland claimed that ‘the improvement of those parts of the country has not yet been reached, has been always a favourite object of the Society’. As recent historians have shown, the change from a feudal to commercial social structure in the Highlands pre-dated even the eighteenth-century improvement efforts and would have led to the overhaul of the Highland economic system regardless of external pressures. The societies, in many ways, capitalised on an already occurring process, made it a central aspect of Scotland’s identity, and placed themselves as the most important players in facilitating it. Again this differed little from the improving

71 Henry MacKenzie, Prize Essays and Transactions of the Highland Society of Scotland, To which is prefixed, An Account of the Principal Proceedings of the Society during the Years from April 1807 to January 1815, Vol. IV (Edinburgh, 1816), p. iii.
goals of the earlier associations and many of the improving goals of the intellectual societies described above.

Highland societies, even those that had cultural performance of ‘Highlandism’ as their primary purpose also continued to engage in philanthropy and promoted learning amongst Scotland’s poorer populations. The Clan Gregor Society, which formed in 1822, followed a similar structure to the Buchanan Society in that it formed ‘for extending the poor of the Clan the blessing of a sound and Christian education; and more especially to select amongst them, and encourage by pecuniary aid, or otherwise, such young men as have given indication of talent and genius.’ The St. Fillan Highland Society, which formed in 1819 for the purpose of holding Highland games, had ‘two funds, one for prizes for the games held latter end of August annually; and the other, a benefit fund for indigent and distressed members, widows, and orphans’. The Highland Club of Scotland, which formed in 1825, according to the *Edinburgh Almanack*, was a ‘national association…instituted for the preservation and encouragement of national games and exercises, the Gaelic language, ancient poetry and music of the Highlands and Borders of Scotland’ and ‘education and support of poor children, &c.’. The Highland Society of Glasgow remained primarily a philanthropic association and prided itself on providing Highland boys with access to education. The incorporation of improvement and philanthropy into these societies, like the St. Andrew’s Societies discussed in the previous chapter, provided the societies with a way to present themselves as for the good of the nation – Scotland and Britain. They had a purpose, which could be celebrated by all classes and political beliefs, particularly during a time of social upheaval resulting from increased Highland emigration, population growth, urbanisation, and industrialisation.

Britishness, as in the intellectual societies discussed above and the colonial associations and earlier Highland societies discussed in the previous chapters, remained a crucial concern for Highland societies and needed to be continually
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incorporated into their cultural performance. While the Highland Society of Scotland claimed that they supported the ‘preservation of the Language, Poetry, and Music of the Highlands’, they also included a statement in their ‘Account of the Rise and Establishment of the Highland Society of Scotland’ that:

The different languages, dialects, and patois, which prevail in the British isles, must be considered as an evil, which all enlightened men would rather have remedied than perpetuated. It is easy to perceive that, if the language of the empire were one, not only intercourse would be facilitated, but prejudices would diminish, and a more complete homogeneity would be a general benefit.\textsuperscript{77}

This mirrored almost exactly the message espoused by the SSPRSEL in the 1760s.

By this point, most of the Highland ‘ethnic’ societies, like the Highland Society of Edinburgh and the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen described earlier, had strong explicit or implicit links with their equivalent society in London, often working together on cultural, political, or improving projects. Almost all associations that went by the name ‘Highland Society’ presented the London society as the parent association and themselves as a branch society even if the members of the Scottish branches had more direct contact with the Highlands and Highlanders – seeking charters, which incorporated them into the London-based franchise. The Highland Society of London even created a rule that the members of their ‘sister’ societies, ‘shall become Members of the Society itself, upon their arrival in London, paying the additional sum of Five Guineas, and subscribing the Rules of the Society’.\textsuperscript{78} Thus the members of Highland Societies continued and even reinforced the trend of working within a pan-British associational network, even if it was based on ‘Highland’ culture and met in Scotland. This played an important role in the members’ presentation of political and cultural identity. By presenting themselves as an extension of a society, which functioned by its geographical location in British metropolitan culture, their identity became incorporated in larger formulations of


\textsuperscript{78} Sir John Sinclair, \textit{An Account of the Highland Society of London, From its Establishment in May 1773, to the Commencement of the Year 1813} (London, 1813), p. 83.
Britishness, differing little from the identity asserted by even the whiggish intellectual associations and those diasporic societies evaluated earlier. 79

As the previous chapters demonstrated, associational identity based on Scottish ethnicity and difference, especially within a diasporic context, did not preclude wider community assimilation, intellectual prowess, or British loyalty for its members, but could actually facilitate it. 80 In fact, by spotlighting difference while shaping that difference to appeal to the fashions, morals, and cultural imperatives of the host community, cultural ‘ethnic’ clubs better positioned themselves within wider contexts. Like those in the earlier period, none of the post-1790 Highland societies questioned the importance or benefits of the Union of 1707. None questioned the positive impact England and Lowland Scotland had on the Highlands’ economic and intellectual growth. They simply manipulated ethnic symbols already in existence so that they could be used as tools to promote the members’ positions within wider communities, in this case Britain and the British Empire, and provide their members with power over their place in that society.

That said, their expressions of Scottishness did change in relation to external pressures. Historians have shown that during and after the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, Tories (and sometimes sympathetic Whigs) manipulated Jacobite and Highland culture to promote Scotland’s status quo in response to threats of radical reform. 81 They have examined in detail Scotland’s ‘missing nationalism’ in the nineteenth century, and the ways in which the formulation of a ‘cult of tartanry’ served as a public expression of cultural patriotism toward the British state. 82 The most influential historiography on nineteenth-century ‘Highlandism’ has focused on its inauthenticity, invention, and myth. Many historians have compared the romantic expression of Highlandism to the ‘reality’ of the Highland experience in order to further underscore the mythical nature of Scotland’s cultural identity and the

political agenda behind its expression. In order to understand this new expression of Scottish identity, most scholars of early-nineteenth-century Scottish identity have looked at the ways in which literature began to shape Scotland’s culture, especially through the Ossianic controversy and Scott’s *Waverley* novels, and the development and use of tartan by both civilians and the Highland regiments as a tool to promote a mythical, yet also imperial and modern Highland culture.

The role voluntary associations played in promoting this ‘Tory Highlandism’, has, however, rarely been examined. Scotland’s elites, particularly those associated within the professional and aristocratic communities capitalised on the popular and fashionable ideas of European romanticism and patriotic militarism to promote their political and social goals. It was the associations that acted as the vehicle, as much as the literature and dress, for a change in Scotland’s culture and popular identity, and provide insight into the evolution of Scotland’s cultural identity.

As with all Scottish societies, Highland societies sought to promote (and succeeded in promoting) a representative and collective identity, and define the image of a patriotic Scottish man. As described by the author of *The New Picture of Edinburgh* published in 1816, the Highland Society had become an institution of ‘great respectability, importance, and utility, and countenanced by the nobility, landed proprietors, gentlemen of rank in the army, the navy, the law, and commercial interest, which is evident from the numbers in each who annually press forward for admission as members’. None of the Highland societies defined themselves as Tory associations, yet when the Edinburgh Pitt Club membership list published in 1814 and the membership list of the Highland Society of Scotland published in 1816 are compared there is significant overlap, especially amongst the officers and most
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They, like all societies, defined Scotland and Highland on political, social, and economic lines.

Although they defined themselves as ‘Highland’ or ‘Celtic’, the understanding of ‘Highland’ or even ‘Scottish’ ethnicity became increasingly fluid for many of these societies as the century progressed, much like St. Andrew’s Societies that met in the American colonies. The original membership requirements of the Highland Society of London stated that only ‘Natives of the Highlands, sons of Highlanders, proprietors of lands in the Highlands, those who have done some signal service to that part of the Kingdom; officers of the Highland corps, and the husbands of Highland ladies’ had access to membership. By 1813, according to Sir John Sinclair:

The true qualification, therefore, to be required is not so much the distinction of “Highland Birth,” (though that is certainly desirable, and must always give preference to the Candidate who enjoys that advantage), but the possession of a “Highland Spirit,” which is necessarily accompanied, by all those manly virtues, whose generous traits, and noble qualities, which distinguished the Hero in war, and the Citizen in peace.87

They even allowed men from ‘England’ and ‘foreign countries’ to join as honorary members. The membership requirement of most Scottish Highland societies followed this trend.

In the 1790s the Highland Society of Scotland began to focus their attention on all of Scotland, rather than just the Highland region. An article in the Caledonian Mercury, outlining the events of the 1800 General Meeting of the Society, stated:

It... afforded particular satisfaction to the Meeting, that, from the increased number of respectable names coming forward from all corners of the kingdom in support of this patriotic institution, the Society is enabled gradually to extend its encouragement to objects connected with the prosperity and improvement of the country at large, with additional energy and effect.88

---

88 Caledonian Mercury, 5 July 1800.
This change in focus made the Highland Society of Scotland a wholly Scottish institution rather than just a Highland one, thus changing ‘Highland’ to mean ‘Scottish’. By the 1820s, the Society celebrated the fact that it had members ‘from all parts of Scotland’.\(^8\) According to the *New Picture of Edinburgh* (1816) the Highland Society of Scotland was ‘originally formed for advancing the interests of the Highlands of Scotland, and is therefore named the Highland Society, but now it embraces whatever is connected with the prosperity of Britain’.\(^9\) This allowed the members of the Lowland and even English elite into a society that sought to promote an elite Tory agenda and provided them and the Society with increased social capital.

This also suggests that, as in St. Andrew’s Societies, ancestry and regional differences started to matter not as much as attitude, wealth, and prestige in defining Scottishness. All of these societies began to present themselves as inclusive, but they ultimately became more exclusive. The societies began to take control over deciding whether a person was ‘Scottish’ or ‘Highland’, while at the same time promoting the idea that they provided for a wide Scottish and British community. According to Strang’s account of the Gaelic Club of Gentlemen, ‘the chance of [a potential members’] admission into what soon became an aristocratic brotherhood, would depend more on his position in society, and on his connexion with the leading members who governed it, than on anything peculiarly Celtic of himself’.\(^9\)

Highland societies, perhaps more than any other force, made the dress and culture of Highlandism the universally recognised identity of Scotland and even the most identifiable image of Britain.

This emphasis on defining and displaying the identifiers of Scottish culture and identity as the distinguishing mark of British culture is evident in the assertion reinforced by these Highland societies that the inherent and historical values of the ‘Scotch nation’ supported contemporary British values. The societies re-fashioned Highland culture so that it fit the priorities of their wider imperial community in which they co-existed. The Highland Society of Scotland proclaimed to George IV when he visited Edinburgh in 1822, ‘The same animated spirit for improvement, and
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the same pious observance of the Moral Virtues, which have so long distinguished
the Scotish[sic] Nation, remain uninterrupted, and are disseminated in active exercise
throughout the Kingdom.’\textsuperscript{92} They argued that improving the Highlands actually
benefited the whole of Britain.\textsuperscript{93}

This was the beginning of the age of Romanticism – a period when
Europeans, Britons and North Americans idealised the primitive and ancient.\textsuperscript{94} It
was a period when the reality or rationality of nature, art, literature, and even science
did not always matter as much as the powerful feelings that they evoked. As
Womack remarked, ‘Bens and glens, the lone sheiling in the misty island, purple
heather, kilted clansman, battles long ago, an ancient and beautiful language,
claymores and bagpipes and Bonny Prince Charlie – we know all that, and we also
know that it’s not real.’\textsuperscript{95} The landscape of the Scottish Highlands, which previously
had been viewed as barbaric and ugly, became picturesque and sublime. The
Highland societies not only accepted this literary and poetic description, but also
shaped it and encouraged it. Romanticism, while based on feeling, played a practical
economic and social purpose for Highland and Lowland elites.\textsuperscript{96} The romance
associated with the Highland past promoted the goals of many Scots who lived in the
eyear-nineteenth-century present. Public cultural displays of ‘ancient’ Scottish
culture, especially those that whipped up nostalgic and patriotic emotion, countered
political Anglicisation and reform (a clear Tory agenda), appealed to the aesthetics of
the already romantically inclined literate and culturally engaged public, and did not
undermine British imperial position and loyalty. It became clear that the societies
could collectively assert the members’ political and social objectives by promoting
the romantic image of Highland culture and manipulating it to their own ends.

In 1782, the Highland Society of London held a ‘Great Highland Bagpipe’
competition in Falkirk with great success. From 1783 the London Society along with
the Highland Society of Scotland and (from 1820) the Celtic Society organised an

\textsuperscript{92} Prize Essays and Transactions of the Highland Society of Scotland, Vol. VI (1824), p. lvii.
\textsuperscript{93} McCullough, ‘For the Good and Glory of the Whole’, p. 209.
\textsuperscript{94} For an overview of Scottish romanticism see Murray Pittock (ed.), The Edinburgh Companion to
\textsuperscript{95} Womack, Improvement and Romance, p. 1; Withers, ‘The Historical Creation of the Scottish
Highlands’, p. 143.
\textsuperscript{96} Matthew P. Dziennik, ‘Whig Tartan: Material Culture and its Use in the Scottish Highlands, 1746-
annual ‘Great Highland Bagpipe’ competitions at the Theatre-Royal in Edinburgh, strategically at the same time that many elites from all over Britain came to see the Caledonian Hunt’s Edinburgh races.\(^{97}\) According to the New Picture of Edinburgh (1814) ‘the races being a vast concourse of people from all of Scotland, and from the northern counties of the sister-kingdom’.\(^{98}\) Rather than simply having the pipers perform and compete, the societies incorporated other distinctly Scottish or Highland elements into the pageantry based on public opinion. According to the report of the 1804 piping competition, ‘the audience were also much entertained with dancing of Highland reels, introduced between the acts’.\(^{99}\) Indeed, ‘Sir J. MACGREGOR MURRAY, Resolved, That it will be proper in future to encourage, by suitable premiums, at this annual exhibition, the practice of the Broad Sword Exercise, or Cudgel; the Dancing of Strathspeys called Twosome, and other species of Highland Dancing’.\(^{100}\) In 1817, most people even stated that they attended to see the dancers rather than hear the pipers.\(^{101}\) These competitions played a key role in standardising Scottish cultural identity. They also promoted the associations’ goal of supporting the political and social interests of their Scottish members by legitimising what was previously considered marginal, even barbaric, as uniquely British.

As with all other Scottish cultural societies both at home and abroad, Highland societies adjusted the traditional displays to fit modern ‘polite’ ideals, making the identity conducive to wider cultural norms. As Gibson argued, the music played at these Edinburgh competitions was not Highland \textit{per se}, but ‘aimed at a curious, literate urban market’, which came primarily from Lowland Scotland and England.\(^{102}\) In 1819, the societies encouraged the participants to wear the Highland dress. The \textit{Morning Post} and the \textit{Glasgow Herald} recorded that ‘a number of handsome athletic young Highlanders, pipers and dancers, appeared dressed in a very correct manner, most of them in the tartans of their respective clans’.\(^{103}\)

\(^{100}\) Ibid.  
\(^{102}\) Ibid., p. 174.  
\(^{103}\) ‘Competition of Highland Pipers’, \textit{Morning Post}, 6 August 1819.
manner had to do with contemporary military benchmarks and contemporary aesthetic standards rather than traditional Highland garb, which lacked the bright colours and structure of style that appealed to the British (including English and Lowland) audience. By mixing contemporary cultural mores with traditional symbols, the societies created an identity for Scotland that promoted Scottish partnership in Britishness, and even asserted pre-eminence in the making of British identity. This is important in that these Scots were not merely conforming to metropolitan English culture, but were trying to co-opt the very meaning of British in the wider view of Britain, the British Empire, and the world.

Scots in the eighteenth century capitalised on Scottish and/or Highland imperial military successes. The American War of Independence and the French wars made the Highland regiments of the British army an even greater symbol of Scottish loyalty and imperialism. As Colley argued, ‘though the English and the foreign are still all too inclined today to refer to the island of Great Britain as ‘England’…at no time have they ever customarily referred to an English empire’.104 As such the Highland culture that most post-1790s societies presented adopted an even stronger militaristic tone. The Highland societies described the Highlanders as ancient ‘warriors’ and natural soldiers.105 In 1804, when describing the Highland societies’ bagpipe competition, the Caledonian Mercury described the bagpipe as producing ‘ancient, warlike, and national music’ and ‘the favourite music of ancient heroes’.106 The Highland games which first began to be held in St. Fillan, and later in Dunkeld, Blair Atholl, Crieff, and Stirling demonstrated the physical prowess of these warlike Highlanders.107

Whenever possible, the societies referenced Highland military achievements. Before the Edinburgh bagpipe competition in 1814, Sir John Sinclair wrote a letter to Sir Rowland Hill (Lord Hill), ‘who had several corps of Highlanders, under his command, first in the Peninsula, and afterwards in France’. Sinclair, subsequently, read Hill’s response to those in attendance. In it Hill stated that the Highlanders under his command ‘imitated the example of their warlike ancestors’. From this

104 Colley, Britons, p. 130; McNeil, Scotland, Britain, Empire, p. 10.
105 Womack, Improvement and Romance, p. 28; Withers, ‘The Historical Creation of the Scottish Highlands’, p. 149.
106 ‘Competition of Pipers’, Caledonian Mercury, 28 July 1804.
Sinclair surmised that ‘it appears, that these competitions may not only be of use at home, by preserving the ancient music, dancing, dress, and customs of the country, but may also prove of intimit[e]sic importance abroad, by maintaining the warlike spirit of Highland corps, which they see their countrymen, by such exhibitions, are so anxious to encourage’.  

The significance here not only lay in the societies’ promotion of Highland cultural displays, but also in the idea that these societies facilitated this ‘ancient’ and ‘warlike’ behaviour in a civilised manner. The Highland societies manipulated the Highland recruitment already occurring as part of fiscal military policy for their members’ own social capital and to support Scotland’s loyal image. In 1799, Sinclair stated at the Edinburgh bagpipe competition, ‘it has long been the ardent wish of the Highland Societies of London and of Scotland, to maintain, and to encourage that martial spirit, by which the Natives of the Highlands of Scotland have been so long, and so eminently distinguished’. He went on to suggest, ‘In the line of your profession, you could desire no higher reward, than to receive so honourable a mark of distinction, for such useful and public spirited associations, as the Highland Societies of Scotland and London’. Indeed in 1815, he went so far as to argue, ‘had it not been for the encouragement bestowed by the Highland Societies of London and Scotland on the practice of the Highland Pipe…there would not, perhaps, have been single piper now living, qualified to rouse, by his martial strains, the enthusiastic spirit of his countrymen’. These societies used the success of the Highland regiments to promote the reputation and ‘usefulness’, indeed essentialness, of the members’ actions in support of the British imperial effort. While praising the Highland regiments in order to promote Scotland’s place in the British Empire, it also usurped their success to enhance the non-military elites’ reputations.

The promotion of the ‘ancient Highland garb’ reinforced these political, economic, and personal imperatives as well. The Celtic Society argued, ‘The tartan and bonnet formed a martial dress worthy of a Scottish soldier’. The dress worn
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108 ‘Competition of Pipers’, *Caledonian Mercury*, 6 August 1814.
111 Ibid., p. 67.
112 ‘Competition of Pipers’, *Caledonian Mercury*, 31 July 1815.
113 *Glasgow Herald*, 13 March 1820.
by their chairman at a meeting held on 26 May 1820, included ‘hose, philibeg, and belted plaid…armed with broadsword, pistol, and dirk’.\textsuperscript{114} In describing their desire to promote the Highland dress they argued, ‘but they may not turn to the past, and look forward to the future battles of their country, to tell how worthy of preservation are the dark plumes and graceful plaid of Caledonia, and how laudable and rational are the objects and exertions of the Celtic Society.’\textsuperscript{115} When describing the different role the ‘ancient’ Highland garb played, Scott argued at a Celtic Society meeting:

To strangers there is a romantic gracefulness in the dress which interests and animates them; to Scotchmen there are associations of ancient glory and independence, and recollections of chivalrous suffering, and conquest, in more recent times, which act like magic on them, and give strength to the feeble, courage to the timid, and rapture to the brave.\textsuperscript{116}

Again, the society promoted themselves as the preservers of the dress, which inspired the martial spirit of the Highland regiments in battle. They used the Highland regiments’ reputation to their own ends, while at the same time changing the way Scotland was viewed both internally and externally. This emphasis on Scottish identity as inherently a martial tradition (a process whose beginnings can be seen in eighteenth-century Scotland and colonial America) was so successful that it came, eventually, to overshadow the enlightenment project of the technocratic, scientific-minded Scot so carefully constructed during this period.

Despite the fact that the middling professionals and businessmen held the active positions and tended to do the majority of the work, there was no assertion of anything radical, reforming or democratic. Highland societies regularly recognised the most senior members of the landed aristocracy as their president, patron, or even ‘Chief’ of ‘Chieftain’ in order to underscore the counter-revolutionary idea of supporting the distinction of social rank and patronage. The Highland Society of Scotland, in 1800, for instance, re-elected the Duke of Argyll as its president and the

\textsuperscript{114} Caledonian Mercury, 8 June 1820. Perhaps the author of this article did not realise that if the chairman was truly wearing the philibeg (little kilt) and the belted plaid (the breacan-an-fhèilidh), he would have been wearing two kilts at the same time.

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid.
Duke of Buccleuch, the Earl of Eglinton, the Earl of Moray and the commander-in-chief in Scotland as its vice presidents, while elite professional men held the active positions of secretary, auditor, deputy secretary and collector, recorder and clerk, and jeweller and medallist. The Celtic Society had the Marquis of Huntly (who rarely attended society meetings) as its president, but had men like Scott and Garth as its functional leaders. When addressing the King on his visit to Edinburgh in 1822, the Highland Society of Scotland claimed that ‘from their great number and respectability, the Society’s Addresses to the Throne…may, in some measure, be considered as speaking the united voice of the Nobility and the landed interest of Scotland. During the official ‘Deputation’ with the King the only members of the Society present included:

The Duke of Argyll, President, the Marquis of Lothian and Viscount Arbuthnot, Vice Presidents, in office; the Dukes of Hamilton, Athol, and Montrose; the Marquis of Queensberry; the Earls of Morton, Moray, Lauderdale, Elgin, Wemyss, Aboyne, Breadalbane, Rosebery, Fife, Rosslyn, and Cathcart; Viscount Melville, Lord Glenlyon, Right Honorable Sir John Sinclair, Baronet, James Hunter Esq. of Thurston, and William Macdonald, Esq. of St. Martins, - attended by the Treasurer and Secretary of the Society.

According to the same account, and this emphasised the political, social, and cultural clout of these associations, only the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the Highland Society addressed the King on that occasion.

Certainly the most high profile display of Highlandism during the early nineteenth century was George IV’s visit to Edinburgh in 1822. Historians have evaluated the tartan pageantry of the event in great depth. It was clearly orchestrated as an anti-radical event, celebrating Scottish distinctiveness immersed in acclamations of unwavering loyalty. Indeed it was a carefully choreographed performance of not only the martial characteristics of the Scottish clans in their

117 Caledonian Mercury, 18 January 1800.
118 Ibid., 26 January 1822.
120 Ibid., p. lvi.
121 Ibid., p. lviii.
capacity as arbiters of empire and strongholds of the British army, but also Scotland’s perceived ancient history. It acted as a celebration of de-politicised Jacobitism (conforming to the romanticisation of the Jacobite rebellions in the *Waverley* novels) and a cultural distinctiveness along the lines of that delineated by the Highland associations in order to promote Scotland’s unique place within Union and its most colourful and identifiable component.¹²²

Yet, once again, few scholars have realised or articulated the key role associations played in its staging, usually giving Sir Walter Scott personally all the credit and/or blame as if he carried it off as a solo act. Nothing could be further from the truth. When it became clear that George IV would visit Scotland, Lord Provost William Arbuthnot and William Adam, an influential Scottish lawyer and politician, asked Scott to form a committee to plan the event. Scott chose the Lord Provost, Garth, James Skene of Rubislaw, and Alexander Keith of Ravelston to help choreograph the pageant.¹²³ Within the committee, with Scott at its head, it was decided that associations would be key to the pageant – Garth and the Celtic Society would form the honour guard for the King, the Royal Company of Archers would become the King’s bodyguards, and the Caledonian Hunt would hold one of the two balls.¹²⁴ They even relied on certain societies rather than real Highland regiments to act as symbols of Scotland’s imperial role. John Pinkerton, the notorious anti-Celt, Teutonistic antiquarian, and Whig historian, who was at this point a sickly 64 year old, even wrote:

> …the notion that any given club of private individuals being selected to guard the Regalia of Scotland, in preference to the regular forces of his Majesty’s empire, appears to me, I must
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¹²⁴ *Caledonian Mercury*, 29 August 1822.
fairly confess it, not a little queer. And this, too, a club instituted anno 1820!\textsuperscript{125}

Scott and other committee members saw the Highland societies, the Caledonian Hunt, the Celtic Society, and the Society of Archers, in particular, as the best representatives of Highland culture and depended on their active participation. George IV’s visit created an opportunity for more publicity for the societies themselves, validating their cultural purpose with a royal imprimatur and promoting the reputation of the members as Scots on the national, British, and world stage.\textsuperscript{126} They were instrumental to the King’s visit and orchestrated the display of what was seen as Scottish culture and Scottish politics.

One can see the social and political capital and personal identities at play in these associations’ participation in the ‘King’s Jaunt’ in the controversy that arose between Alexander Ranaldson MacDonnell of Glengarry and the Celtic Society in 1822. In 1815, Glengarry formed the Society of True Highlanders, which was based in the Highland village of Inverlochy, Fort William and created for the purpose of supporting ‘the Dress, Language, Music, and Characteristics of our Illustrious and Ancient Race in the Highland and Islands of Scotland’.\textsuperscript{127} According to a history of the London Club of True Highlanders, which was created on the example of Glengarry’s True Highlanders in 1817:

The year 1815, rendered so glorious in the annals of our country by the crowning of Waterloo, also witnessed the gradually increasing expression of pride and satisfaction with which Highlanders at home regarded the glorious manner in which the honour of their country had been maintained during the Peninsular War; and when peace was proclaimed they were enabled to turn their thoughts toward the best manner of preserving that Highland dress, which, described by tradition as a fitting garb for heroes, had been so proudly borne to the front by the gallant wearers on the red field of war.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{125} 

\textsuperscript{126} Prebble, \textit{The King’s Jaunt}, pp. 86-91.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., p. 39.

In many ways it functioned as a Highland society on the same lines as those associated with the Highland Society of London and the later Celtic Society. Its members went to well-attended balls, sang songs, recited poetry. Glengarry acted as the Society’s publicist, writing to the *Inverness Journal* providing detailed accounts of the Society’s proceedings to the wider Scottish and British public.\(^{129}\) The only difference was that the Society of True Highlanders only allowed Highland men of property and proven Highland descent to join.

Glengarry joined the Celtic Society in its early years as it supported his romantic and Tory imperatives. An article in the *Caledonian Mercury* describing the Celtic Society’s second public meeting stated that ‘Glengarry, who had only arrived in town that afternoon, joined them in the evening, and was received with loud cheers’.\(^{130}\) After being excluded from the choreography committee of the Edinburgh pageant by Scott and Garth, however, he rebelled against it. In order to chastise the association, he attacked the racial composition of the club. He argued that the Society was made up of men of Saxon stock, and did not adequately represent the traditions and culture of the Highlanders. He wrote in the *Edinburgh Observer*:

> I dined one day with them since, and I never saw so much tartan *before* in my life, with *so little* Highland material. The day went off pleasantly, to be sure, but how could it do otherwise to any man, seated on one hand of Sir Walter Scott in the chair, who had another Highland chieftain on his other. Still, not being dazzled by outward shew alone, I take this opportunity of withdrawing my name publicly from this mixed society, for the reasons already assigned. There may be some very good and respectable men amongst them, but their general appearance is assumed and fictitious, and they have *no right to burlesque the national character or dress of Highlanders*, against the continuance of which liberty, so mortifying to the feelings of all real Highlanders. I, *for one* formally protest.\(^{131}\)

\(^{129}\) For examples of the types of articles Glengarry included in the *Inverness Journal*, see *Inverness Journal*, 6 September 1816, 20 September 1816, 9 May 1817, 27 June 1817, 10 December 1819, 7 July 1820, and 22 June 1821.

\(^{130}\) *Caledonian Mercury*, 8 June 1820.

He had joined the Highland Society of Scotland in 1793, but did not dissolve his connection with that society even though it admitted members of non-Highland origin, suggesting that this argument had more to do with reputation and visibility than race. In fact, this clash had much in common with the earlier argument between the Earl of Buchan and William Robertson, only at this point over which organisation represented ‘true highlanders’ rather than which represented the accomplishments of enlightened Scotland. The reputation of Scottish associations as arbiters of Scottish identity was a high stakes game worthy of dispute.

The Highland appropriation of Scottish identity in the first decades of the nineteenth century certainly threatened those who used a kind of racial politics to attack the Highland and Celtic societies’ articulation of Scottish Toryism. In 1822 ‘A Goth’, believed to be John Pinkerton, argued that almost all Highland Chiefs came from Gothic or Norman stock, with the exception of Glengarry. While no less patriotic toward Scotland, he argued that the Lowland Scots were the pride of Scotland as they were of Teutonic, and thus superior, racial ancestry. As Kidd argued, ‘The Picto-Gothicists conceived of themselves as true patriots; for instance, Pinkerton advanced views on the libertarian and whiggish character of the Picts’. Through his *Morning Chronicle* article, Pinkerton argued, ‘Celtic Society! -you are a set of right ravenous chaps, and not to be trusted in a tripe-shop. Let the Highlanders do with their hinder ends as they chuse; and be assured, that an association to encourage kilts is laughable to the widest extent of the human mouth.’

Pinkerton’s assertion of a Scottish identity that focused on Scotland’s progress and civility rather than a celebration of a barbarous and primitive Scottish or Highland past was an attempt to preserve the enlightenment project in the face of the romantic Highland response. Pinkerton explained:

> The Caledonian Canal, the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge, Steam Boat Navigation, and this Magazine, will at no
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133 *Morning Chronicle*, 10 October 1822.


135 *Morning Chronicle*, 10 October 1822.
very distant period, introduce civilization into the Highlands of Scotland...For be it remembered, that while the elements of knowledge are increased the elements of nature remain pretty much the same; and it is conceivable that the Highlanders, when enlightened and civilised by means of those powerful agents enumerated above, will continue to expose their extremities to blasts more searching than excisemen? Impossible. – Breeches will triumph.136

Indeed, he even asked the rhetorical question ‘would [it] not be right to institute a society for the encouragement of breeches in the Highlands of Scotland, as to counterpoise to the fatal influence of the Celtic Society?’. To this he answered:

No, things will find their own level. There is no call for any such Association. It would do more harm than good. Celts might be enticed into breeches, who would afterwards turn renegades and apostates, and would adhere to kilts out of spite to the Breech Society, We might see the flames of civil war.137

Picto-patriotism as promoted by Pinkerton ultimately failed to gain a following because of the allure of the romantic Dalriadic origin theory and the power of the Ossianic tradition paraded so clearly by Highland societies – maybe because it was paraded so clearly by the Highland societies.138

This dispute between the two images of Scotland, though, did not undermine the Highland societies’ collective mission. In 1805, The Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh published an article by John Jamieson on the ‘term Scull or Skoll as used in Old Writings, being an Article in the Etymology Dictionary of the Scottish Language’. In it the author stated:

Etymology is often the only light by which we can trace the migrations of the early inhabitants of countries, and in the present instance, may afford the explanation of a leading fact in the history of this island, viz. the establishment of the language in question over all the low part of Scotland, from a period of very remote

136 Ibid.
137 Ibid.
antiquity, while the Gaelic was the language of the mountainous part.\textsuperscript{139}

This article described the Lowlanders as Goths and the Highlanders as Celts, but this delineation did not resonate as it was not really about race, but rather reputation. The Highland Society, Celtic Society, and the Royal Society of Edinburgh had an overwhelmingly large overlap in membership and men, some of whom embraced these racial theories of superiority, and most of which also supported the continuation of an ‘enlightenment’ intellectual Scottish identity. The Highland fashion exploited by these societies had more to do with politics, elitism, and fashionable romanticism than actual racial theory. With the exception of Glengarry’s ‘True Highlanders’ and the various ‘clan’ societies which formed during this period, most associations did not pretend to have a completely Highland membership base, but included men with what the societies deemed ‘Highland spirit’ and defined ‘Highland’ in a way that most advantaged the members rather than following any geographical or cultural distinction. The racial differentiation was even presented as inconsequential. Christopher North (John Wilson) went so far as to write an article published in the Tory-leaning \textit{Blackwood’s Magazine}, in October 1822:

Dine together, drink together, talk Erse together, guard the Knight Marischal, or the Regalia, or the King. Glengarry and the Celtic Society, shake hands and be friends. Why should you remember what every body else will have forgotten in a fortnight? Shake hands – we repeat – and the next number we shall have an “elegant article,” entitled, “Reconciliation between Glengarry and the Celtic Society,” which will make you clap your kilted hips with joy, and placed on the list of honorary members.\textsuperscript{140}

Indeed, in a toast given in 1823 at a Celtic Society dinner, Scott stated, ‘If any Highlander should still persist in drawing a line of distinction, he must protest, on the other hand, against any of them entering or presuming to shelter their limbs in the comforts of boots and corduroys.’\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh}, Vol. V (1805) p. 29.
\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Aberdeen Journal}, 23 October 1822, from \textit{Blackwood’s Magazine}.
\textsuperscript{141} \textit{Caledonian Mercury}, 6 March 1823.
The Highland identity presented by Tories was not made of out of nothing, of course. Instead, it was a manipulation of pre-existing Highland culture and cultural displays to fit the priorities of the members. Highland societies, like the enlightenment societies of the eighteenth century and ethnic societies, which met in the American colonies, capitalised on wider ideas of romanticism in order to shape Scottish/Highland identity so that it provided social, political, and economic capital to the members who performed it. It was a product of the changing political and social environment of Britain and Europe and the Scottish Tory’s desire to challenge those who supported political reform. Yet, it was also deliberately and calculatedly constructed by the collective memberships within associations.

III

This chapter, again, has only touched on two of the many Scottish identities which associations expressed during this period of political, social, and economic change in Scotland. It has by no means exhausted the topic. What is clear though, even in this limited discussion, is that Scottish voluntary associations remained key to Scotland’s identity construction and performance. They, like societies in colonial America, shifted their Scottish identities to fit their new political, social, and economic environment. Unlike the fairly coherent ‘enlightenment’ identity presented by the literati in the early period, with its provincial and regional variants and localised disputes, the identity expressed in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries was much more disparate, competitive, and political. Societies (new and old) during this period re-evaluated and re-formed their Scottish identity to best position themselves within the social and political imperatives of the times as well as shape the image held of Scots and Scotland by an increasingly literate and politicised public.

The purpose, however, remained the same. Most if not all of the associations deliberately used their various symbols of Scottish identity as a means to present their community as key players in the wider British, imperial, and even European intellectual discourse. While the political, economic, and social structure of Scotland took a dramatic turn with the French Revolution, the desire of these associational
Scots to remain strongly incorporated as equal partners within a British state and empire and a key player in the Republic of Letters continued. Indeed, almost all societies made reference to other British institutions, or promoted symbols of British unity. Scottishness in Scotland in most if not all its manifestations remained British, and the associations were key to promoting and shaping this identity. What is perhaps most interesting is how Scottish associations came to define what it meant to be British – bagpipes and kilted soldiers came to be the most recognisable representation of Britain and the British Empire, not just Scotland.

The chapter that follows examines the identity expressed by Scottish associations in America following the American War of Independence. The question here will be that of the shape of Scottish identity when expressed by associations that were no longer British.
On 30 November 1829, forty-six years after the signing of the Treaty of Paris which ended the American War of Independence and one hundred years after the founding of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, members of the Society along with numerous interested spectators met at the First Presbyterian Church of Charleston to listen to the President of the Society, Mitchell King, read an anniversary address. In his speech he stated:

Ask the nations of Europe – ask every nation and people visited by civilized man round the habitable globe, whether the nationality of Scotchmen has ever prevented them from doing their duty to a country, with which they have been connected. When and where were their promises broken, and their pledged faith violated? When have they betrayed the trust reposed in them, or bartered their honor for gain? Ask of every nation, who are the foreigners settled among them who are industrious, diligent, prudent, punctual, honourable – in whom they have entire confidence, whom they are willing to have as neighbours, or to select as friends. Ask, what nation, in proportion to its population, has given the greatest number of soldiers, and sailors, and instructors, and officers, and statesmen, to the rest of the world. And though some of the other nations may in this respect claim for themselves the first rank, we confidently believe that every nation will assign, if not the first, at least the second place to Scotland, and she will thus be entitled to bear the palm.¹

The idea that Scots were the best immigrants in the United States became a common theme used by Scottish ethnic associations in order to publicly display their identity and allegiance in the American republic. King’s sentiments signified much more than a love for Scottish culture and a desire to connect with an ancestral past.

¹ Mitchell King, Esq., Address Delivered in The First Presbyterian Church Before the St. Andrew’s Society of the City of Charleston, on Their Centennial Anniversary, the 30th of November, 1829, at their Request (Charleston, 1829), p. 55.
Instead they expressed a desire for Scots to be accepted as loyal citizens of the United States. He attempted to prove to the wider American public that admiration for the ‘mother country’ should not, and indeed did not affect Scots’ allegiance to the ‘adopted nation’. The Scottish identity that King attempted to assert was one in which Scots inherently possessed the ideal traits of an American citizen.

This chapter turns to the examination of the identities and allegiances that Scottish ethnic societies portrayed to the wider public following the American Revolution. Through the examination of ethnic Scottish-American societies in particular, this chapter demonstrates that post-revolutionary Scottish ethnic societies’ efforts constituted the most significant expression of Scottish-American identity in the new nation. It shows that the identity performed by the Scottish ethnic societies that met in post-revolutionary America, like their Scottish counterparts, deliberately changed to fit the new political situation and provide for the ‘Scottish’ men that joined them. In fact, these societies were central to the creation of a new hybrid Scottish-American identity (as opposed to Scottish-British-American identity) that was legitimate in its own right.

Yet, these Scottish ethnic associations also provide insight into the nature of the early republic, which itself was desperately trying to find an identity that it could acknowledge as Anglo-protestant but not English or British. These societies took calculated, and sometimes complicated, measures to shape their performance of identity in order to proclaim their loyalty and support for the United States, maintain a cultural link with Scotland, and assert that the two expressions of identity and allegiance were not mutually exclusive. By examining Scottish-American ethnic associations’ changing priorities, engagement with American politics, public performance of Scottish ethnicity and culture, and interactions with other ethnic groups, this chapter argues that American Scots used associations to express their identity in a way that was ethnically Scottish and engaged with the identities expressed in the ‘mother country’, yet at the same time involved with America’s national popular political culture and responded to the continuation of real and imagined fears by others of the Scots; a fear they shared with other ethnic groups in America. The identity performed by these associations dealt with the insecurities,
anxieties, and political priorities held both regionally and nationally in the newly formed United States of America.

I

War-torn cities proved a hostile environment for associational activity, unless that activity directly related to the war effort or the association was made up of members with the same political allegiances.\(^2\) As Roney has shown, twenty per cent of the societies that met in Philadelphia in 1775 ceased to exist after the Revolution.\(^3\) Those societies that survived even though their members had conflicting loyalties suffered considerable strain and only eeked out a meagre existence during the war.

Scottish societies, before the conflict, presented themselves as distinctly Scottish yet fully British and engaged in Britain’s imperial enterprise. Yet, by the 1770s, the mixed political loyalties of the members of most, if not all, Scottish societies became apparent. According to Easterby’s calculations, out of the 109 members of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston included on the membership rolls at the beginning of the American War of Independence, thirty-two explicitly declared their loyalty to the King before the end of the war. At the same time, however, at least fifteen members made their political support for the Patriot cause known.\(^4\) Similarly, the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia had five signers of the Declaration of Independence on its membership lists – James Wilson, George Ross, Philip Livingston, John Witherspoon, and Thomas McKean.\(^5\) Yet, other members supported the loyalist cause. Major John Pitcairn, for instance, died leading British troops at Bunker Hill.\(^6\)

As a result, most Scottish societies fell into inactivity. Only scanty treasury records exist for the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston in the period from 1775 to

---

\(^2\) Committees of Safety, for instance, formed throughout the colonies and acted as de-facto colonial governments. For more on these associations see Agnes Hunt, *The Provincial Committees of Safety of the American Revolution* (Cleveland: Winn & Judson, 1904).

\(^3\) Roney, “‘First Movers’”, pp. 338-339.

\(^4\) Easterby, *History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, South Carolina*, p. 44. The loyalties of the other sixty-two members are unknown.

\(^5\) *Constitution and Rules of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia* (1769), pp. 16-20.

1780, with no record of any regular meeting taking place. On 31 August 1776, the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia recorded in its minute book, ‘The Secry. advertized according to custom, but the President and Vice President, judg’d proper to put off this Meeting, owing to a number of members, being out of Town, or more particularly on Account of the convulsed & unsettled State of the times.’ The Philadelphia society held an anniversary meeting in November of that year, but only six members attended. Those present simply voted to keep the same officers and then adjourned the meeting without dinner. The minutes do not begin again until 1783. Like the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, the Philadelphia society’s treasury book suggests that some Scots did receive aid, but nothing in its records suggest that any meetings took place. The societies in Boston, New York, and Savannah also suspended their activities during this time.

A burst of activity did take place in Charleston and Savannah when the cities came under British occupation. In 1779, 1780, and 1781, the loyalist members of the St. Andrew’s Society of Savannah held events in celebration of St. Andrew’s Day. Similarly, during 1780, St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston’s loyalist members revived its celebratory activities. It held lavish anniversary meetings on St. Andrew’s Day in 1780 and 1781 and voted in numerous British military officers and other loyalists in the city as members. They even gave a musical prize to a ‘Hessian [Hessian] Band’. These loyalist members, at least, asserted that the Scots in Charleston and Savannah supported the British cause. Once the British evacuated Charleston in 1782, however, the Society once again stopped holding meetings and did not revive its activities until 1787. Likewise, no records of St. Andrew’s Day celebrations in Savannah exist from 1782 to 1791.

The only Scottish society that seems to have been formed during this turbulent period was a Scots Prayer Society founded in 1779 in New York City. Its minutes stated:

---

8 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, 31 August 1776.  
9 Ibid., 20 November 1776.  
10 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Treasury Account Book (1759-1843), Mss.361.Sa2, APS.  
13 Ibid, p. 47. Hessians were German mercenaries contracted by the British to fight against the American Patriots. For more on the Hessians see Rodney Atwood, *The Hessians: Mercenaries from Hessen-Kassel in the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
That none can be admitted into the society but such as believe the word of god to be the only rule of faith and practice. And profess an addherence to the reformation standards of the church of scotland contained in our confession of faith larger and shorter catechisms the Presbyterian form of church Government Worship and Discipline as it was received approven and established by the forsaid church of Scotland betwixt the years 1638 & 1649.14

Unlike the charitable Scottish clubs, this society attached itself to the Reform Presbyterian (or Covenanting) Church in America. Societies in America associated with the Covenanting religion sought to uphold the National Covenant signed in Scotland in 1638 in the American colonies and saw the British government as illegitimate as it had not upheld covenanting principles on either side of the Atlantic. As Robinson argues, however, the meetings of the Covenanters ‘fostered a self-conscious insular community which was remarkably resistant to assimilation and acculturation.’15 Some suggest that since they already argued against the British government, most American Covenanters supported the Patriot cause.16 The limited manuscript sources available for this and most American covenanting societies, however, make little reference to the Revolutionary War and only speak in terms of Scottish covenanting faith and their desire to promote that faith in America.

After the war was over, most, if not all, of the societies attempted to re-form. Reorganising the societies, however, was not an easy task, especially since many of the members were forced to relocate during the war. Clearly, the Scottish-British-imperial identity that most Scottish societies had sought so hard to proclaim had become politically divisive and physically dangerous by the end of the war. It no longer fit the identity that the members collectively sought to assert or served the purpose of proclaiming Scottish usefulness to the political establishment. Even without their previously performed British identity, these societies could still be seen

---

14 ‘Principles and Rules of a Prayer Society formed in the City of New York during the war of the American Revolution by The Scotch Presbyterian Patriots then Residents of Said City’, Misc.Mss.Box.13, NYHS.
16 Ibid., p. 235. Edward DeWitt wrote the title given to the ‘Prayer Society’ manuscript in 1874. The members themselves may not have called their association by this name.
as identifying with the British Empire by the mere fact that most of them only
opened their membership to men of Scottish ancestry and claimed Scottish ethnicity.
This problem did not go unnoticed by the members. In fact, they were very aware
that associations that publicly celebrated Scotland, or were, more dangerously,
exclusively made up of Scots and their offspring, could stimulate fears among an
already anxious American public.

The mixed loyalties of the members during the conflict also caused
significant tensions within the re-established associations, which had not previously
existed. Following General William Howe’s evacuation of British troops from
Boston in 1776, for example, many of the loyalist members of the Scots’ Charitable
Society left Boston for safer climes, such as Halifax, Nova Scotia, or New York,
leaving as few as twelve members in the city. The Society briefly dispersed, as
many Scottish societies did, and came back together once the war was over. In order
to deal with the fact that many of the original members were no longer in Boston, the
re-formed society decided that only members physically resident in the city would
have access to the Society’s funds. Unfortunately for the members still in Boston,
however, the Society’s records and bonds were still in the hands of the former
treasurer, Archibald Cunningham, who had evacuated the city in 1776. In a letter
written in 1784, Cunningham stated:

There are nothing in its Rules to prevent, [the records] being
removed from Boston, allowing a Majority of votes in favour of it,
which was the Case in this instance (This Society never had a
Charter from the General Court of Massachusetts) if the small
number of Members which are in Boston think themselves intitled
to any part of the Fund; surely the largest number of members, &
who were obliged to leave Boston are equally intitled to part, I
am convinced you will think so too.18

---

17 This is an approximation made by William Buddle, ‘A Concise History of The Scots’ Charitable
Society of Boston, Massachusetts’, Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston website,
Charitable Society of Boston, ‘Authorization to Collect Bonds, Mortgages, etc., December 27, 1782.‘,
18 Archibald Cunningham to S.S. Blowers, 23 July 1784, Robert May Collection, 1773-1907, Ms. N-535, Scots Char. Soc. 1773-1786, MHS.
Cunningham refused to return the books and securities to Boston unless the Society decided to open its funds to the ‘members’ outside of the city. An epistolary argument continued for nineteen years between the Scots’ Charitable Society in Boston and Cunningham, the supposed voice of the members outside the city, over the books and the Society’s funds.

The members in Boston kept the society afloat without the original records and securities until they were finally returned in 1803. They printed documents and contributed articles to local and more distant newspapers without including the names of members who had left Boston.19 What is most significant about this episode, however, is not that the exiled treasurer held the books hostage, but that the American War of Independence made American politics and loyalty to the United States a central concern for Scottish societies. The Society, according to those who stayed in Boston, needed to be tightly governed by men of similar political beliefs and priorities. With the United States being such a new and unstable entity, rife with fears of political dissidence, it became increasingly clear to Scottish ethnic societies that they needed to outwardly express their patriotic support, loyalty, and allegiance to their new nation or face being seen as politically subversive. As Cunningham explained after the Society won their petition for a formal Act of Incorporation in 1786:

I also have read the Act for incorporating the Society which took place the 16th. March 1786 (and not before as you formerly supposed it had) the Powers that you are Invested with may be proper, & confined but surely they cannot extend farther than your own State, the authority that has given you Powers, are [fearful] of your acquiring too large a Fund, as they have confind the society to the Annuall income of Two hundred pounds, this will require many years, before you can possibl[y] accumulate a fund, to produce such an annual income, perhaps they may be rig [ht in this & of you accepting – but what appears more stricking to me of their having a jealous eye, over you, is in restrickting the number of Members to one hundred, this is a convincing proof of their fears of the Scotch nation, and allow me to say that [the] very reason why that the

19 See, for instance, Rules and Regulations of the Scots’ Charitable Society, Instituted at Boston, Ad. 1684 – Renewed 1786 (Boston, 1800).
Scotch Charitable Society could never obtain an Act to Incorporate them before.\textsuperscript{20}

As the quote in the beginning of this chapter signifies, Scottish societies responded to this fear of the ‘Scotch nation’ well into the nineteenth century, especially with the increase in American nativist sentiments following American independence. As such, Scottish societies constantly shaped their display of identity in order to appease those around them (something that they had already done in the colonial period, and indeed Scots continued to do in Scotland). Arguably, emphasising loyalty to the United States was becoming, for all not just Scots, the touchstone of civil engagement, which is itself indicative of the anxiety-ridden nature of the early republic.\textsuperscript{21} Scots needed to be very specific with the way that they presented themselves, or their loyalties could be misinterpreted.

Tellingly, even though Scottish societies already in existence were responding to attacks that they were ‘too national’, new societies began to form in considerable numbers. The St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore was not founded until 1806, and quickly acquired a large membership base. By the 1830s Scottish societies could be found in towns as small as Schenectady, New York and as far west as Lexington, Kentucky and Cincinnati, Ohio. This would suggest that the benefits provided by Scottish ethnic associations, such as patronage opportunities, economic security, and influence within civil society, contained enough impetus to warrant the creation of new societies. It also suggests that the philanthropic and cultural agendas of Scottish societies must have been attractive to a late-eighteenth, early-nineteenth-century middling and professional masculine population of immigrant Scots and their American-born offspring.

Most importantly for this study, however, it indicates that the Scottish, or hybrid Scottish identity performed by the older societies was successful enough at alleviating the fears of the American population to allow for the creation and

\textsuperscript{20} Archibald Cunningham [signed Mrs. Lydia Cunningham] to John Scollary, 14 August 1786, Robert May Collection, 1773-1907, Ms. N-535, Scots Char. Soc. 1773-1786, MHS.
incorporation of new societies attached to Scottish ethnicity. It shows that the
Scottish-American identity could cooperate and even facilitate an early-republican
identity that was loyal, Anglo-Protestant, yet not nationally British. Indeed, new
societies immediately began to perform the public identity that the re-formed
societies were beginning to cultivate. The Caledonian Society of the City of New
York, for instance, wrote in their first printed rule book published in 1794:

…our well known preference and persevering Attachment to the
Constitution and customs of this happy land of civil and religious
Liberty, together with that principle of gratitude which must
naturally arise from the hospitable reception and friendly
attachment which we have experienced in this country, we hope,
will sufficiently evince to the world, that we do not act under the
influence of any National Prepossession.22

Unlike the Scottish societies before the American War of Independence, post-
Revolutionary Scottish associations (both new and old) expressed themselves as
supportive of the United States of America and its political establishment, which
allowed them to maintain a cultural link to their homeland.

II

The main forum through which Scottish societies, both old and new, began to
perform their new identity and allegiance was the toasts given at anniversary
celebrations. Toasts were the main form of entertainment at formal dinners during
the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They were a way to collective and genteel
inebriation, which was a common goal of Scottish societies on the tutelary saint’s
day. Yet, the practice of toasting was not a frivolous matter. The drinking of toasts
was an important means through which members could communally consume and
accept the identity that the societies were beginning to assert. As Hugh Henry
Brackenridge wrote in 1804, ‘…a single thought may depend the essence of liberty:
health or poison may be communicated by a word. For the toasts of this day are

22 Constitution of the Caledonian Society, of the City of New York (1794), p. 3.
considered as an indication of the public will...’.

Americans, in particular, were not keen to drink toasts with which they did not agree. As such, each toast during a single evening’s gathering (which often numbered twenty or more) needed to represent the beliefs and sentiments of everyone present.

While toasts were drunk by Scottish societies during the colonial American period, they would have been used as insular entertainment rather than public performance. After the American War of Independence, however, newspapers began to dedicate even more space to articles that described civic feasts and celebrations throughout the country. Toasts given at St. Andrew’s Day celebrations, as well as other ethnic societies’ national holidays, began to be recorded in detail in regional and distant publications and were thus read and consumed by a much wider public than that which met in the tavern or hotel for the celebration itself. They also began to be used to a greater degree as a means to express a sense of community within the Scottish-American population throughout the United States and as a means to publicly profess a certain kind of identity to those outside of Scottish ethnic associations than they had previously. Powell’s argument that in Ireland ‘alcohol [may have been] consumed by those present, but the toasts themselves were avidly “consumed” and then reused by a patriotic population’ held true for early-republican Scottish-Americans as well. An evaluation of the slates of toasts compiled, given, and subsequently published gives an excellent indication of the identity these societies expressed.


On first glance the toasts given by different societies seem similar to one another. The Beggar’s Benison, which was an elite gentlemen’s club devoted to ‘male sexuality’ originally founded in Anstruther, but expanded to include branches in Edinburgh and Manchester, for instance, was included in lists of toasts up and down the eastern seaboard.27 ‘The land o’ cakes’, and ‘the land we live in’ were also regulars. Upon further examination, however, it becomes clear that many societies subtly revised the standard list of toasts in order to make statements that would better place their specific society within the regional environment in which they were situated. While similar, each society had a slightly different identity to perform.

As would be expected, Scottish-American societies’ first priority when creating a slate of toasts was to express their political allegiance to the United States in order to alleviate the fears that others were expressing toward these ‘immigrant’ associations. Toasts to ‘The United States’, ‘The President of the United States’, and various other political and military offices were never missed. Toasts recorded by the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia in 1799 such as, ‘The United States and all faithful citizens of the same, wherever they were born, and from whomsoever descended’, ‘The president of the United States, and a steady support to the wise council and inflexible integrity of his administration’, ‘The congress of the United States, may their only strife be the strife of freemen, for pre-eminence in virtue, and zeal for the honour and independence of our country’, ‘George Washington, and the army of the United States-if called into the field, may they, as citizen soldiers, and a band of brothers, emulate the virtues of their illustrious chief, and follow his banner to victory and death, in defence of our constitutional rights and liberty’ and ‘The memory of the departed, and the happiness of the surviving patriots, statesmen and soldiers of our revolutionary war; may the noble example of their virtues never be disgraced by the degeneracy of their sons’, would have been an explicitly clear indication of the Society’s national allegiance.28

Yet, many Scottish clubs and societies also sought to influence American political and social culture. While the internal records of most Scottish societies

---

28 Constitutional Diary and Philadelphia Evening Advertiser, 5 December 1799; Claypoole’s American Daily Advertiser, 6 December 1799.
post-Revolution stated that they were truly philanthropic organisations that celebrated Scottishness, they did not always refrain from subtly (or sometimes not so subtly) commenting on American politics.29 By involving themselves in American political debate, even if it was simply through the toasts given at anniversary celebrations, these societies still maintained the goal to assert themselves as fully incorporated Americans, but also situated themselves as an important part of American civil society and the voice of the Scottish-American population.

These political toasts, therefore, were often partisan. Almost immediately following the American War of Independence, political polarity was apparent in the United States. With the debates surrounding the ratification of the Constitution, two groups, the federalists, and the anti-federalists, emerged. The federalists believed that a strong centralised government as outlined by the Constitution provided the best form of government, while the anti-federalists feared that it would take away from the sovereignty of the States, with some even supporting the continuation of the failed Articles of Confederation. Indeed many anti-federalists feared that under the Constitution the government of the United States would act as a ‘monarchical’ power reminiscent of the British state from which they had fought so hard to be independent.30 After the ratification of the Constitution in 1788, the political friction did not abate. By the early 1790s the Federalists had created an organised political party that supported the formation of a strong centralised government, the creation of a central bank, and the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, Between His Britannic Majesty and the United States of America (colloquially known as the Jay Treaty), which solidified trade between the United States and Great Britain. Subsequently, in 1791 Thomas Jefferson and James Madison formed the Republican

---

29 The 1833 rulebook of the Caledonian Society of Cincinnati specifically stated that, ‘no political toasts will be permitted to be drank at our celebration of St. Andrew’s day’. Most societies claimed to be politically neutral, yet their printed toasts suggest that they often overlooked this particular declaration. *Charter and Constitution of the Caledonian Society of Cincinnati* (Cincinnati, 1833), p.15.

Party (commonly referred to by historians as the Democratic-Republic Party or the Jeffersonian Republican Party), which supported, amongst other things, a close relationship with France (as opposed to Great Britain) and stronger state and local governments. In particular, the Republicans fervently opposed the Jay Treaty and the economic policies put forth by Alexander Hamilton.  

As Pasley has suggested, ‘Lists of toasts often included such detail and shading that they functioned almost as platforms, long before official party platforms were invented.’ Again, as Scottish societies were meant to be philanthropic rather than political, toasts of this nature were often understated. By the 1790s, George Washington, in his capacity of both President of the United States and Commander and Chief of the American Army, quickly became a key figure to be toasted by the vast majority of Scottish associations in both the northern and southern states. George Washington was universally popular among the American people and remained an independent throughout his term in office. All people who claimed loyalty to the United States, no matter what party, could celebrate his role as a political leader, American figurehead, and Revolutionary War hero. Yet, as with most symbols, Washington was not always a benign figure to be toasted. His name could also symbolise a public attachment to the Federalist Party. As Newman has stated, ‘Celebration of Washington – both as a real leader and as a symbolic figure – was at the heart of Federalist political culture’. Even before the 1790s, Washington was used as a symbol for federalism and support for the construction of a strong federal government. Following the negotiation of the Jay Treaty and subsequent debates over its ratification, toasting Washington began to symbolise support for an alliance between Great Britain and the United States, as opposed to an American alliance with France as suggested by Thomas Jefferson. A toast to Washington did not necessarily make any specific political statement, but also could be used by those who sought to subtly express their Federalist affiliations, especially when coupled with other Federalist figures or symbols.

33 Newman, Parades and Politics of the Street, p. 45.
The St. Andrew’s Society of the State of New York was by far the most blatantly political Scottish association during this time. In 1798, for instance, the New York Society toasted ‘Geordie McGregor’s Malison to all Democrats’, (an extremely clear partisan statement) which marked a significant change from their 1785 toast ‘Geordie M’Gregor’s Maleson[sic] to all the enemies of Scotland.’\(^{34}\) The term ‘Democrats’ used here most likely referred to anyone who challenged the accepted political order. By giving this toast the Society both ‘cursed’ the Republicans and the French Jacobins at the same time. This was also the year of the passing of the Alien and Sedition Acts by the Federalist government, which was meant to shield the country from radical foreign influences – namely the republican French – and publications, which might threaten the stability of the United States government.\(^{35}\)

Their support for the Federalist cause was solidified even further in the public eye through their toasts to Washington’s trusted advisor and Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton. Although Hamilton had been an active member of the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York (as it began to be called after the war), any toast to him as a politician was rife with partisanism, especially if it was expressed in the public sphere.\(^{36}\) Hamilton had written fifty-one out of the eighty-five essays included in the influential *Federalist Papers* written in support of the Constitution, been a leading advocate of the Jay Treaty, and was the first to propose the formation of a national bank. He fervently fought for the creation of a strong centralised federal government, which fundamentally differed from the priorities of the anti-federalists and later the Republicans.\(^{37}\)

Two years after his fatal duel with Aaron Burr, the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State New York erected a ‘fourteen-foot-high monument that consisted of a four-

---

\(^{34}\) *Daily Advertiser*, 1 December 1798; *New-York Journal*, 1 December 1785. Efforts to identify Geordie M’Gregor have not been successful to date.

\(^{35}\) Cogliano, *Revolutionary America*, p. 225.

\(^{36}\) Alexander Hamilton (the US Secretary of the Treasury) was the illegitimate son of an itinerant Scottish trader who was born on the island of Nevis in the British West Indies, which made him eligible to join the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York. Forrest McDonald, ‘Hamilton, Alexander (1757-1804)’, *ODNB*, [Accessed 21 July 2014].

foot-square base, topped with an obelisk and a flaming urn’ to commemorate Hamilton on the spot where he fell with a plaque that read:

On this spot fell, July 11, 1804, Major General Alexander Hamilton. As an expression of their affectionate regard to his memory and of their deep respect for his loss, the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York have erected this monument.  

Interestingly, Burr had also been part of the Scottish-American community and was part of the same social circle as Hamilton, yet was politically opposed to him and, by extension, the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York. As such, he was never mentioned in the Scottish societies’ toasts, newspaper articles, or any other of their publications. In one newspaper article, the Society stated that the death of Hamilton ‘deprived America of her greatest pride and ornament’, while Burr was never mentioned.  

The same year that the monument was erected, Hamilton’s son, Alexander J. Hamilton, was elected 2nd Vice President. By doing so, A.J. Hamilton maintained his father’s legacy in the Society. In 1819 the only named Americans in the list of toasts were Washington, Hamilton, and former Society president, Dr. James Tillary, who had passed away the previous year. In 1821 ‘The Memories of Washington and Hamilton’ was toasted immediately before ‘The Memories of Bruce and Wallace’. In fact, every list of toast from 1819 onwards seems to include these two Federalist figures. Even during the Republican ascendency, the New York society never toasted any Republican figures. The office of ‘President of the United States’ was honoured, but the Society never mentioned by name any of the men who filled it.

---

38 Harlan Douglas Whatley, Duncan A. Bruce, and Randall Lenox Taylor (eds.), Two Hundred Fifty Years, 1756-2006: The History of Saint Andrew’s Society of The State of New York (New York: Printed by the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York, 2008), p. 49. The cenotaph is now on display at the New York Historical Society Museum. The first quote comes from its caption.  
39 New-York Gazette and General Advertiser, 2 December 1805. 
40 Ibid., 2 December 1806. 
41 New-York Commercial Advertiser, 1 December 1819. 
42 New-York Spectator, 4 December 1821.
While not as vocal in their support of Federalism, the St. Andrew’s Society of Albany obviously supported the St. Andrew’s Society of the State of New York’s creed. In 1804 the Albany society printed in the *Connecticut Herald* and the *Litchfield Monitor*:

Resolved unanimously, That in token of the sincere grief of the Society for the premature and untimely death of General ALEXANDER HAMILTON, and the high sense they entertain of his distinguished service to his country, as a Soldier and a Statesman; of the eminent virtues which adorn him as a man, a friend, and a citizen; and of the high respect in which he has justly been held by our sister Society of the city of New-York, of which he was one of its members, that they, at every meeting of the Society, for six months, shall appear with an appropriate badge of mourning.

Resolved, That the Reverend John M’Donald, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Ramsay, and Dr. M’Clelland, be a committee to prepare a respectful message of condolence to Gen. PHILIP SCHUYLER, the venerable and afflicted father-in-law of our dear deceased brother, expressive of the sympathy of this Society with him and his family in their irreparable loss; and that they convey the same in the most delicate manner to the General.43

The memory of Hamilton and Washington were also toasted periodically by the Albany society through this period of study. Again, no mention of any Democratic-Republican figures can be found in any of their published lists.

None of this is surprising, however, as the Federalist ideology suited the political and cultural aims of Scottish societies in New York State. Scottish societies in general were filled with landed elites, lawyers, professionals, and army officers based in urban centres, which were the archetypal Federalist and later Whig supporters. By toasting Washington and Hamilton both New York societies asserted their allegiance to the leading figures of the newly formed United States and their support of a strong central government, but also justified their continuation of
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43 *Connecticut Herald*, 14 August 1804; *Litchfield Monitor*, 15 August 1804.
British-like cultural celebrations and a cultural attachment to Scotland. They also would have voiced their support for the central bank, which would have greatly benefited individual members. Not only did Federalism fit the individual agendas of the members, but it also suited the collective identity they sought to express.

Toasts could also be used to voice specific regional concerns, rather than party allegiances. In 1802, for instance, numerous newspapers in at least four different states recorded that the St. Andrew’s Society of Lexington, Kentucky, raised their glasses to, ‘A candid interpretation, of the 22d article of the Spanish treaty, or (with regret) an explanation from the mouths of our guns.’ The Spanish treaty, in this instance, referred to Pinckney's Treaty of 1795, (also known as the Treaty of San Lorenzo), which secured Spanish recognition of the American border. The 22nd Article stated that the United States had full use of the port of New Orleans and ‘if [his Catholic Majesty] should not agree to continue it there, he will assign to them on another part of the banks of the Mississippi an equivalent establishment.’ In 1800, however, the Spanish returned Louisiana to the French through the secret Third Treaty of San Ildefonso, thus placing the United States’ use of the port of New Orleans in jeopardy. In 1802, the Spanish Intendant formerly suspended the United States’ use of the port without producing another in its stead, thus blocking American trade through the Mississippi River and causing a hostile diplomatic situation.


Printed in at least the Gazette of the United States, 22 December 1802; The Daily Advertiser, 24 December 1802; The Spectator, 25 December 1802; Columbian Courier, 31 December 1802; The Connecticut Centinel, 4 January 1803.


St. Andrew’s Society of Lexington’s engagement with this political issue suggests that the Society actively participated in frontier politics and saw itself as an important part of the burgeoning ‘national popular political culture’. It also suggests that the St. Andrew’s Society of Lexington’s members would have been directly affected by the obstacles to trade through the Mississippi, and so used the Society’s anniversary celebration as a means to make a strong and public statement of their feelings and intentions concerning this issue.

Of course, not all societies were as blatant in their political language as those in New York and Kentucky. Lists of toasts and the identity that they represented needed to be tempered for the audience with whom they were communicating. Mixed-party loyalties within Scottish societies also resulted in the toasting of ambiguous American symbols. The Savannah society, for instance, had to deal with much stronger anti-Scottish sentiments than those in the northern states. In fact, in 1782 the Georgia legislature enacted a law, which stated:

…no Person a Native of Scotland shall be permitted or allowed to emigrate into this State with intent to Settle with the same, or to carry on Commerce or other trade, Profession or business, but every such person being a Native of Scotland shall within three days after his arrival within this State be apprehended and Committed to Gaol there to remain without bail or mainprize until an opportunity offers of shipping or Transporting him to some part of the English King’s Dominions, which the Governor or Commander in Chief for the time being is hereby Authorized and Required to do. Nothing herein contained is to be construed to extend to such Persons, Natives of Scotland who have exerted themselves in behalf of the freedom and Independence of the United States in the Present contest, and who are entitled to the Rights of Citizenship in any or other of the United States.

As a result, the Society was much more concerned with presenting themselves as nonthreatening and unwaveringly loyal, than politically biased. They attempted to

---

alter the preconceptions of Georgian Scots’ national loyalties rather than express their party loyalties.

While the toasts given on the day were likely more detailed, the list of toasts published by the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston included only the shortened titles of the toasts, such as ‘The President of the United States’, ‘The Governor of the State’, ‘Peace amongst the Great Family of Mankind’. Specific politicians were only mentioned in the separate list of ‘volunteer’ toasts. By printing the toasts in this way, these named political figures were associated with the specific person who offered the toast, such as the Society’s officers, rather than the Society as a whole. In 1799, the City Gazette included a list of the songs that accompanied the toasts, which were also rather benign. The playing of ‘General Pinckney’s March’ with the toast to ‘The Governor of the state of South Carolina’, and ‘Washington’s March’ to accompany the toast to ‘The commander and chief of the American army’ were the only two songs that made any reference to specific figures. Even then, they referred to these figures’ wartime heroics rather than any political party affiliation. Charleston was a small Federalist stronghold within a widely Republican South Carolina. It would have been expedient for this society to maintain a very careful footing in terms of political expression.

During the War of 1812, toasts given by most Scottish societies became more America-centric, if recorded at all. It became expedient that they perform their total support for the United States and re-establish that, while Scottish, they were not threatening to the American establishment. In 1809, the St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore included the toasts, ‘May the Independence of the United States be preserved by the justice, and firmness of our government; and the spirit and union of the people’, ‘Peace and Amity with all nations on honorable terms’, ‘The Sons of St.
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51 For an example of this type of list see City Gazette and Daily Advertiser, 2 December 1795, 2 December 1797.
52 Ibid., 3 December 1799.
54 Those with Federalist leanings seem to have refrained from engaging in this political situation. The St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, for instance, printed only short statement saying that ‘national and patriotic toasts were drank ’ rather than their regular list of toasts in the newspapers between 1811-1816. I have not been able to find any list of toasts published by the St. Andrew’s Society of the State of New York during the War of 1812. Although the absence of material is not strong enough evidence to make a decisive claim, it would seem that they stayed away from engaging in this political discussion in order to maintain their perceived American loyalty.
Andrew throughout the world—May they never dishonour the country which gave them birth, nor disturb the government that affords them protection’. The Society only included three toasts dedicated to anything Scottish, cultural or otherwise. In 1813, the year the British Navy attacked Baltimore’s Fort McHenry, they included toasts, ‘To a speedy and honorable peace’, ‘The Army of the United States, may they realise the best hopes of their country’, ‘The Navy of the United States, Olde Ocean sounds its praise And the Lakes echo in chorus’, and ‘The Spirit of Toleration, May its benign influence prevail in our politics as it does in our religion’. Only one toast, to ‘The Land O’ Cakes’, was addressed to Scotland. In 1815, when the conflict was over, the toasts included ‘The Navy of the United States – The triumphant defenders of their country, the chastisers of Pirates, and emancipators of those whom they had enslaved’, ‘The Gallant Decatur – The hero of the Mediterranean, the consciousness that he has rescued many of his countrymen from falling [into] slavery is his happiness and his reward’ (which referred to Stephen Decatur’s heroic role in the First Barbary War during the first few years of the nineteenth century), ‘The Army of the United States – Citizens, who became soldiers in their country’s defence – Soldier, who proved themselves worthy to be citizens’, and ‘The blessings which result from Peace; among which the restoration of friendships and harmony between our Native & Adopted Countries, is not the least welcome’.

The toasts and their timing indicate that Scottish-American societies sought to assert themselves as fully American and supportive of the nation which ‘afford[ed] them protection’, as well as place themselves within the expanding American civil society. Even if the societies were against the War of 1812 and supported the British monarchy, Scottish societies knew better than to publicly profess those feelings. Instead, they either refrained from printing their toasts at all or performed an even stronger allegiance to the American cause and their desire for peace. Following the war, however, they quickly returned to either engaging with the American party system or the local political issues they saw as most pressing, and/or

55 St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore Minute Book (1806-1915), MSA, 30 November 1809.
56 Ibid., 30 November 1813.
57 Ibid., 30 November 1815.
58 Ibid., 30 November 1808, 1809, 1810, 1813.
asserting that they had no ‘national prejudices’, but were supportive of the ‘free and liberal country’ that allowed groups of Scots to associate.59

While some societies made deliberate statements of political alliance and asserted their public opinions throughout this period, the ultimate goal was not to cause political strife but to underscore Scottish-American societies’ participation in American civic culture. These associations wanted to be viewed as fully American and, at the same time, situate themselves the best they could in their regional environment. For the New York societies, the Federalist Party supported the agendas of their overwhelmingly professional and mercantile membership. For the Charleston society, the performance of ambiguous American loyalty allowed them to maintain an unthreatening persona in a politically disparate environment. Either way, it can be unequivocally stated that every Scottish society in America after the American War of Independence made a concerted effort to present themselves as American and an important part of American culture.

III

The way that Scottish clubs and societies in America toasted Scotland in the years following American independence was more uniform than the way that they toasted American national and regional interests. With the years surrounding the War of 1812 excluded, the Scottish cultural displays of dress, language, music, and literature became more frequent and pronounced. An attachment to the heritage of their ‘native land’ and the cultural differences between themselves and other ethnic groups in America started to be consistently expressed. In general, Scottish-American societies attempted to create an identity, which combined the priorities and political imperatives of America with the culture of Scotland.

Most societies began by toasting rather benign aspects of Scottish culture such as, ‘The Land o’ Cakes’, ‘Auld Reeky’, ‘the Thistle’, ‘Scotchmen’s Wives and Scotchmen’s Bairns, and those who lie in Scotchmen’s arms’, ‘All the Bonny Lasses that kiss amang the Heather’, and the ‘Beggar’s Benison’. They began to use Scots as a colloquial cultural expression of Scottishness, rather than as a practical or even

59 For an example of this, see Charleston Courier, 1818; Easterby, History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, South Carolina, p. 84.
idiomatic language. By 1815, Bruce and Wallace had become central figures to be toasted, Scottish folk songs were regularly sung, and the poetry of Ramsay, Burns, and Scott were consistently quoted, often together.

They continued to argue that their Scottishness made them the best Americans by drawing from contemporary expressions of identity used in the ‘mother country’. Learning, for instance, was an important aspect of Scottishness to commemorate, as its merits could be understood in an American setting. In his address to the Charleston St. Andrew’s Society, King stated, ‘the establishment of the Edinburgh Review alone, may almost be considered as a new era in literature…It has done more to enlighten the general mind, to diffuse knowledge in every branch of physical, moral, intellectual and political science, than any other work by which it was preceded.’ Indeed he went on to argue, ‘Scotland, within these last hundred years, had done more than any other nation in Europe. And all this glorious intellectual wealth, is well sustained by the moral and religious character of her people’. 60 The St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, which was also Federalist leaning, toasted in 1816, ‘Scotland’s Glory – Education to the poor, encouragement to the industrious, laurels to the brave, and honor to age’, and ‘The Constellation of Scottish Talent – Resplendent in history, divinity, moral philosophy, and poetry’. 61 Toasts to ‘Scotch knowledge’ were often coupled with toasts to Scottish industry and commerce. In 1804, the St. Andrew’s Society of New York included in their list of toasts, ‘May industry, economy and integrity, the characteristics of Scotchmen, never fail to supply them with a coat that dreads neither the cold nor the creditor, & with a cheerful board when frugality and hospitality shall preside’. 62

In his toast to the Scots Charitable Society in 1839, the Mayor of Boston, Samuel A. Eliot, stated:

Not merely do we derive some traits of character from the Scots, but some of our Institutions may be traced to the same origin. Especially I would mention our system of common schools, of which the prototype has long existed in Scotland, and which has
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60 King, Address Delivered in The First Presbyterian Church Before the St. Andrew’s Society of the City of Charleston (1829), p. 46-48.
61 Poulson’s American Daily Advertiser, 5 December 1816.
62 Commercial Advertiser, 8 December 1804; Spectator, 12 December 1804.
been modified here to meet the necessities of our situation. In
physical science, too, this country is peculiarly indebted to yours. 63

With only a few select exceptions, Scottish societies in America avoided
including references to specific Scottish events or political affairs, other than those
that concerned American interests. They began to draw from cultural displays of
Scottishness as presented by contemporary figures like Burns, Scott, Sinclair, Garth,
and Glengarry, and the Antiquarian, Highland, Burns, and even intellectual societies.
Yet, they used these symbols as a means to showcase Scotland’s inherent qualities,
which could be recognised as important to the budding United States rather than to
the United Kingdom or conservative politics. Those that could be seen as politically
subversive, such as the Highland regiments, were only celebrated once it was
politically safe to do so. In the 1780s and 90s, for instance, the regiments were one
of the most recognisable symbols of the British army and British loyalism. By the
mid-nineteenth century, however, the global symbol of Scottish culture and martial
prowess was no longer threatening to the United States but something that could be
used to celebrate Scots’ inherent heroism and brave character.

This expression of Scotland and Scottish ethnicity, which was expressed as
separate from English ethnicity, could easily be transferred to an American context.
Instead of showing their distinctiveness and usefulness within Great Britain, Scottish
ethnic societies could use romantic symbols employed in Scotland to express their
distinctiveness and usefulness within the United States. In fact, many of the Scottish
toasts were used to express very American priorities. Bruce and Wallace, for
instance, could stand for independence generally (rather than specifically Scotland’s
independence from England), which resonated quite clearly in the United States. 64
Toasting the Treaty of Union between Scotland and England in 1707 symbolised
Scottish unionism which, when understood in the context of unionism which had
been expressed in America since Franklin’s 1754 Join or Die campaign, could
suggest that Scots were able to work within and indeed support a union among the

63 The Celebration of the CLXXXII’d Anniversary of the Scots’ Charitable Society, on St. Andrew’s
Day, November 30, 1839 (Boston, 1840), pp. 17-18.
64 For more information on the role William Wallace has played in Scottish national sentiment see
American states. In addition, following the publication of Scott’s *Waverley* novels, Scotland’s Jacobite past then current unionism could be used to show that a leopard could indeed change its spots and a glorious Scottish past could be transformed to fit a unionist and politically beneficial present. In the same vein, by the early nineteenth century, it was not considered paradoxical to include ‘Flora McDonald’, the woman who carried Charles Edward Stuart to Skye following the battle of Culloden and ‘The 1st of May, 1707’, the day the Treaty of Union was signed, in the same list of toasts.65 These types of Scottish toasts, when given in the United States, allowed Scottish-American societies to attach themselves to Scotland culturally, while at the same time avoid being viewed as politically dangerous in the now independent country. The societies carefully placed themselves within a cultural rather than political framework of Scottishness, which could be understood by most Americans.

‘The King of Great Britain’ was included in published lists of toasts by almost every Scottish association as early as the 1790s. This would seem to counter the argument that Scots were attempting to separate themselves from the British nation, state, and monarchy. These societies, however, never toasted the King without also including a toast to the President of the United States. The combination of the King and President should be understood in the same context as the combination of the toasts to ‘the land we live in’ and ‘the land o’ cakes’, or ‘the mother country’ and ‘the adopted nation’. Scots were attempting to create an identity that combined Scottish and American symbols. The British state, parliament, and prime minister were never toasted, while the United States of America and its government were always mentioned. The King, in this instance, could be seen as a symbol of culture rather than political allegiance, or perhaps an adherence to anti-radical and pro-Church ideologies, which were political, just not dangerously political. This combination of toasts could also be an indication of the societies’ political support for the alliance between the United States and Great Britain, which was an important Federalist rallying point. Either way, it should not have been viewed as a sign of anti-American sentiment.

Indeed, Scottish societies asserted that by maintaining an ethnic and cultural attachment to Scotland, they were better able to be loyal and devoted citizens of the

65 *New-York Evening Post*, 1 December 1802.
United States, perhaps the most loyal and devoted of all ethnic groups. In an address given at the funeral of the Saint Andrew’s Society of the State of New York’s late president, Dr. Tillary, David Hosack stated, ‘As a citizen of this republic, I may venture to say, that while he remembered with becoming feelings the land of his forefathers, he possessed an ardent attachment to his adopted country.’ 66 In the anniversary speech given by Mitchell King in 1829, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, the Society president stated:

...Scotchmen are often accused of being too national; that is, in the sense in which the word is used as a term of vituperation, they are so much devoted to their native country-they remember it with so intense a regard, that they cannot be sincerely attached to another…If such a one could forget the land of his birth…He would be unworthy of being called a man. He would be utterly unworthy of being a Scotchman-utterly unworthy of belonging to any country, and much more of becoming a citizen of a free and enlightened republic. No; the true hearted Scotchman, he who is worthy of the name, who is worthy of his native country, will fondly cherish the memory of his early affections. He will be proud of being national…. But he will also dedicate himself with a sacred devotion to the duties by which he is surrounded... He will endeavour, by every means in his power, to promote the well being and prosperity of the community of which he is a member. He will preserve his pledged faith with inviolable fidelity; and in the hour of peril he will maintain that faith with his fortune and his life. 67

The same sentiment was expressed in 1839 at the 182nd anniversary of the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston by a representative of the Irish Charitable Society, Daniel O’Callaghan, who stated, ‘It has been said, that in this, our adopted country, such sentiments would be a divided allegiance. But sir, I love my wife, but I must reverence my mother; and its an old adage, that a bad son never made a good husband.’ 68

These societies also combined their Scottish and American toasts in order to make this point even more clear. In 1801, for instance, The St. Andrew’s Society of
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66 Hosack, A Funeral Address, p. 10.
67 King, Address Delivered in The First Presbyterian Church Before the St. Andrew’s Society of the City of Charleston (1829), pp. 52-54.
68 The Celebration of the CLXXXII’d Anniversary of the Scots’ Charitable Society (1840), p. 23.
the State of New York toasted, ‘May the Sons of St. Andrew ever support the
government of the United States, as their ancestors eminently did that of their native
land’. In 1809, members of the St. Andrew’s Society of Albany raised their glasses
to ‘May loyalty to the mother country give place to fealty in our adopted’.
The same society in 1815 toasted, ‘The American Eagle—may it be supported by the
Scotch thistle, as long as it continues in the path of justice and honor.’
Furthermore, almost immediately following the end of the War of 1812, Scottish
associations in America reverted back to toasting Scotland and Scottish symbols. By
expressing their Scottish identity in this way, Scottish ethnic societies were able to
present themselves as culturally Scottish, supportive of an alliance between the
United States and Great Britain, but at the same time American by nationality and
political loyalty. Again, they used the ‘Scottishness’ performed in the homeland, but
manipulated it for their own uses. For, as a poem written specifically for the St.
Andrew’s Society of Baltimore’s anniversary dinner held in 1826 stated:

But whilst you think on Scotia’s worth,
       Columbia still shall have your voice;
For, though Old Scotia gave you birth,
       You are Columbia’s son from choice.
May Scotsmen, whereso’er they roam,
       To this lov’d land their footsteps bend,
‘Tis here that worth will find a home,
       And here will merit find a friend.

IV

It is important to note at this point that Scottish societies were not the only
ethnic associations that publicly professed a certain kind of ethnic identity. Irish,
Welsh, English, and German societies (to name a few) were just as active as Scottish
associations, and were established along a similar time frame, with the exception of
the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston. The Society of Ancient Britons, which later
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69 *New-York Evening Post*, 1 December 1801.
70 *Albany Register*, 8 December 1809.
71 Ibid., 12 December 1815.
72 *Baltimore Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, 4 December 1826.
became the Welsh Society of Philadelphia, was established as early as 1729, eighteen years before the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, but the same year as the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston. The St. George’s Society of Charleston was founded as early as 1733.

In 1787, the founder of the St. George’s Society of New York, under the pseudonym A.B., wrote in the *Pennsylvania Packet*:

> Being a great advocate for Societies, part of whose aim is to relieve the necessitous: I was pleased with the account given of the last anniversary of the St. Andrew’s society at New-York…Now as we find the emigrants from other countries have similar Societies, it has struck me, that if Englishmen and Anglo Americans were to meet on St. George’s day annually, with the same view as the members of the St. Andrew’s Society, It would be equally commendable in them: peace having spread her ample wings over both countries…It is also submitted, whether we should not have a set of form toasts, suited to the nature of our Society, as formed of Englishmen and Anglo-Americans. I would however preserve a brotherly attention to the toasts of the St. Andrew’s Society, with some small variations.  

A.B. suggested here that the St. George’s Society and the St. Andrew’s Society were part of a separate yet united ethnic community. The St. George’s Society and the Welsh Society of Philadelphia often met at the same taverns as the St. Andrew’s Society and even enjoyed the same dinners. Many of the ethnic societies’ presidents attended each other’s anniversary celebrations and participated in their toasting and entertainment. In 1832, Mr. Kelsey of the St. George’s Society of Charleston even toasted, ‘The Memory of Robert Burns – “What bird for beauty, flight or song, Can with the bard compare; He sang as sweet, and soar’d as strong As any child of air.”’

Before the Revolution, ethnic societies rarely referenced other ethnic groups in colonial America. After the Revolution, however, ethnic societies began to publicise that they worked within an ethnic associational network. In 1790, for instance, the Hibernian Society of Boston printed in the *Massachusetts Centinel*:
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73 *Pennsylvania Packet*, 11 January 1787. Although this was published in 1787, the Society was founded in 1770.
74 *Southern Patriot*, 26 April 1832.
As no object can be more laudable, so, to a benevolent mind, none can be more grateful, than the relief of distress: Perhaps no institution can afford a more ample scope for the effectuation of this purpose than the national societies established in this country, for the protection of those emigrants whom misery, misfortune, or oppression has compelled to forsake their native country, and fly to the “asylum” established here “for the oppressed of all nations.”…These reasons and others equally forcible, have induced a number of gentlemen, natives of Ireland, or descendants of Irishmen, to associate themselves under the title of the “Hibernian Society for the protection of the Irish Emigrant.”75

Most of these societies, apart from celebrating a particular national identity, continued to promote the common goal of supporting migrants who were in need of financial assistance. They, therefore, began to use this community of ethnic societies in order to claim that ethnic exclusivity was natural and was the best way to provide for migrants in need. By doing so, ethnic societies, especially those associated with Ireland, were also able to respond to strong American anti-immigration sentiments, which would later culminate in the formation of the nativist Know Nothing Party.76

Scottish societies were no exception. They made sure that they were seen within this network of ethnic associations, and made calculated decisions influenced by the actions of other like-associations. In 1820, the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia recorded in their minutes:

It was stated to the meeting by some of the members present that the Hibernian Society had agreed that their officers should decline attending in the customary manner the meeting of the other benevolent Societies at their anniversaries. This Society taking into consideration the present pressure of the times and the necessity of Husbanding the resources of the Society as much as possible to meet the demands on them, it was resolved that the officers of the Society should ascertain before the next meeting whether the Hibernian Society had come to a resolution as stated,

75 Massachusetts Centinel, 24 March 1790.
and that then the Society should then determine on the propriety of their adopting a similar resolution.\(^{77}\)

Yet, they also made it clear that they were separate organisations, which worked independently. This was the case between ethnic associations as well as between different Scottish societies. While Scottish societies were influenced by other ethnic groups, their stated toasts and public performances were ultimately their own. They, for instance, did not subscribe to the often militant hatred of the English by the Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia. Nowhere in the records of the early American Scottish associations do you find words that rival the statement made in the *Weekly Aurora* in regards to the St. Patrick’s Day celebration held by the Sons of St. Patrick in 1813:

> The war with Great Britain, is well adapted to call forth the feelings of an ardent and gallant people, whose progenitors for six ages have borne the most intense and unintermitted tyranny that the annals of mankind can furnish any account of…those people with the remembrance of suffering, the recollections of their kindred, and that hereditary hatred which it is impossible to eradicate from the human mind, when it is produced by the feeling legendary record and the presence of corroborative misery, insult, and degrading insolence; such feelings must be acutely awakened by a war between the enemy of their ancestors and their adopted country.\(^ {78}\)

In contrast Scottish societies spoke in terms of American liberty and American accomplishments. Indeed they often toasted and celebrated the English in America and their philanthropic endeavours. That being said, the Hibernian Society of Philadelphia (whose anniversary celebration was recorded directly after the quote above in the *Weekly Aurora*) was much more in keeping with the loyal, yet subtly political toasts given by Scottish associations.\(^ {79}\)

The ‘ethnic competition’ described by Bueltmann and MacRaild was truly alive during this period although not explicitly stated.\(^ {80}\) The English and the Irish
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\(^ {77}\) St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1786-1833), APS, 31 October 1820.

\(^ {78}\) *Weekly Aurora*, 23 March 1813, p. 383.

\(^ {79}\) Ibid.

maintained ethnic hostilities more so than any other two associational groups (or at least those of British origin). The militancy of the Irish against the English societies’ attachment to the British monarchy and empire rather than the American republic was extreme. The Scots, while still the victims of attacks for being too ‘national’, made sure to respond to these claims in the manner described above in order to avoid the vitriolic attacks made against the English.

The term ‘English’ was often used synonymously with ‘British’. As such, the Scottish societies used their public identity to separate themselves from the British Empire and monarchy in a way that they English were unable to do. Even though the Scots consistently toasted the King of Great Britain, they were able to maintain a cultural separation from Britishness by drawing from the romantic imagery and symbolism used contemporarily by Scots in Scotland. They also only attached themselves to ‘Britishness’ when it was politically safe and/or useful to do so. Unlike the English, they were also quite successful at breaking away from the British ‘imperial nationalism’, which was beginning to be expressed by British ethnic associations including Scottish societies in other parts of the globe, as it could not exist in the same way in the United States. They were able to present themselves as Anglo-Protestant, yet not English, and Celtic, but not Irish.

V

The identity expressed by these associations and perpetuated throughout the United States, was a conscious response to the external factors at play in the early republic and the place Scots held in that environment. The toasts given by Scottish societies between 1783 and c.1830 demonstrate that, following the American War of Independence, it became increasingly clear to these associations that by integrating Scottish cultural performance with expressions of American patriotism, and in some cases partisanship, Scottish societies could maintain their original creed to protect destitute Scots, maintain a cultural link with the homeland, and assert the notion that Scottish associations did not pose a threat to the newly formed United States. By creating published slates of toasts which engaged with the United States’ present
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political situation and Scotland’s cultural accomplishments, these societies attempted to influence the American political situation, present themselves as part of American’s burgeoning civil society, support the political affiliations and personal agendas of their members, as well as situate themselves in their regional environment. Moreover, by positioning themselves as distinct, yet also part of a larger ethnic associational community, they were able to legitimise their existence and their celebration of a specific ethnic identity, as well as maintain ethnic autonomy.

Ultimately, however, while they expressed a very different version of Scottish identity than their counterparts in Scotland, they still followed the same process in its construction. They used Scottish clubs and societies in order to make the Scots in America into a distinctive community, but also one that fit within wider political and social constructs. They situated Scottishness within an American context in the same way that Scots in Scotland situated themselves within a British context. As such, the identity they performed, in many ways, was just as legitimate and had the same foundation as those identities performed by associations in Scotland. It simply followed a different ‘national’ trajectory.
‘Most Authentic Materials’: Associational Material Culture and Scottish Identity in Scotland and America, c.1750-1832

I consider Scotland my native country as a rude but noble medallion of antient sculpture which ought not to be defaced or forgotten in the Cabinet of Nations because it lay next to one more beautiful & splendid richer and larger, more polished, and elegant, but of less relief.¹

- David Steuart Erskine, 11th Earl of Buchan (1784)

The last four chapters evaluated the origins of the transatlantic Scottish associational phenomenon. They demonstrated that Scottish associations proved essential in shaping Scottish identities that were distinct, while at the same time engaged with the specific social, political, and economic contexts of Britain and America in which they were expressed, resulting in a divergence in expression. Through the evaluation of the ways in which Scottish associations in both Scotland and America from c.1750-1832 used and manipulated material culture in order to underscore their authority and shape Scottish identity, this chapter continues as support for this argument.

The study of Scottish material culture has gained momentum in the last few decades. As Pittock has argued, many historians now recognise that Scotland was ‘the first nation to locate itself not only by but through artefacts’.² Historians of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scotland have examined the ways in which tartan, portraits, print collecting, architecture, and even foods shaped Scotland’s identity.³ Yet, the study of the link between Scottish associational uses of material

¹ Buchan, Anniversary Discourse, NLS, 15 November 1784.
culture and its importance in Scottish identity formation is still in its infancy.\textsuperscript{4} Pittock and Whatley have examined some of the paraphernalia of Burns clubs.\textsuperscript{5} Their analysis, however, is part of a wider study on the general material culture surrounding the memory of the bard and tends to focus on the period after c.1850. The only analytical studies of associational material culture during this period are Pittock’s brief evaluation of the material culture of Jacobite clubs and Andrews’ examination of the Select Society and Poker Club’s use of alcohol for political purposes.\textsuperscript{6} Historians have yet to realise that through the evaluation of the goods purchased, produced, and disseminated by Scottish associations, one can begin to understand the great lengths that these societies went to in order to increase their reputations, construct and perform Scottish identity, and disseminate that identity to their members and the outside world.

To begin, this chapter evaluates Scottish associational engagement with the world of print, describing how the brand, material, size, quality, and quantity of their printed outputs helped shape the associations’ reputations and thus the reputations of the communities they wished to represent, i.e. the Scots or Scottish-Americans. Next, it evaluates what I have deemed ‘objects of authority’, such as transactions, badges, seals, and medals, and the images depicted on them. By doing so, it examines the associational use of objects to underscore their legitimacy and power over Scotland’s identity and the incorporation of graphic design and visual imagery as a means of reinforcing specific versions of that identity. Finally, this chapter examines the symbolic value of the food and drink consumed by associations and the communal vessels used to assist in said consumption. It demonstrates the ways in which societies used certain foods and containers to further promote a collective


\textsuperscript{5} The exception to this rule is in the historiography of punchbowls. See, for example, Erik Frederick Gollannek, ‘“Empire Follows Art”: Exchange and the Sensory Worlds of Empire in Britain and its Colonies, 1740-1775’ (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation: University of Delaware, 2008), pp. 217-221.

Scottish identity amongst club members as well as proclaim that identity to the outside world.

Rather than separate the ways in which associations in Scotland and America used materials to shape Scottish identities, this chapter takes a more general approach by discussing Scottish associations in Scotland and America together, noting any differences between them along the way. By taking this approach, this chapter underscores the importance of material culture for Scottish associations on both sides of the Atlantic as well as demonstrates their shared experience of identity construction and expression. At the same time it determines the ways in which they varied as a result of their distinctive environments. Ultimately, however, this chapter argues that all of the Scottish associations studied here deliberately engaged with the growing ‘world of goods’ in order to promote the priorities of their members and, in turn, create Scottish (Scoto-British, Scoto-British-American, or Scottish-American) reputations and identities.

I

Eighteenth-century Britain and her American colonies underwent a ‘print explosion’ in the eighteenth century.\(^7\) Not only did Britons in both places print more books, but they also bought, borrowed, and read more books. The average person became much more engaged with the literary outputs of the intellectual elites.\(^8\) In these newly commercialised societies, books also became a commercial commodity as well as a means of transmitting ideas. The books owned and displayed in libraries, both public and private, reflected the social status of the owners, their interests, their masculinity (or femininity), and their expendable income.\(^9\) As Altick has argued, a merchant’s clerk in the eighteenth century ‘would have to choose between buying a newly published quarto volume and a good pair of breeches…, or

---


\(^8\) Towsey, *Reading the Scottish Enlightenment*.

between a volume of essays and month’s supply of tea and sugar”. The buying and commissioning of printed items served as a tool to mark out the genteel elite. Scottish and Scottish-American associations, both colonial and national, fully engaged with this expanding medium of material expression and used it to their advantage.

First, Scottish societies, especially those in nineteenth-century Scotland, acted as consumers of printed materials. They collectively bought and displayed books in order to better their reputations. The same commentators who noted society buildings, for instance, also commented on the societies’ libraries. The section on the ‘Literary and Scientific Debating Societies’ in the *Edinburgh Literary Journal* printed in 1823, described the Royal Medical Society as having an ‘extensive and well-managed medical library and museum, which is daily increasing’, and the Royal Physical Society as having ‘a very good hall on Richmond Street, and a small library’. The transactions of the Highland Society of Scotland, published in 1824, included an entire section on the Society’s library and its new acquisitions. Indeed, it included a section, which stated:

The Society have now purchased premises for a Hall, and to afford the additional accommodations which the extension of its business requires, sufficient provision has been made in the arrangement of the new building, for the library of the Society, with a view as well to its present extent as to its progressive enlargement.
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11 Towsey, *Reading the Scottish Enlightenment*, p. 28.
These libraries acted as a symbol of prudent learning, masculine intellect, and the opportunities Scotland proffered. After describing the Royal Medical Society’s library, the author of the New Picture of Edinburgh (1816) came to the conclusion, ‘It is not at all surprising, that so many gentlemen repair to Edinburgh to prosecute their medical studies, since it is a place where they can enjoy such incomparable advantages’.

More importantly, Scottish societies also became producers of print. As early as the mid-eighteenth century, societies began to collect subscriptions or draw from society treasuries in order to have books and documents published and printed. In 1733, the Medical Society, which later became the Edinburgh Philosophical Society, printed the first volume of their Medical Essays and Observations. In 1759, the Glasgow Literary Society had Robert and Andrew Foulis print Essays; Read to a Literary Society; at their Weekly Meetings within the College, at Glasgow. In 1731, the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston commissioned the printing of their first rulebook. By the mid-nineteenth century, book printing of this kind had become commonplace amongst voluntary associations of all varieties in both Scotland and America. The reputation and authority of post-1790s Scottish enlightenment associations began to rely heavily on the amount of printed material they produced. When describing the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, for instance, The New Picture of Edinburgh (1816) stated, ‘they have a museum of ancient coins, armour, &c. but only one volume of their transactions has been published’. In contrast, when describing the Royal Society of Edinburgh, the author wrote, ‘the volumes of their transactions which have been laid before the public reflect great honour on the society’. Similarly, in regards to the Horticultural Society, ‘six numbers of their memoirs are already before the public, which are highly interesting’.

15 While private and intellectual libraries were masculine spaces, circulating libraries could also be feminine. For more on libraries as a contested space see Jacqueline Pearson, Women’s Reading in Britain, 1740-1835: A Dangerous Recreation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 152-175.
16 The New Picture of Edinburgh (1816), p. 120.
17 Medical Essays and Observations (1733).
18 Essays; Read to a Literary Society; at their Weekly Meetings; within the College, at Glasgow (Glasgow, 1759).
19 Rules of the St. Andrew’s Club at Charles-Town South Carolina (1731).
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
Newspapers and magazines provided the most effective means through which Scottish societies in both Scotland and America communicated with the wider public. They reached a large number and wide variety of people. Newspapers by their nature, however, only provided limited space in which the societies could express themselves and assert their goals (spoken or unspoken) even after the development of editorial style articles from the c.1790s. The articles concerning voluntary societies, especially in the earlier period, were often crammed between other articles on different subjects and advertisements.\footnote{See Figure 1.1.} As stated by the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh, ‘there is only one inconvenience attending the plan of the Scotch Society – namely, that papers thus published are not so generally noticed in the periodicals, as if they appeared in a volume of original matter.’\footnote{‘Transactions of the Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh’, in James Johnson and Henry James Johnson (eds.), \textit{The Medico-Chirurgical Review, and Journal of Practical Medicine}, Vol. XXII (London, 1835), p. 429.} In addition, articles had to fit house styles and were printed on paper of a standard size and of a quality chosen by the printer. The physical newspaper, therefore, did not materially represent the societies that they discussed – rather the material medium represented itself.

Once an association began to commission the making of objects, including but not limited to printed works, they entered the expanding consumer world where modishness and expense played a significant role. The shape, quality, and ‘brand’ of these items influenced the way the associations were viewed by the members and potential members as well as those in the outside community who had access to the material. On 30 November 1751, a committee of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia commissioned to update the rules even finished their report by stating:

\[
\text{…as every Thing of this kind, exposed to the view of the World in Print, ought, for the Honour of the Society, to appear to the best Advantage, the Committee humbly beg leave to recommend it to the Society that they would be pleased to put the correction of the Press under the Inspection of some proper Persons, such as they shall think fit to appoint for that purpose.}\footnote{St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, 30 November 1751.} \]
If the works were not presented in a suitable manner, the ‘honour’ of the society or the reputation of the members could lose credibility. As Scottish associations of all varieties sought to present a representational identity, which situated Scotland with a particular class of people – usually the professionals and aristocracy – they understandably paid attention not only to the words they printed, but also to the style in which they were printed and the physical pages on which they were printed. Indeed, most societies put together committees in order to ensure that their printed materials reflected their desired reputation. The Royal Society of Edinburgh explicitly stated in their rules, ‘the secretary and treasurer of the Society shall select by Ballot and arrange the papers which they shall deem worthy of publication in the name of the Society, and shall superintend the printing and publication’.26

The quality of the materials used to print the books and documents reflected on the societies’ status, expendable income, and even political leanings, particularly if they were ‘printed for the society’, meaning at the association’s expense. Paper was a precious commodity, especially in the American colonies.27 According to a Franklin & Hall bill, the St. Andrew’s Society rulebooks printed in 1751 were printed on ‘fine demi writing Paper’.28 Demy was the most common sized paper used by printers in Britain, but it was one of the largest sizes used in the colonies. Franklin never printed any work on paper larger than demy size between the years 1728-1766.29 They were also fairly expensive to print. According to the same bill, this one batch of rulebooks cost the Society £6.10.0 – the equivalent of £553.54 today.30

The bindings on society books varied. According to Franklin & Hall’s bill, they delivered the rulebooks bound in ‘blue paper’.31 Similarly in 1810, the St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore ordered ‘one hundred and fifty copies of the list of members printed, and one hundred and fifty copies of the Constitution stitched in

28 Franklin and Hall Payment, 1750-1753, Records of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, MSS 142, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 1, Folder 2, Item 23, SAS.
29 Amory, ‘Reinventing the Colonial Book’, p. 54.
31 Franklin and Hall Payment, 1750-1753, SAS.
bleu paper, for the use of the members’. The paper coverings did not necessarily denote cheapness. Most works throughout this period in both Scotland and America were purchased in paper-covered board. If an individual, bookseller, or institution desired to have a grander binding, they commissioned their own. The rulebooks, transactions, and society documents may not have remained in their original paper coverings. Individual members may have rebound their rules to give them more prominence in their libraries. Those who purchased the transactions and memoirs may have done the same thing. The high quality paper used to print the books, rulebooks especially, suggests that the societies did not expect those who owned them to treat them as throwaway items.

The audience and purpose of Scottish associational books also varied. Many of the books written and printed by Scottish clubs, particularly those in America, had an ostensibly private purpose. Rulebooks and membership lists, at least in theory, acted as vehicles through which the members could access the societies’ internal structure. These books, however, still had a significant social life. The print runs of rulebooks often outnumbered the number of members. On 30 May 1752, the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia recorded, ‘That a new Edition of the Laws (consisting of 300 Copies) should be forthwith Printed’, yet only 144 honorary and regular members are included on the 1751 membership list. Similarly, in 1769 the same society ordered ‘five hundred copies printed’, yet they only listed 243 members in the book. When Dr. Alexander Hamilton visited the Scots’ Charitable Society of Boston in 1744 he was ‘presented with a copy of their laws’. While Hamilton did not have any immediate need for the laws as he did not join the society or attend more than one meeting, it provided him with an indication of the Society’s purpose, structure, and status. As already mentioned, the societies took great pains to write ‘advertisements’ which certainly were directed toward a public audience.
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32 St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore Minute Book (1806-1915), MSA, 8 February 1810.
34 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, 30 May 1752; Rules for the St. Andrew’s Society in Philadelphia (1751), pp. 14-16.
36 *Itinerarium*, p. 275.
As Scottish societies in Scotland included philosophical, cultural, and improving associations, they regularly published books for outside distribution and sale. These books served the stated purpose of informing the public of the societies’ benevolent works, improvements, intellectual discoveries, and ‘Scottish’ identity. The societies, along with their publishers (if they did not pay for the printing themselves), therefore, carefully shaped these books to attract a large yet respectable audience. Transactions, accounts, or reports, for example, usually came in the user-friendly and standard octavo size. While not cheap, they were not overly expensive. The *Prize Essays and Transactions of the Highland Society of Scotland*, printed in 1803, sold for £1.3.0, which equates to approximately £39 today. It follows that those that sought to influence the masses or to present a reformist agenda, particularly in Scotland after c.1790, made their publications less expensive and smaller in size. The preface to the second volume of the *Glasgow Mechanics’ Magazine*, for instance, stated:

The benefits resulting to all classes of society, and particularly to artizans, from the weekly publication of such a work as ours, are already too well known, and too highly appreciated, to require any farther illustration from us. Its cheapness is of great importance to those whose desire for knowledge is beyond their means of attaining it in more bulky and more expensive works: the smallness of its size entices many to read, who from want of time or inclination, seldom think of opening a large book; and it has all the advantages of a larger journal, as it is read, by those who prefer it, either in a monthly, or quarterly parts. It is, besides, “the cheapest and best got up” publication of the kind which has yet appeared.

As Keen has argued, the societies along with the printers and publishers that worked with them, shaped their books to fit the markets in which they were sold and to reach the correct clientele.
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37 Sher, *Enlightenment and the Book*, p. xxv.
Like rulebooks, Scottish associations also circulated gratis copies of their public material to important institutions and individuals, again to underscore their legitimacy and disseminate indicators of their respectable identity and thus Scotland’s respectable identity. In 1827 the Bannatyne Club instituted a rule, which stated, ‘Each Member of the Club shall receive one of every such Work, free of all charge: The remaining copies to be at the disposal of the Club, as donations to such Libraries, and private individuals, as shall be approved by the Committee.’41 In 1782 it was moved by the Earl of Buchan at a Society of Antiquaries of Scotland meeting that, ‘Copies of Mr. Smellies publication [The Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland] should be circulated to the Foreign Members, to certain publick Libraries to the Honble. Mr. Horace Walpole, and other eminent English Antiquaries, and that the Secretary do make out a List of such as should be supplied by the Society.’42 Societies also advertised that they commissioned their own books in newspapers and magazines in order to serve the same purpose. In the ‘Account of the Rise and Establishment of the Highland Society of Scotland’, the Society took pride in stating that ‘In 1799, the Society published a volume of memoirs in one vol. 8vo.’.43 The first Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh boasted that their claimed predecessor, the Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, published transactions in ‘1754, under the title Essays and Observations, Physical and Literary; the second volume was published in 1756, and the third in 1771’.44

The connection between the societies’ printed books and ‘Scottishness’, or the Scots’ loyalty to Britain or America did not go unstated. Each Scottish association argued that they printed books for the good of the nation, or at the very least to inform the public of the good the Society was doing for the nation – be that Scotland, Britain, or America. The Highland Society of Scotland for instance, stated in their Transactions published in 1816, ‘the following short account of its proceedings will enable the public to appreciate the value of its inquiries and

42 Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Minute Book (1780-1782), APS, 26 March 1782.
exertions’. Similarly, the St. Andrew’s Society of New York explained, ‘Every institution calculated for the charitable Relief and Assistance of our Fellow Creatures in Want and Distress, is certainly commendable; such, it is hoped, the St. Andrew’s Society of New-York, will be acknowledged, by all who candidly peruse the subsequent Rules of their Institution.’

Some societies also stated that one of the benefits of voluntary associations was their ability to print papers, when individuals could not. The Medico-Chirurgical Society of Edinburgh began its first Transactions by stating:

> The Members of the Medical Profession in this country, are now generally aware of the advantages which result from associations of medical men, intended for the communication of facts, and the interchange of opinions on medical subjects, and for the collection and preservation of important practical observations, so frequently made by gentlemen whose avocations do not permit them to undertake separate publications.

Historical printing societies began to form in Scotland in the 1820s in order to privately print rare manuscripts connected to Scotland’s history. In a Quarterly Review article, Scott argued, ‘the members of the Bannatyne Club, in some degree, waive their own claims of individual distinction, and lessen the value of their private collection’. They claimed that their physical printing of books provided a national service. Indeed, Scott argued that the members were ‘Scotsmen before [they] were bibliomaniacs’.

Yet, this ‘national good’ argument only told one side of the story. As with all identity expressions, the individuals expressing it needed to benefit. The Bannatyne Club, for instance, limited the number of copies printed in order to retain the scarcity of the material. Owning one of the society’s original print copies gave the owner a level of importance and status. According to one of its early rules, ‘the impression of
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such Work shall never exceed Eighty-four copies’. They also used a variety of paper qualities in order to keep down costs as well as to demarcate who had access to the highest quality prints. According to their rules:

…when Works intended to be printed, are of such importance or magnitude as to render it inexpedient to confine their circulation within the Club, it shall be optional to have an extra impression thrown off, on a paper differing in size and quality from that which is made up of for the copies intended for the Members.

In 1825, the Club printed Thomas Thomson’s edition of *The Historie and Life of King James the Sext*. According to a catalogue of books, ‘Fifty-two copies were printed for the Club; and one hundred and fifty, on paper of different and inferior quality, for sale.’ While announcing that they served the historical needs of Scotland by circulating ‘important’ historical tracts, they also promoted the individual prestige of the members’ private collections. This served the dual role of maintaining the scarcity of the manuscript while also bringing it to the attention of the public, thus enhancing its cultural value.

The printers, publishers, and booksellers that societies used cannot be neglected as they played a significant role in the reputation of the items they printed and thus the societies that authored them. Many Scottish associations, particularly those in Scotland, solicited printers, publishers and booksellers associated with a particular genre to deal with their works. The Edinburgh Philosophical Society had their *Essays and Observations* printed by Hamilton & Balfour and included the statement ‘Printers of the University’ on the title page imprint, which connected the Society’s transactions with those printed by the University. The Highland Society of Scotland included in their *Report of the Committee of the Highland Society of
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51 James Maidment (ed.), *Notices Relative to the Bannatyne Club, Instituted in February, M.DCCC.XXIII. Including Critiques of Some of its Publications*. (Edinburgh, 1836), p. 161; In their first set of rules, the Bannatyne Club stated that the public impressions needed to be ‘of most advantage to the General Fund’. ‘Rules of the Bannatyne Club’, in Abbotsford Club Minute Book (1833), NLS.
54 *Essays and Observations* (1754), title page.
Scotland, Appointed to Inquire into the Nature and Authenticity of the Poems of Ossian a list of the other ‘Scottish’ books published by Archibald Constable & Co. Edinburgh, further situating the Society’s published works as part of the Constable & Co. brand.55 This included ‘The POEMS OF OSSIAN’, ‘PRIZE ESSAYS and TRANSACTIONS of the HIGHLAND SOCIETY of SCOTLAND’, ‘The HISTORY of SCOTLAND’, ‘OBSERVATIONS on the PRESENT STATE of the HIGHLANDS of SCOTLAND’, ‘The HISTORY of the ORKNEY ISLANDS’, and ‘The FARMERS MAGAZINE’.56 The imprint of the same work also stated in a conspicuous type ‘Printed at the University Press’.57 Some societies even appointed specific ‘printers to the society’, to deal with their various publications, further giving their societies a professional and institutional identity.58

Furthermore, Scottish societies invited those associated with the book trade to join them as members, or gave their business to the printers who already were members of the societies. Franklin & Hall worked as the printers of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia. David Hall was a founding member of the Society. Similarly, James Crockatt (who the Society described in their membership list as their ‘Bibliopol ad Societ’) acted as printer for the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston.59 The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland when limiting their number of members stated, ‘this number to be exclusive of the officers of the Society, the Booksellers, Printers, Printsellers, and Painters and Engravers, thereunto association by Membership’.60 This supported the mutually beneficial relationship between associations and printers. The association gained a credible printer or publisher who promoted their work, and the publisher benefited economically as well as socially from printing the work of a society whose work and identity they supported.

In order to influence the way that the outside world viewed the societies and Scotland, associations also solicited booksellers in other cities. The second edition of the Medical Essays and Observations printed for the Edinburgh Philosophical

56 Ibid., pp. 1-2.
57 Ibid., title page.
58 See, for example, MacKenzie, Prize Essays and Transactions of the Highland Society of Scotland (1799), title page.
60 Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Minute Book (1780-1782), APS, 18 December 1780.
Society in 1737 listed booksellers in Edinburgh, London, Dublin, Glasgow, and Amsterdam on its imprint. A minute for a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland in March 1782 stated, ‘Mr Smellie moved that Mr Thomas Caddell[sic] Bookseller in London should be recommended to the Society to be appointed their Bookseller in London which was agreed to’. This both expanded the possible reading audience as well as gave the Society more social clout by having a wider distribution, especially in Britain’s capital city. As Sher argues, the house of William Strahan and Thomas Cadell was the foremost publisher of the works associated with the Scottish Enlightenment. Having Cadell as their bookseller gave the Society of Antiquaries the same imprint as the work of David Hume, Adam Smith, and William Robertson. The St. Andrew’s Societies had less interaction with the wider British book trade, partly because they tended to print rulebooks rather than transactions, which they usually had printed locally and distributed themselves. This does not mean, however, that they did not cross the Atlantic or had a trans-colonial circulation.

It is important to note at this point that books and newspaper articles, while the most influential, were not the only documents societies had printed. Societies of all varieties went to great pains to print membership certificates to give to each new entrant. Although it is difficult to know how many members displayed their membership certificates, it is clear that they were significant tools the societies used to endorse themselves and their imperatives. In 1780 when loyalist members of the Charleston St. Andrew’s Society held St. Andrew’s Day celebrations, they immediately ordered Mr Thomas Coram, the engraver, to strike 150 certificates of membership. They were also one of the only means that an honorary member could prove his connection to a particular society with the exception of the membership lists. Event tickets also played a significant role in disseminating associational identity and status. The tickets circulated by the Edinburgh Musical Society had the name of the attendee printed on them, could not be transferred to any other individual, and could only be used for a single night’s performance. Each of

62 Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Minute Book (1780-1782), APS, 26 March 1782.
63 Sher, Enlightenment and the Book, p. 327.
64 Easterby, History of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, South Carolina, p. 46.
the tickets was complimentary, with the exception of when the Society collected funds to supplement their international performers’ pay.\textsuperscript{65} Men and women also had different styles of tickets, each printed from their own special plate.\textsuperscript{66} The Society spent a considerable amount of money creating new plates when they changed their venue from St. Mary’s Hall to their own St. Cecilia’s Hall in 1764. According to a summary of the accounts for the period from 1763-1764, the Society spent £32 on 256 ladies tickets for the ‘St. Cecilia’s Concert’.\textsuperscript{67} It is impossible to know what the Society or the concert attendees did with the tickets once they used them for entry. Yet the cost and effort put into them surely accentuated the civility and gentility of the association and the Scottish culture they wished to represent. The same could be said for the handbills and menus used at other events.\textsuperscript{68} One thing seems certain, based on the meticulous care that went into what would be considered ephemera today, these artefacts were meant to be kept and displayed as signifiers of the owner’s importance, of the organisation’s sophistication and prestige, and, in turn, the cultural accomplishments of the professional and elite Scottish community.

Scottish societies on both sides of the Atlantic, therefore, engaged with the ‘printing revolution’. The societies became owners, authors, and even printers of important texts and used them to enhance the association’s reputation, and thus the reputation of the Scottish community they represented. While this was a medium not limited to Scottish societies, Scottish societies in Scotland and America used it to promote Scotland and advantage their Scottish members. This engagement with print also serves as an example of the ways in which associations engaged with material goods. The quality, size, brand, and quantity of all the goods associated with Scottish clubs influenced the ways in which they were viewed by their members and were meant to influence those in the outside world that came in contact with them.

\textsuperscript{66} MacLeod, ‘The Edinburgh Musical Society’, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., pp. 77, 80.
\textsuperscript{68} See, for instance, the numerous handbills printed by the Highland Club of Scotland held in the Records of the Highland Society of London, Dep.268/15, NLS.
Printed items, particularly rulebooks and transactions, represented the societies’ intellectual, cultural, and institutional power. They became symbols of the societies’ success and public purpose. They proved that the society had the organisational structure and savvy which allowed them to put together written works, the ability to collect enough revenue to pay for said works to be printed, and enough motivation and confidence to bring something material into the world. Yet, they were far from the only objects associations used to represent their legitimacy and cultural authority.

Scottish societies on both sides of the Atlantic, for instance, commissioned the engraving of society seals. In 1751, the vice president and secretary of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia wrote to Innes & Clark, merchants in London, stating, ‘We gratefully acknowledge your Present of a Seal to the St. Andrew’s Society of this place…& beg your acceptance of the Inclosed [membership] Certificates’. Many societies rules had clauses stating something like, ‘A Seal shall be prepared and used, as the Seal of the Society’. These seals were used to give approval and authenticity to the items on which they were stamped. According to the first set of rules of the St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore, all members ‘shall be entitled to a Certificate of admission, authenticated with the Seal of the Society, and signed by the President and Secretary’. Most of the royal charters given to societies included clauses, which stated that the now incorporated society would become a ‘body corporate and politic’ and have ‘perpetual succession, and a Common Seal’.

Rather than just internal tools, society seals also had a considerable social life. As Hamilton wrote in his History, seals were ‘affixed to all Commissions Summons, writings, or Instruments of whatsoever kind’ issued by the Club. The majority of membership certificates, event tickets, and handbills printed by societies

---

69 St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1749-1776), APS, 22 July 1751.
71 St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore Minute Book (1806-1915), MSA, p. 20.
and circulated to their members and the wider public included depictions of society seals. Hamilton alluded to the importance of the Tuesday Club seals when he wrote that it was a ‘Laudable and Ingenious device expressive of that amity and Sociable Spirit which prevails among [society members]’.  

Along with seals, formal Scottish societies, particularly those with an external ‘improving’ agenda commissioned and distributed engraved medals. The importance of medals was well known in Scottish and American society. They had ancient connotations and were often collected and included in cabinets of curiosity. John Pinkerton wrote in his *An Essay on Medals*, ‘The amusement arising from medals is so common and universal, that we meet with few people who have not formed a little collection of some kind or other…we must induce to suppose that the study of medals is almost as ancient as medals themselves’. Indeed he went on to argue, ‘medals alone remain as the principle proof of historic truth’. 

Medals in the long eighteenth century could be both useful and ornamental. They served as vehicles of propaganda, like the medals used by Jacobites to underscore the legitimacy of the exiled Stuart monarchy. Medals were also regularly struck, as they are today, to commemorate royal births, deaths, marriages, and military victories. Most often clubs and societies used medals to award achievement, to broadcast the society’s agendas, and to influence the way that the wider public viewed the society and the nation, ethnicity, class, or small group it represented. More importantly, however, the distribution of medals suggested that the society had the power to award or commemorate something or someone. In 1809, the Highland Society of Scotland voted that a ‘Gold Medal, with suitable device and inscription, should be presented by the Society’ to Angus McKay for refusing ‘to accept French General Bernier’s watch and purse, when tendered to him by that Officer, at the time he was taken prisoner’. They saw themselves as an
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appropriate body to commemorate McKay’s ‘meritorious, manly, and disinterested conduct’. The Highland Society of London similarly struck a medal to commemorate the Highland regiment’s participation in the Egypt campaign in 1801 (Figure 6.1). By doing so, they demonstrated their support for the imperial kilted regiments. According to Sinclair, however:

A Medal, of excellent workmanship, was prepared accordingly, and distributed among the Subscribing Members of the Society; but the Officers of the 42d Regiment, declined accepting the Medals intended for them, considering it to be solely the prerogative of Majesty to confer such a mark of distinction on Military Men.

Although the officers rejected the Society’s medals, this interaction demonstrates that by distributing medals, the Society acted like an official body, rather than an insignificant community of men.

FIGURE 6.1 Obverse and Reverse of Highland Society medal for Egypt, 1801, Silver, in a gold mount under glass, 44x49mm, National Museums Scotland. Images licensed by SCRAM.
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Clubs and societies even commissioned the engraving of society badges to be worn by the members at anniversary dinners, meetings, and other society events both public and private. These badges delineated who was a member of the society. As Hamilton satirically argued, ‘the use of these badges is evident, they being absolutely necessary, to distinguish and render conspicuous, certain families and persons, who have no other quality in nature, (except sometimes the pretended, and rarely the real merit of their ancestry) to distinguish or render them conspicuous’. The wearing of a St. Andrew’s Society badge, particularly in public, which usually included a depiction of the St. Andrew’s cross, acted as a clear symbol of the wearer’s incorporation into that ‘official’ body, but also as a Scot in general.

Each of these objects had an understood social value in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scottish and American society. Society members would have viewed the objects, as well as those outside of the societies who either came in contact with a member of a society wearing a badge, won a medal at a society event or knew someone who won a medal, or even simply viewed one of the multiple items on which societies affixed their seals. Societies also paid attention, as they did with their printed books, to the quality of these objects. Societies often produced medals, for instance, in a variety of precious metals in order to be able to award different levels of approval to the recipient, i.e., gold, silver, or copper, assigning hierarchical levels of cultural as well as monetary value. The first rulebook of the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston, published in 1731, included a rule that stated, ‘a Silver Seal shall be provided for the Use of the Society’. The Society of Antiquaries even had David Deuchar, a ‘Seal Engraver’, in 1781 produce ‘A HANDSOME seal of the arms of the society cut on a Scots calcedon, and set in silver’.

---

84 Rules for the St. Andrew’s Society in New-York (1770), p. 7.
85 See, for instance, the reference to gold and silver medals awarded by the Highland Society of Scotland in Premiums Offered by the Highland Society of Scotland, for Promoting Agriculture and Internal Improvement in Scotland, in 1831 (Edinburgh, 1832), p. 15-16; Also the references to gold, silver, and ‘extra’ and ‘honorary’ medals awarded by the Caledonian Horticultural Society in Memoirs of the Caledonian Horticultural Society, Vol. III (1825), pp. 29-32, 36-37, 41-42, 255, 276, 458.
86 Rules of the St. Andrew’s Society at Charles-Town (1731), p. 9.
87 Smellie, Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, p. 69.
the recipients of these items would have, as Breen argued, ‘produced an interpretation of that object, a story that gave it cultural meaning’. 88

Rather than just using the objects to promote their identity, however, societies also added cultural meaning and value to these items through the addition of graphic designs. Many Scottish societies, for instance, commissioned painters to visually render the things that they collected, studied, or supported. The societies then incorporated printed engravings of these images into their transactions in order to make the work more marketable and to give the work and its author more credibility. In a discourse read at a quarterly meeting of the Caledonian Horticultural Society in 1811, Andrew Duncan argued:

The best chance we have of obtaining Royal Patronage, is by demonstrating that we deserve it: And we ought without delay, to begin experiments, although upon a small scale. With this view, your Council take the liberty of recommending to you, to appoint two new officers to the Society; and experimenter for conducting such trials as the Society may judge proper; and a painter of fruits, flowers, roots, and other such vegetable productions as may serve to illustrate and to demonstrate the result of experiments. 89

Patrick Syme was duly elected the Society’s painter and almost immediately began working on depicting plants studied by the Society. The next Memoirs of the Society included William Miller’s engravings of Syme’s work. 90

More importantly, many societies also included engraved images on the title pages of their printed transactions, which themselves acted as objects of authority. These images could play the same role as the frontispiece portraits that dominated the first pages of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels and philosophical texts. 91

It provided a way in which they could commemorate the achievements of past

90 Ibid., p. 224.
members and claim them as their own. *The Glasgow Mechanics’ Magazine* stated, for instance, ‘having now brought our Second Volume to a conclusion, we have thought proper to adorn it with a Portrait of the late Professor Playfair of Edinburgh’. Other times they included stylised vignettes, which represented the club (See Figures 6.2 and 6.3). In many ways these visual images functioned in a similar manner to contemporary business trading cards. They visually advertised the societies’ priorities and identities in relation to the consumer, or in this case the reader of the text. After experiencing the quality and size of the book’s paper, readers engaged visually with an image representing the society before reading the text on the following pages. Seals, medals, and badges all had images engraved upon them serving the same purpose.

The kinds of images included in the graphic designs affixed to ‘objects of authority’ tended to fit contemporary iconographical ideals and could be read by an informed public. At the same time, they were related to the distinct priorities of the particular association that displayed them and the identity they wished to express. Ranging from simple to elaborate depending on the limitations of the objects on which they were inscribed, these images acted as a kind of visual representation of the association, yet also as a public proclamation of their identity, and thus the identity of other Scots.

Starting in 1788 and continuing throughout this period of study, the Royal Society of Edinburgh included one particular engraved image on the title page of each of their transactions (Figure 6.2), which visually represented the Society.

---

FIGURE 6.2 Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Vol. VIII (Edinburgh, 1819), Frontispiece.

First and foremost, the image evoked classical antiquity. The woman’s stance, clothing, and action of writing on a shield-like structure are reminiscent of the winged victory included on various classical coins and medallions. The cornucopia at the bottom of the image references abundance and plenty. The shield includes the Latin inscription ‘Regia Societas Edinensis Instituta Ad. MDCCLXXIII Austiciis Georgii III’ or ‘Royal Society of Edinburgh Institution 1783 under the Auspices of George III’, which gives explicit information about the Society’s institution. Although the entire message is not visible, the Greek inscription on the plinth quotes a line from the ‘Funeral Oration of Pericles’, which translates to mean, ‘We cultivate refinement without extravagance and knowledge without

---

94 See H. Mattingly and E.A. Sydenham (eds.), The Roman Imperial Coinage, Vol. 2: From Vespasian to Hadrian (London: Spink & Son Ltd, 1926), RIC 66. I wish to thank Alex Imrie for his kind assistance with deciphering this image.

As stated in previous chapters, the Royal Society of Edinburgh was deeply attached to the University of Edinburgh and incorporated into the European ‘Republic of Letters’. These visual symbols and inscriptions made specific claims to these connections, the civility of the Society on a classical model, and the members’ masculine quest for knowledge. This was an expression that summed up not just the identity of the Royal Society of Edinburgh but what many ‘enlightenment’ societies saw as the determining characteristic of Scottishness – a unique, sophisticated, and admirably laconic culture with an appreciation of the humane intellect and its accomplishments while maintaining manliness. Indeed, this became a defining benchmark of Scottishness. In turn, this might also be seen as a comparing of Scottishness with other cultures whose identity seemed (to the Scot) to be overly ornate and effeminate.

‘National’ symbols can be seen in this image as well. Britishness and empire are celebrated through the frieze of Britannia receiving imperial gifts appearing on the side of the plinth. Britannia, however, is pictured with a shield bearing a saltire, rather than a Union Jack, at her side. The unicorn with the crown around its neck references the symbol of Scotland used in royal heraldry. The thistles as the feet of the woman and on the top of the shield are stock symbols of Scotland. If one looks closely, an image of Edinburgh Castle can be seen in the distance. Rather than Anglo-British in identity, then, the image suggests that the Royal Society of Edinburgh professed a Scoto-British identification through the distinctly Scottish images as well as those related to a united Britain and the British Empire. In many ways, this image provides the perfect symbol of the ultimately Scottish, yet also British, imperial, and European identity the Society wished to assert.

---


Perhaps even more interestingly, in 1782, six years before the Royal Society of Edinburgh began using their frontispiece image, the Society of Antiquaries in Scotland placed an engraved image by Andrew Bell, a well-known engraver and fellow of the Society who regularly worked with its secretary and founding member William Smellie, on the title page of Smellie’s *Account of the Institution and Progress of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* (Figure 6.3). This image, with the suggested reverse and obverse, is also reminiscent of a classical medallion. The Latin inscription around the sides and the right facing profile of the Earl of Buchan, their founder, evoke standard classical imagery. It also includes the same symbols of Scotland as the Royal Society of Edinburgh. A unicorn is in the foreground with thistles at its feet and Edinburgh Castle is in the background. The saltire and the crown can be seen on the shield held by the unicorn. Like the Royal Society of Edinburgh, they used standard visual-shorthand for Scotland and the Union, which an informed viewer could easily read and understand.

On the surface, these two images seem analogous. Indeed, it might even be suggested that the Royal Society of Edinburgh modelled their image on that produced by Bell for the Scottish Antiquarians. As Chapter 2 argued, in many ways

---

the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and the Royal Society of Edinburgh sought to express the same identity. Their conflict related to who could claim Scottish identity and what that identity should look like. It is unsurprising then, that they used the same imagery of Scotland and both evoked antiquarian ideals. The differences between these two images and the different versions of identity they expressed, however, are significant and lie in which symbols took priority. Buchan and the Antiquaries took a less British, European, and specialist approach to their presentation of Scotland. They engaged in antiquarian collecting and learning, but maintained the political and cultural goal of presenting Scotland as culturally different from England. As such, the Scottish symbols, rather than antiquarian or classical symbols, take the foreground of the image. The motto around the outside of the image, ‘Patriae Perculsus Amore’ or ‘Struck by the Love of Country’, while in Latin, makes clear reference to the Society’s patriotic Scottish purpose. The Royal Society of Edinburgh placed the respectability and civility of Scottish knowledge and Edinburgh University as their primary concern. As such, the classical images and references toward the pursuit of knowledge take precedence and are flanked by Scottish images.

This process was not limited to eighteenth-century intellectual societies. As part of its mission, the Celtic Society provided prizes to pupils of Highland schools for academic excellence. They set up competitions in twelve Highland districts on a rotating basis. They had ‘Clergymen of the Parish’ distribute prizes to students who showed the highest proficiency in ‘Gaelic and English Reading, Writing and Arithmetic’, and Latin. If two students were judged as equals, the prize was ‘awarded to the youth who [exhibited] the most accurate knowledge of the Gaelic Language.’ As a prize, the students received a medal and a religious or academic book. According to the reverse of the below medal (Figure 6.4), a prize was given to James Lowe from Little Dunkeld for being ‘The best latin Scholar of his School’ in 1824.

---

98 Objects and Regulations of the Celtic Society Instituted at Edinburgh 1820, pp. 2-9.
99 Ibid.
FIGURE 6.4 Obverse and Reverse of Silver Medal of the Celtic Society, presented to James Lowe of Dunkeld for Latin, 1824, 1.45”Dx.10”Th, National Museums Scotland. Images licensed by SCRAM.

The front of the medal abounds with symbols of the Society’s romantic cultural mission. It depicts a Highland man in military style dress with a broadsword, pistol, sporran, shoulder belt, and Tam O’ Shanter style hat. The collared jacket is reminiscent of the red coat worn by contemporary Highland regiments. By depicting the Highland man in this military attire, the Celtic Society promoted the martial nature of the Highland people. They referenced the Highland regiments’ impact on the British Empire, and their loyalty to the British State. The background of the medal depicts a Highland glen surrounded by picturesque mountains and a distant castle. Rather than a centre for Scottish agriculture, sheep herding, or luxury hunting, the medal portrays the Highlands as romantic and picturesque. Thistles are also depicted as growing around the Highlander’s feet. Above the Highlander the Celtic Society placed the Gaelic phrase, ‘Cha Trèag Mi Thu’, which translates to mean ‘I will not forsake you’.  

In the same way that the Royal Society of Edinburgh and Society of Antiquaries of Scotland’s images combined symbols of learning and antiquity with symbols of Scotland, the engraved words and images on this Celtic Society medal

---

100 I wish to thank Matthew Dziennik for his help with this translation.
mixed Highlandism with learning, which reflected the dual identity the Society wished to express. Their desires to promote the Highland garb in its military manifestation, celebrate Scotland’s distinct yet loyal position in the United Kingdom, and encourage intellectual and social improvement are all depicted on this one small medal. By physically awarding medals like this one, particularly to members of the Highland population, and subsequently publishing that they awarded these medals in public pamphlets, the Society not only promoted its agenda to reward academic achievement, but also broadcast the image of the Highlander and Highland culture that they saw as most useful in supporting their political, economic, and identity-creating objectives.  

FIGURE 6.5 Seal of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia found on a membership certificate, c.1760, Records of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, Series 1, Subseries 1, Folder 2, SAS. Image courtesy of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia.

---

101 Objects and Regulations of the Celtic Society Instituted at Edinburgh 1820, pp. 2-9.
Scottish-American societies engaged in this language of Scottish symbolism as well. Most if not all colonial-American societies’ seals included a thistle, a crown, and the words ‘Nemo Me Impune Lacesset’, which means ‘No one attacks me with impunity’.\textsuperscript{102} As described in an article in the *Odd Fellows’ Magazine* in 1847, ‘THE SCOTTISH THISTLE.-This ancient emblem of Scotch pugnacity, with its motto, Nemo me impune laeciset, is represented of various species in royal bearings, coins, coats of armour’.\textsuperscript{103} It was also a trope used on the seals and badges of societies in Scotland. When describing the badge of the Whin Bush Club, Hamilton wrote satirically:

Such was the plainness and Simplicity of the whin bush Club [badge], that they had no [inscription] in any language whatsoever, tho their badge might have born such a motto, as the Scots Thistle, vizt: Nemo me Impune Lacesset…the reason why this ancient and venerable Society, rejected any such pompous motto, was, as I conjecture, this, they were Jealous, that some acute wits, would clap to it some foolish or Impertinent

Interpretation, or Comment, as they did to the other, that is *None shall scratch me without paying dear for their familiarity, or Catching the itch*, which is a distemper, to which it is said the Scots Nation, are extremely liable…\(^{104}\)

By incorporating the crown into the seals, the Scottish societies in America visually depicted their distinct Scottishness and at the same time their loyalty to the British monarchy. Like societies in Scotland, they chose stock symbols that supported their political, social, and economic aims, at least during the colonial period.

Yet, they also changed their images to fit the political and social priorities of their members and their surroundings. The St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia’s rulebooks published in 1751 and 1769, included an article, which stated, ‘A Large seal shall be provided for the Use of the Society, with a Thistle and Crown over it, together with the Motto, *Nemo me impune lacessit*’.\(^{105}\) This seal can be clearly seen on the membership certificates printed during this period, as evidenced by the seal shown in Figure 6.5. In 1786, immediately after the Society re-grouped following the American War of Independence, the same description of the seal printed in the 1751 and 1769 rulebooks can still be found in the list of rules recorded in the minute book of the Society.\(^{106}\) On 31 August 1789, however, ‘A Motion was made and seconded that the Seal be altered and one more proper be procured’.\(^{107}\) Mr Alexander Christie designed a new seal. The Society disapproved of it, however, because Christie had changed the motto to read ‘Ubi Libertas ibi Patria’ (Where there is Liberty, there is Country), which did not sit well with a society of Scottish-Americans who viewed Scotland as the mother country and America as the adopted.\(^{108}\) The amended rules recorded in the minutes in 1790 stated that there should be a ‘large seal, provided for the use of the society, with the motto, Nemo me impune lacessit’, yet made no reference to the crown or the thistle.\(^{109}\) While there is

---


\(^{106}\) St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia Minute Book (1786-1833), APS, Rules, 1786, 16th Of the Seal.

\(^{107}\) Ibid., 31 August 1789

\(^{108}\) Ibid., 30 November 1790.

no written record that the crown was taken off the seal in the Society’s minutes, it is obvious from the above printing plate (Figure 6.6) that this alteration did take place. This change to the seal, however minimal, is significant. By keeping the original motto and the thistle on the seal, the Society maintained a cultural attachment to the mother country. By removing the crown, they removed the most blatant symbol of loyalty to the British monarchy. Rather than being stagnant, symbols of Scottish identity, like the societies that created them, could be modified and changed over time to fit the current accepted national/ethnic identities.

These images visually reinforced the clubs’ identity. Having them depicted on objects that were understood symbols of authority emphasised the legitimacy of the identity they performed even further. The objects, and the images depiction on them, served as important tools societies used to define and assert Scotland’s/Scottish identity.

III

The depth of this engagement with the material world becomes even clearer when one examines the ways in which Scottish associations used food and drink as a tool to enhance societal reputations and Scottish identity expression. Associations of all varieties in Scotland and America met in taverns, hotels, or even society halls for feasts and drinking sessions. Conviviality worked alongside wit, learning, national improvement, and sociability in club culture and polite discourse. Even the Select Society, which engaged in serious intellectual and political debates, indulged in dinners and drinking and viewed this aspect of their activity as fundamental to their success. According to Carlyle:

Mr Robert Alexander, wine merchant, a very worthy man, but a bad speaker, entertained us all with warm suppers and excellent claret, as a recompense for the patient hearing of his ineffectual attempts, when I often thought he would have beat out his brains on account of their constipation. The conversation at those convivial meetings frequently improved the members more by free conversation than the speeches in the Society.110

The St. Andrew’s Societies in colonial America also offered food and drink at their quarterly and anniversary meetings. In the nineteenth century, anniversary celebrations continued and were seen as an important way to create a community amongst members. Indeed, they were often the only event that brought the majority of members together.

During the eighteenth-century consumer revolution, high quality food and drink, like high quality materials, accentuated associational reputations and were regularly referenced in printed accounts of club activities. Carlyle, for instance, recorded in his Autobiography that at each Poker Club meeting the members ‘drank the best claret and sherry’.\(^\text{111}\) According to an account of the anniversary dinner of the St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore held in 1826, ‘The wines and liquors, as well as the viands were of an excellent quality, the whole entertainment was highly gratifying to the company’.\(^\text{112}\) Almost all newspaper accounts of society events referenced the quality of the dinner served. In 1802, the City Gazette recorded that the St. Andrew’s Society of Charleston ‘sat down to a most sumptuous and elegant dinner provided by Mr Thomson’.\(^\text{113}\) In 1821, the author of an article describing the anniversary dinner for the St. Andrew’s Society of Baltimore went so far as to write, ‘The entertainment provided by Mr. Williamson was uncommonly elegant in arrangement, and sumptuous and substantial in provision – and the “feast of reason and the flow of soul” were equally gratifying’.\(^\text{114}\)

The archival collection of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia includes itemised bills of the food and drink purchased by the Society for quarterly and anniversary meetings. Figure 6.7 gives an account of a bill from a quarterly meeting of the St. Andrew’s Society held on 5 February 1760. It includes a variety of expensive meats including gammon, fowl, veal, turkey, beef, and tongue as well as a large portion of sugar, which was expensive and part of fashionable consumption.\(^\text{115}\) It also included numerous bottles of claret and other wines, which further accentuated the civility and refinement of the occasion. The emphasis on refined

\(^\text{112}\) Baltimore Gazette and Daily Advertiser, 4 December 1826.
\(^\text{113}\) City Gazette, 2 December 1803.
\(^\text{114}\) Baltimore Patriot & Mercantile Advertiser, 5 December 1821.
foods and drinks was especially important in the enlightenment period when societies primarily sought to present Scotland’s elites as fashionable and civilised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19l Beef</td>
<td>£0.9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12l Gammon</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 fowls</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Turkey</td>
<td>0.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8½ veal</td>
<td>0.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tongues</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallad &amp; apples</td>
<td>0.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vinegar Sall Dr</td>
<td>0.0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter &amp; Cheese</td>
<td>0.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Loaves Bread</td>
<td>0.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Galls. Beer</td>
<td>0.2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Limes</td>
<td>0.18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>0.12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 galln spirit</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Galls wine</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6l Candles</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dozn. Clerat</td>
<td>4.16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washing House &amp; plates</td>
<td>0.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washing 5 Table Cloths</td>
<td>0.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pipes &amp; tobacco</td>
<td>0.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mustard</td>
<td>0.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a China Bowl Broke</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Decanter…Ditto</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£13.8.11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 6.7** St. Andrew’s Society Bill, 29 Feb. 1760, Records of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, MSS 142, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 1, Folder 5, SAS.
Punch was one of the favourite beverages drunk by societies on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1807, Sinclair explained, ‘When punch is made in perfection, the water should be thoroughly boiled, the sugar, the water, and fruit, should be well mixed before the spirits are put in, and the fruit should be ripe and generous’. All of these ingredients can be found on the St. Andrews’s Society’s receipt. One undated bill, probably from a quarterly meeting held in the early 1750s, can be seen below (Figure 6.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Loaf of Sugar, 11 Pound weight</td>
<td>£0.11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hundred of Limes</td>
<td>0.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Lemmons at 14/0 Per Hundred</td>
<td>0.7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Lines at 5/6 Per Hundred</td>
<td>0.2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gallon of Spirritts</td>
<td>0.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pound Candles</td>
<td>0.4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gallons of Beer</td>
<td>0.2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobbacco</td>
<td>0.0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing ye House</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing five Table Cloaths</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out 60 Notes</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2.14.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 6.8** St. Andrew’s Society Bill, c.1750s, Records of the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia, MSS 142, Series 1, Subseries 1, Box 1, Folder 2, Item 23, SAS.

Punch, like wine, was a fashionable drink, but it also had its own symbolic value. It usually incorporated imperial ingredients such as lemons, limes, sugar, and spirit – usually rum, gin, or whisky. It demonstrated at least some wealth and

---

status. It was also a drink that was shared amongst all the members of the club or society. The communal act of drinking punch, like toasting and other rituals described in previous chapters, played the role of underscoring associational cohesion, masculinity, and a collective identity. The punchbowls in which the drink was mixed and served were also seen as communal and ritualistic vessels. As Gollannek argues, ‘the bowl maintained its versatility as a utilitarian object as well as a potent cultural symbol’. Alexander Hamilton referred to the importance of this communal vessel in his History, particularly through its inclusion in various graphic renderings of the Club’s activities. He also described one ritual in which:

…a large bowl of Rack punch, being carried in procession
Round the great table, typically representing the great bell, while
the members followed it in regular order, shouldering tobacco pipes, this was the first appearance of pomp and pageantry, in this ancient and honourable club. (Figure 6.9)

---

118 Ibid., p. 191.
While punch was a common drink amongst all middling and elite male groups and punchbowls of a variety of qualities and sizes could be found in private homes and drinking establishments, it could still be used as a means of Scottish identity expression. The physical punchbowls, for instance, could include graphic designs related to club activity, the club’s purpose, and/or Scotland. At a Burns Supper held in the Globe Inn in Dumfries on 25 January 1819, a punchbowl, a silver liner, a ladle, jugs, and glasses were commissioned for the use of the Dumfries Burns Club. According to an article recorded in the Scotsman on 22 January 1820:

The admirers of Burns in Dumfries have formed themselves into a club or society, and are to meet for the first time in their

corporate capacity on the 25th inst. We have seen the huge china bowl that has been produced for the use of the club, which is probably the most superb thing of the kind that ever issued from Mr Spode’s manufactory. The ornament upon the bowl having been executed by no common artist, and in our opinion render it more valuable than if it had been framed of solid silver. The outside is divided into four compartments, on the first of which is a pretty faithful likeness of the poet; on the second, a representation of the marble sculpture lately erected in the mausoleum; on the third, an excellent view of the house in which Burns was born (“when my father built this frail clay biggin’;”) and on the fourth, a convivial scene taken from the well-known song of “Willie brewed a peck a’ maut.” The bottom of the same superb utensil is ornamented by a very accurate drawing of the Dumfries mausoleum, above which, on the side runs a wreath of thistles, and on the other a wreath of hopevine intermixed with barely-heads.122 (Figure 6.10)

The images placed on either the inside or outside of the porcelain bowl acted as important messages to those who consumed its content. By consuming punch out of this bowl, the Dumfries Burns Club members not only communally ingested the same drink, but also visually consumed the imagery associated with their collective Scottish, or at least Burnsian, identity. This society used a nineteenth-century convention and shaped it to meet their specific Scottish priorities.

This phenomenon was also not limited to punchbowls. Figure 6.11 depicts a snuff mull that was owned and used by the same Dumfries Burns Club. The local silversmith, David Gray, carved the mull out of a single cows horn. The top of the horn is engraved with the line, ‘presented to the BURNS CLUB of Dumfries BY a much esteemed member ON the Birthday of the Poet 1823’.123 The mull, like the punchbowl would have been a shared vessel, which the members passed around during meetings and events. The engraved message and the mull itself were symbols of the society’s cultural mission. Snuff mulls could also be found in the American colonies. One of the current St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia’s most prized

122 Scotsman, 22 January 1820.
possessions is a ram’s head snuff mull that was gifted to the Society in 1848.\textsuperscript{124} Again, the societies used the mull as a symbol of the club as well as a means of visual and literal consumption.


\textsuperscript{124} For a list of ‘relics’ associated with the St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia to go http://www.standrewsociety.org/relics.htm.
Since at least the sixteenth century, food has been used in Britain to express national characteristics. In the eighteenth century, however, British ‘national foods’ started to take on even more importance. The ‘Beefsteak’, for instance, became an emblem of Englishness. It became synonymous with English liberty, prosperity, and manliness. As early as 1709, Beefsteak clubs started to form in London. It should be unsurprising then, that Scottish associations also used food and drinks associated specifically with Scotland as a way through which they could underscore their cultural Scottish identity. According to Nasmyth’s account of his father’s dealings with the Edinburgh Dilettanti Club, for example, ‘The drinks were restricted to Edinburgh ale and whisky toddy.’ Ludington has suggested that ‘whether it was consumed by active or passive Jacobites, Unionists or anti-Unionists, Tories or Whigs, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or Catholics, claret represented something far more than a familiar taste: it represented a nostalgic idea of an independent Scotland’. The Poker Club and the St. Andrew’s Society consumed this drink in large quantities. Burns clubs from the very beginning ate haggis after hearing a member recite the bard’s ‘Address to the Haggis’ at their annual dinners.

Even if they did not physically consume Scotland’s national dishes, many associations referenced them in their toasts, particularly during the nineteenth century. St. Andrew’s Society of Albany, as early as 1809, toasted, ‘The Haggish[sic], the Scotsman’s delight and the hungry man’s friend’. In 1814, the Speculative Society toasted, ‘The Land of Cakes; may it be long distinguished by its orators, its philosophers, and its poets’, accompanied by the song ‘Caledonia’. By consuming fashionable fare, while at the same time referencing hearty haggis and oats, the societies combined two cultural priorities – to present the club and elite

---

130 *Albany Register*, 8 December 1809.
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Scottish community as civilised through the consumption of high quality food and drink while at the same time praising the inherent robust and honest nature of the Scotland’s national dishes.

Even the act of laying out the food could be manipulated so that it exemplified the ‘Scottish’ identity the societies wished to articulate. An account of the Society of True Highlander’s ‘Fete’ held in 1816 stated that their feast was ‘to be spread in all the abundance and simplicity of the days of Ossian’. Likewise, according to an article in the *Caledonian Mercury* detailing an account of the Highland Society of London’s meeting to celebrate the Battle of Alexandria in 1817, ‘Everything was conducted according to the ancient banqueting of feudal times. The great cup of friendly pledge went round the hall. The whisky was drank out of the shell’.  

The banning of certain foods and drinks also acted as a means of presenting the associations’ collective political loyalties. One of the rules compiled by the Hodge Podge Club (a Glasgow convivial society) in 1783 stated, ‘No wine except port wine shall be allowed to be used at the ordinary meeting of the Club. Madeira may be used on the Anniversary, but no French wines shall ever be called for on any pretence whatsoever.’ As Carr argues, by creating this rule the Club made a clear statement against French involvement in the American War of Independence, particularly as the Club included a large number of Glaswegian merchants who relied on Atlantic trade. The Caledonian Horticultural Society also used food and drink as a symbol of Scottish and British patriotism during the Napoleonic Wars. In his discourse given on 3 December 1811, Andrew Duncan stated, ‘amidst tyranny and war, we are necessarily deprived of many of the blessings of peace; and it is the duty of the patriotic citizen, either to submit to these privations, or to supply them by the produce of our own islands, and of our own colonies’. In September of that same year, the *Caledonian Mercury* recorded that at their anniversary dinner the
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133 *Caledonian Mercury*, 29 March 1817.
Caledonian Horticultural Society consumed fruit wine made in Scotland rather than wine made in France. By boycotting luxurious French wines and instead supporting local wine-makers, the Society proclaimed their British loyalty. The food and drink society members ingested, the manner in which it was consumed, and the vessels which held it all had remarkable significance in sending symbolic messages to the members and those who read about their meetings in local newspapers or in the societies’ transactions. It not only created a communal identity amongst members, but also was used to proclaim the society’s status, political leaning, and connection to Scotland. Once again, Scottish societies used a social convention, drinking and eating, and shaped it to fit their national, ethnic, social, and political priorities.

IV

Scottish societies engaged with the world around them and shaped Scottish identity in a way that most advantaged their members, then disseminated that identity to the outside world. Material goods provided a medium through which they could convey their message. Scottish societies created material goods so that instead of simply being seen as fashionable or useful, they were seen as expressions of the identity of the association, the members of that society, and Scots or Scottish-Americans in general. The quality of the materials, the symbolic importance of the iconic images placed upon them, and the identification of distinctly Scottish food and drink defined and reinforced the Scottish identity the members of these associations desired to be embraced by the wider public both at home and abroad. This chapter has addressed the print, seals, medals, food and drink used by associations, but that represents only the tip of the material culture iceberg. Societies used dress (most obviously tartan and kilts by the nineteenth century), portraits, sculptures, buildings, weapons, and relics for this very same purpose. By owning, using, publicly displaying, and disseminating these physical materials, the associations made clear

137 Caledonian Mercury, 9 September 1811.
statements asserting their credibility and authority as the arbiters of what it means to be Scottish. They played a key role in determining the way that Scotland and the Scots were viewed and are viewed both by the society members and, more importantly, the outside world that came in contact directly or through publicity with these ‘authentic materials’.\textsuperscript{139}

CONCLUSION

In describing his *History of the Ancient and Honorable Tuesday Club*, Dr. Alexander Hamilton wrote:

> It has been the misfortune of most Historians, while they grope, fumble, and blunder in the dark, among the Rubbish of Antiquity, and vainly try to take together fragments, and broken hints of history, to produce an Chimera, or monstrous birth, which seems to every Judicious Reader, altogether inconsistent in itself, ridiculous, and Indeed Incredible.¹

Ever aware of Hamilton’s critique of the community of historians, this thesis has had three main goals; to determine and subsequently assert the role Scottish associations played in shaping Scottish identity during the period from c.1750-1832 (a key period in Scottish identity formation and Scottish emigration), to examine the extent that class, politics, and economics played in the types of Scottish identities associations projected, and ultimately to emphasise this process of Scottish identity formation as a transatlantic dynamic and discourse.

Through examining the records of these associations, it is clear that associational culture provided an important avenue through which Scots could shape collective and representational Scottish identities on both sides of the Atlantic. Clubs and societies in Scotland and America, while organised along formal structures, adapted to fit the changing priorities of their members over time and to the environment in which they existed. While maintaining an exclusive membership, they suggested that they represented the entirety of the Scottish population in their definition of the Scottish character. In doing so, they engaged in almost every form of identity performance. Societies collectively wrote newspaper articles, paraded through the streets, printed documents for circulation supporting those authors who furthered their beliefs and goals, and built buildings which physically and publicly acted as monuments to the identity they claimed. Indeed, these Scottish associations, at home and in the diaspora, proved so important to Scottish and Scottish-American

¹ *History*, Vol. I, p. 44.
populations, that their activities were often covered by the public media and even spurred heated and public debates about their role as the arbiters of ‘Scottishness’.

The second aim of this thesis was to encourage discussion about the ways that the Scottish identities expressed by Scottish associations reflected the political, social, and economic priorities of their members as well as the priorities of their ‘host’ communities. The records suggest that societies whose members primarily consisted of the Edinburgh literati in the period between c.1750 and 1790 presented Scotland as a civilised, cultured, improved (or improvable) nation, completely intertwined with and supportive of the British Union and the wider European ‘Republic of Letters’. At the same time they vigorously asserted that being British and being part of the wider enlightenment community did not negate being distinctly Scottish. Other societies outside of Edinburgh in other centres of urban Scotland, while agreeing and expanding on the goals of the Edinburgh groups, also included aspects of their own regional priorities into their identity performance. The Aberdeen Philosophical Society or Wise Club, which was filled almost exclusively with university professors, for instance, placed more emphasis on education than their more lawyer-based Edinburgh equivalents. Highland societies, which met in Glasgow and Edinburgh, promoted aspects of Highland distinction through having Highland-only memberships or supporting only Highlanders. At the same time they engaged with wider ‘enlightenment’ trends through supporting the use of the English language as the lingua franca of empire and endorsing British improvements.

When the political and social priorities of Scotland changed during and after the French wars, aspects of the identity performed by these societies changed as well. From c.1790-1832, those societies that supported ‘Scotch knowledge’ became more technocratic and specialised. They attempted to engage with a world in which larger and wealthier institutions tended to gain the most recognition, while at the same time sought to claim past Scottish ‘enlightenment’ glories as their own. Highland societies created and embraced the more romantic symbols of Scottishness. This reflected the priorities of their overwhelmingly Tory membership. They subtly advocated the maintenance of the political status quo as well as promoted the unique addition of Highland/Gaelic/Celtic to the definition of ‘Scottish’, which came to
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dominate the public image of the Scots. Both of these shifts reflected Scotland’s alteration in social and political composition and the Scots changing place in Britain, the British Empire, and the world.

As the experience of Scots in Scotland and America followed similar political trajectories in the eighteenth century, their articulation of Scottishness could be quite similar. The Tuesday Club of Annapolis, for instance, based its structure on a Scottish association, the Edinburgh Whin Bush Club, and claimed Scottish ancestry because its membership had similar goals in presenting their British identity and loyalty. Scottish ethnic societies similarly claimed equality as British subjects, but also shaped their Scottishness to fit the priorities of their colonial environment. Almost all Scottish ethnic associations, for example, acted as charities, reflecting the need to be seen as moral agents for the greater good. They also actively supported the Highland regiments, which fought in the American theatre of the Seven Years’ War, reflecting their support of the British establishment and promoting Scotland’s participation in it.

The expression of Scottishness by Scots in America, however, changed with the American War of Independence. Scottish societies in the newly independent United States began performing a Scottish-American identity, which, while it was culturally and ancestrally Scottish and drew from symbols contemporaneously used in Scotland, was patriotically loyal to the United States rather than Britain. They expressed their Scottishness in relation to American priorities, such as support for the American establishment – toasting figures like George Washington and self-consciously and publicly describing themselves as loyal Americans. As such, they actively engaged with the American political environment.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, this thesis sought to establish the similarities (or differences) between the experience of Scots at home and abroad in shaping Scottish identities during this pivotal period of Scottish identity formation, c.1750-1832. As stated in the Introduction, the historiographies on Scottish associations in Scotland and in the Scottish diaspora are growing. The studies to date, however, tend to restrict their investigations to very short periods of time and to one geographical space. Those that evaluate Scottish enlightenment associations in the 1750s rarely, if ever, expand their analysis to the period after the French
Revolution and never connect societies in Scotland to the Scottish ‘ethnic’ societies that formed and met at the same time in America. Those who study Scottish diasporic associations usually limit their analyses to one society or group of societies in one geographical location, more often than not in Canada, Australia, or New Zealand. Even the volume edited by Bueltmann et al., includes a variety of case studies with very few connecting threads. The literature on Scottish diasporic associations has also not linked their expressions of Scottish identity with the associations in Scotland who also constructed and expressed Scottish identity. The two processes, to this point, have remained entirely separate. The necessary synthesis does not yet exist.

The creation of Scottish societies at home and abroad, which actively shaped Scottish identity, suggests that Scottishness served an important purpose in the Atlantic world, at least from the mid-eighteenth century onward. Scots in Scotland and in America could easily have assimilated into wider social trends. Indeed, the members of societies in both places actively engaged with the priorities of their wider surroundings. The Select Society and its offshoots engaged in what many historians have misleadingly described as ‘Anglicisation’ while performing a particular and distinct Scottish identity. The Scots who joined the St. Andrew’s Societies in colonial America could have even more easily assimilated into the colonial establishment and often did so on a day-to-day basis. Yet, they still formed societies that claimed Scottish ‘ethnic’ roots. After the American War of Independence, Scottishness could be seen as politically dangerous, yet Scottish societies formed with more vigour than they had previously. The formation of Scottish identity was a transatlantic and continually useful phenomenon.

The records also suggest that in the transatlantic context it was the associations that defined the archetypal Scot and Scottish identity. As a result, the archetype constructed reflected the collective class, occupation, political affiliation, wealth, and prestige of the members of the associations. This can be seen clearly in the overwhelmingly professional membership lists of the ‘Scottish’ societies that met in Scotland and America in the mid-eighteenth century. They both attempted to equate Scottishness with middling professionals and their noble supporters. Indeed,

3 Bueltmann et al., *Ties of Blood, Kin and Countrie*. 
it can perhaps be even more clearly seen in those societies, particularly those with ethnic ties like St. Andrew’s Societies and Highland societies, which allowed ‘affinity’ Scots to join. One could claim Scottishness (or Highlandness), according to these associations, as long as they had the attributes the societies wanted to equate with Scottishness.

Most significantly, however, this comparison has made it abundantly clear that different associations shaped Scottish identity to fit their specific environments and that this process was not limited to those who performed their Scottishness through associations in the diaspora, but could also be seen within Scotland during this pivotal time in identity negotiation. When compared, the records of Scottish clubs suggest that the Scottish identity constructed and performed by associations in America had (and has) as much validity and legitimacy as that expressed in Scotland. It grew out of the same foundation and simply followed a different trajectory as a result of the different political, social, and economic environments in which it was expressed. Scottishness, then, should be understood as a multifaceted, sometimes incongruent, yet ultimately connected and successful transnational identity, rather than simply an identity expressed in (and in relationship to) Scotland. Scottish identity in the homeland was contingent on wider British, imperial, and European constructs and was strategically performed in ways and at times that proved most beneficial to its performers. This was the same process that led Scots in America to perform an identity that was first engaged with the specific colonial population then based on allegiance to the United States. The dynamic, however, shows that Scottish identity in itself was about the ability to adapt to different conditions, in different places, with different political environments. In essence, being loyally British, or loyally American (or loyally Australian, or loyally Canadian) became part of being distinctly Scottish.

In no way has this study ‘spoilt the subject for anyone else’ as McElroy argued for his work on Scottish literary societies. In fact, it has only grazed the surface of the information that these associations provide and has only had the scope to evaluate a small number of what could be described as ‘Scottish’ societies. The chosen methodology has been useful in delineating large trends in identity formation
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and associational activity in four different contexts, but it has not allowed for any sustained analysis of the various impacts and influences each association had in their particular setting. Undertaking a micro-study, which compares Scottish ethnic associations in two cities, rather than all of colonial and early-national America and Scotland would provide even more insight into the mutability and usefulness of being Scottish, making the conclusions of this broadly focused thesis even clearer. Change over time and more subtle shifts in identity performance could be found and analysed for this purpose as well.

That said, this thesis does open up the study of associational culture in America to other scholars. It shows that larger themes and conclusions can be gleaned from their understudied archives, particularly those in America. The St. Andrew’s Society of Philadelphia for instance, has hundreds of folders of archival material that are in need of more scholarly attention. Not only do they display internal information concerning club activity, but the archives also provide information about the transformation of Philadelphia since the mid-eighteenth century. The complete collection provides evidence concerning the establishments in which the Society met, the political and social issues that the Society addressed, the food that was prepared at taverns and social gatherings, and societal distress during wartime. Scottish associational archives in America should be used by historians of America more generally, rather than just ‘club’ historians and historians of Scottish identity.

Future studies could and should also investigate the other associations Scottish society members joined separate from those that expressed a ‘Scottish’ identity. By examining those associations in comparison to the ethnic societies, future studies could delineate if they had the same agendas or if they contradicted the Scottish societies’ aims. It could lead to conclusions on whether ‘being Scottish’ was the primary goal for certain individuals, or if they only joined for their personal social, economic, or political agendas. An examination of non-recognisable members and their other associational activities would show whether or not
reputation, patronage, personal betterment, or civic engagement was a bigger priority than their ideological desire for widespread change or even identity expression.\(^5\)

What this thesis has also shown is that the archives of Scottish associations provide a privileged perspective into Scottish identity expression in not just Scotland or the diaspora, but both. This evaluation of Scottish societies in Scotland and America revealed the origins of conscious, deliberate, and collective transnational Scottish identity building and how that identity had the capacity to be profoundly malleable. While in no way representative of Scotland’s domestic or migratory population as a whole, it has shown within the societies that Scots created at home and abroad cogent and influential forms of Scottish identity were formed, asserted and projected.

Moreover, this thesis advocates the importance of the Scottish-American diaspora, particularly the associations that they formed and the identity they expressed, to the study of Scottish history and even Scotland’s history. The societies which formed in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand in the nineteenth century, and the rest of the world in the twentieth century, entered into an already existent and developed Scottish associational world, which had already constructed and expressed Scottish identities that were particular to their specific communities and in turn provided the baseline for subsequent diasporic Scottish associations. Each subsequent society drew from this trend, and manipulated their association to fit their own local political and social goals, while maintaining their distinctly Scottish identity. Far from being culturally unready to be engaged, as recent analyses of the diaspora suggest, Scottish associations already possess a version of Scottishness, which they have carefully constructed over nearly three centuries, that of a transnational Scottish identity, one fit for a globalised world.\(^6\)

---

5 Through her evaluation of Scottish associations in New Zealand, Bueltmann argues that Scottish societies should be seen as promoting a ‘civic’ identity as well as an ethnic identity. This line of inquiry would complement Bueltmann’s work in an American context. Bueltmann, “‘Brither Scots Shoulder tae Shoulder’”, p. 226.
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