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CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

Preliminary to this study it is necessary to recognize the economic, social, religious, and intellectual development which had taken place in Scotland before the period of the American Revolution. Largely in consequence of the Union, the tobacco trade of Glasgow had become second only to that of London. The demands of the trade for manufactured goods stimulated Scottish industries and provided capital for investment. Expanding trade and manufactures stimulated developments in communications, mining, finance, and agriculture, and raised standards of living. In the meantime, by mid-century, political independence had become neither practical nor desirable, and Scotland was playing an increasing role in national life through the appointment of Scots to offices at home and abroad.

Some consequences of these developments were seen already in the third quarter of the century when laws of property were altered to facilitate the development of lands, and business was encouraged by the reform of bankruptcy.
bankruptcy laws as well as by the expansion of banking and the construction of roads and canals. Before the American war the transformation had begun in Scottish agriculture which made it at the end of the century almost the best in Europe, afforestation was practised, the linen and thread industries were important British manufactures, the Carron Iron Works was established, Greenock had become an important sea port and Glasgow a great trading and manufacturing town, landlord and tenant relations in the Highlands were shifting from a social to a more strictly economic basis, and in the towns an artisan class was growing. Accompanying the commercial, industrial, and agricultural enterprise was the vigorous intellectual life of eighteenth century Scotland which made important and original contributions to economic theory and agricultural experimentation as well as to more abstract sciences and maintained at least a measure of independence in political thought.

The impact on Scottish life of the economic and intellectual expansion had been evidenced in the rise of Moderatism in the church. The growth of trade, manufactures, and population, and the social change involved insured dissatisfaction with political arrangements which were /
were designed to keep in power groups dominant at the beginning of the century. The failure of the Jacobites, a decline in the encompassing position of the church, the vigour and variety of intellectual activity, an expanding newspaper circulation and printing industry provided conditions favourable to a new examination of questions relating to the exercise of political control in Scotland. It is in the context of this situation that the question of the American Revolution in Scottish opinion must be considered.

The procedure followed has been to examine, first, some factors contributing to Scottish interest in the American colonies; second, evidence of growing political awareness within Scotland; and, third, Scottish opinion concerning the war, and the associated development of a Scottish political opposition. The emphasis is primarily on local Scottish affairs as distinguished from Scottish participation in the higher levels of British governmental and military activity.

The strongest ties between Scotland and the colonies were a result of the tobacco trade and emigration. A chapter on the trade includes a survey of its nature as well /
well as its extent, its relative importance to the Scottish economy, and the difficulties occasioned by the American disputes. In a chapter on emigration attention is given to the population link with the colonies and to the concern aroused in Scotland by the problem of large scale emigration shortly before the war.

A growing interest in political affairs is most evident in the early efforts (and attendant discussion) to modify the exclusive character of the Edinburgh town council, an agitation which culminated at the end of the war in outright reformist activity. Coordinate with this agitation was a movement to check abuses in county voting and eventually to reform the county system of representation. The debate within the church on patronage is of interest because of the adoption in the arguments toward the end of the war of concepts from contemporary political discussion. The campaign for a Scottish militia is of interest as a movement for a redress of grievance which had broad popular sympathy and was an assertion of Scottish nationalism.

A significant expansion of the Scottish press was coincident with the war, and considerable importance is attached to the role of the Scottish press in stimulating local /
local political awareness in this period and in familiarizing Scottish readers with the debates on American affairs and with the war. A survey of the press and its presentation of the news is followed by a survey of some views on American affairs in the Scottish Parliamentary delegation and views of some literary figures. The reaction of the tobacco traders is revealed mainly by their action in petitioning against the war and their initial refusal to support it by a loyal address. The division of opinion within the Church of Scotland was the main source of local pamphlet literature on the conflict (in the form of fast-day sermons). In the absence of extensive pamphlet production in Scotland, the letters contributed to the newspapers are the most important source of information on local attitudes at various stages of the war. Contrary to the assumptions in the standard histories of Scotland concerning the absence of political views apart from those of the narrow represented classes and expressed by the members of Parliament, these letters show a nucleus of opposition to the war from its beginning and the growth of a political opposition during the war.

Although the war had important effects on the Scottish economy /
economy, the main general concern in this study is the evidence, first, of changes in Scottish political awareness and in attitudes toward local and national government, and second, in the impetus given to these changes by the War of Independence.
CHAPTER II.

THE TOBACCO TRADE

Scotland's most successful trading efforts in the eighteenth century were with the American colonies and the West Indies. The dominant article in the American trade was tobacco, although naval stores and other wood products and the West Indian sugar and spirituous beverages were also important imports. British goods were exchanged for those of the colonies, and a feature of the tobacco trade was the distribution of almost the whole of the importation to the continent.

The tobacco trade had its beginnings well before the Union of 1707. It flourished in the middle fifty years of the eighteenth century and reached its peak in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the American war. Before 1707 the trade was illegal, but a number of circumstances contributed to its development. The abatement of religious and political controversy was followed by an expansion of commercial activity. Transportations and deportations under Cromwell and Charles II and emigration in the last quarter of the seventeenth century and early /
early years of the eighteenth brought Scotsmen in considerable numbers to the plantations. Scottish settlements in East New Jersey and Carolina attracted Scottish merchants who spread their activities into Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, and New England as far as New Hampshire. A brisk illicit trade carried in both Scottish and colonial ships seems to have come into being after 1675. The northern colonies invited illicit trade because they had more difficulty than the southern colonies finding markets in England. Entrance into southern markets was aided by the fact that as illicit traders the Scots evaded customs and could sell more cheaply than the English merchants.

The illicit character of the trade before 1707 prevents any certain measurement of its extent, but in the twenty-five years before the Union it was a source of much irritation to the English. The reports of Edward Randolph as surveyor general of the customs detailed with bitterness the activities of Scottish merchants in New England, Pennsylvania, the Jerseys, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and his evidence of Scottish penetration was supplemented from other officials and from merchants. Counterfeit seals, certificates, and coquets were discovered and many seizures /
seizures made, but convictions were difficult to obtain and the seizures were too few to stop the trade. One account reported nine vessels sailed with tobacco directly from Maryland to Scotland between 1690 and 1695. Another report listed twenty-seven sailings between Scotland and the tobacco plantations from April 1695 to December 1696. It was predicted that Pennsylvania would become a staple of Scotch and Holland goods, and a report from Philadelphia in March 1699/1700 declared "there is four times the quantity of tobacco made in this country this last year than ever was made in one year before, all which is engrossed by the Scotch – as almost all other trade here is – they give such extravagant rates that I am sure no person that designs to trade fairly can give." But it was not until the Union that the trade could develop freely. The prospects for extending Scottish trading activities were an important motivation for the Union, and the belief that the Scots would share in the plantation trade regardless of restrictions may have contributed to the English desire for a union by which Scottish traders would come under the control of the English Parliament.2

The early and natural interest of Glasgow merchants in /
in trade with the west is indicated by the founding of Port Glasgow as a civic harbor on the estuary of the Clyde in 1668. When Scottish participation in colonial trade was legalized and freed from hampering restrictions by the Union, Glasgow merchants predominated in the development of an extensive Scottish commerce in American tobacco. In the five years from 1708 to 1712 the population of Glasgow increased slightly more than a thousand as compared with an increase of 818 in the twenty years previous to 1708. Using vessels chartered from Whitehaven the Glasgow merchants undersold their English rivals in the chief tobacco centers of Bristol, Liverpool, and Whitehaven within a few years after the Union. English merchants made remonstrances to the Commissioners of Customs at London in 1717 against the Glasgow trade and pressed charges of fraud until in 1722, after investigation by a Parliamentary committee, new officers were appointed at Greenock and Port Glasgow. Difficulties with the customs regulations (possibly deliberately created by the new officers), some of which led to troublesome lawsuits, have been blamed for the temporary decline which followed, although the decade 1725-1734 was a period of severe depression /
depression for the tobacco industry generally. From 1730 the references to tobacco imports and exports increase noticeably in the correspondence between the Scottish Board of Customs Commissioners and the Collectors at Greenock and Port Glasgow. All accounts agree to a steady rise from about 1735. The first Clyde built and owned ship in the tobacco trade sailed from Glasgow in 1718. In 1735 Glasgow had twenty seven ships trading to Virginia, Boston and the West Indies. By 1750 Glasgow had surpassed her English rivals of Whitehaven, Liverpool, and Bristol, and only London imported more tobacco.

John Gibson, the historian of Glasgow, has left a simplified account of the methods of trading developed by Glasgow merchants. He noted that early in the century the shipmaster either on his own or as agent for a merchant bartered his cargo of merchandise in America for tobacco. After 1740 the supercargoes were superseded by factors who resided in the country. They received the goods and remitted the tobacco, operating on an eight to ten per cent commission on all transactions. Other writers have observed the tendency of the Scottish traders to establish stores in the tobacco countries and to deal with the planters.
planters usually through Scottish factors. The marketing procedures of the Scots traders, however, were not purely Scottish innovations, as the development of the factorage system became a feature of the eighteenth century tobacco commerce generally.

Throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth the consignment system predominated along with the practice of direct trading. Tobacco was shipped directly from plantation wharves to Britain, thereby saving the extra expenses of transport, storage, and other charges which would be incurred if the tobacco were collected at central points for shipping, and the same ships were employed for imports as were used for exports. Under the system of direct trading the provincials did not sell tobacco directly to the English merchants for resale, but consigned it to them as commission agents. The marketing process was a long one. Credit was extended to the provincials against eventual sales. It became customary for many merchants to buy regularly from the same planters and the liaison between specific merchants and planters was strengthened by the planter's involvement in debt. There were disadvantages in the system for both planters and merchants /
merchants as arrivals were irregular and frequently at long intervals and the planter had little choice of imports. Even for personal articles such as clothing he had to rely on the judgement of the merchant in matters of style, color, and size. On the other hand, the merchant suffered from delays in collecting tobacco at various wharves; in the absence of collecting centers he had little information on supplies available; and it was difficult to regulate packing and quality.

Supplementing the established channels of direct trading on consignment there was also considerable casual trading whereby a ship captain entered the colonies with a cargo of miscellaneous goods to be traded for farm products or sold on credit as opportunity offered while wheat or tobacco was taken on consignment. Casual trading was hazardous because return cargoes were sometimes difficult to secure and there were uncertainties in marketing chance cargoes, while the credit risk involved in dealing with unknown planters was high.

The practice of direct trading and consignment shipping and the number of casual traders decreased in the eighteenth century as efforts were made to overcome trading difficulties.
difficulties and the outports, particularly the Glasgow merchants, competed for the tobacco trade. Merchants began to deal through correspondents or factors who were in close touch with the colonial situation. The factors developed a clientele of planters who provided them with cargoes either to be purchased or taken on consignment, and as a result the trade became more regular and the debts more efficiently collected. Some factors were regular employees of British firms and were paid annual salaries and living allowances. Others were colonial merchants or planters who transacted business for British firms on a commission basis. As the tobacco industry expanded into the interior the factorage system increased, for direct trading was impossible at any distance from navigable waters. Tidewater planters continued the practice of shipping on consignment until late in the colonial period, but it was estimated just before the Revolution that only about one fourth of Virginia tobacco was then shipped abroad in this manner.

The tendency towards the factorage system was general, but it was largely promoted by Scottish and other outport merchants. When they came on the scene, the tidewater business /
business was largely in the hands of London merchants. In order to gain a share of the commerce, the newcomers had to develop advantageous trading practices and, if possible, to exploit new tobacco growing areas. The Scottish merchants were especially successful in utilizing the factorage system, both near the coast and in the back country where they established stores at convenient points. The stores, some of them mere branches of wholesale firms, gave buyers an opportunity to inspect stocks of merchandise. The factors purchased farm products for cash, or, more generally, in exchange for imported goods and slaves on credit. The store transactions in turn were based on credits of six to twelve months from wholesalers in Britain and of nine months or more from creditors in the northern colonies. The Scottish success in the colonial trade is measured in the steady increase of tobacco imports at Glasgow, and their success with tobacco in the continental markets is evidenced by the affluence of the tobacco lords and the availability of capital for the expansion of Scottish manufactures in the latter half of the eighteenth century. 9

Among papers of the Bogle family are letters which illustrate the activities of a Glasgow consignment merchant early/
early in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{10} The Letter-Book of George Bogle, 1729–1742, especially useful in this respect, contains the letters written by the Glasgow merchant to ship captains who were to procure consignments of tobacco and to the agent in Rotterdam who was responsible for the sales in Holland. The letters imply casual trading efforts rather than established connections with tobacco planters and are alternately optimistic and pessimistic in regard to the quantities of tobacco available and the prices current in the colonies and on the continent. Some of the difficulties experienced by Bogle at this time were due to the general depression in the tobacco industry for the period 1724–1735. In 1735 he withdrew from the tobacco trade entirely in favour of trade with the West Indies, and he withdrew from the latter in 1742. A brother continued in the tobacco trade, however, and a series of letters from George Bogle to a son during the years 1758 to 1763 show George Bogle once more interested in tobacco. The latter series evidences the development of factorage, for the recipient of the letters was engaged on an apprenticeship in Virginia with Glasgow merchants. Another son who had previously served an apprenticeship in Virginia /
Virginia and since established himself as a tobacco merchant in London also figures in the correspondence. During the Seven Years War tobacco prices fluctuated widely and the letters are much concerned with the uncertainties of the trade. In these exchanges one reason for the success of the Scottish merchants is emphasized, namely, the numerous contacts they had with other Scotsmen in strategic places. The Glasgow and London members of the family established a network of business agents in Britain and on the continent, secured a variety of export goods from Scotland and England at the lowest current rates, and were able to find adequate shipping space. The Virginia member disposed of the sundry goods, purchased the best quality of tobacco available, and, following instructions, assiduously sought new contacts with reliable agents and growers along the Rappahannock and neighboring rivers.

The year by year uncertainty as to crops and prices is apparent in correspondence and has been the subject of study by writers on the colonial tobacco industry. A heavy crop meant a glutted market and had an immediate effect on prices. A short crop resulted in complaints from merchants who for lack of established trading connections were unable to /
to secure any of the available tobacco or shipping space. In such years traders were favored who had reliable agents and possibly ships fortuitously in position to secure part of the scarce commodity. The high costs of packing, transport, and brokerage—fixed marketing costs were several times the value of the crop on the plantation—storms, variations in quality, spoilage, and the customs duties added to the hazards while the severe competition for the tobacco itself and for the continental markets allowed only a small margin of profit. 12

Special problems arose out of the system of duties and debentures. From 1703 duties on tobacco totaled six and one third pence. Additional pennies added in 1747 and 1758 brought the total to eight and one third pence where it remained until after the beginning of war with the colonies. Until 1723 all the duty save one-half pence was refunded on re-exportation, and from 1723 to the war the total duties were exempted through drawbacks on re-exportation. Discounts were allowed for prompt payment and only one penny of the total was payable in ready money while the remainder was bondable. As most of the tobacco was re-exported, traders generally posted bonds for /
for all but the penny per pound demanded in ready money. A huge bonded indebtedness was thus incurred which could be and often was disastrous if the trader failed to export within the three years allotted for re-exports. To secure discharge of the duty bonds it was sometimes necessary to sell at a low price in Holland with injurious effects on other traders. Sometimes bankruptcy was the only solution. 13

The high duties provided the occasion and temptation for considerable fraud. Merchants sometimes sold a cargo on the home market for which duties were bonded. The drawbacks were secured when a new cargo was exported, contrary to law and oath, in place of the earlier one. The trader gained a sum of money not available to the home traders who paid full duty, and so long as he received new shipments of tobacco his advantage was held and the revenue on the tobacco sold for home consumption was never paid. On the other hand, in seasons of scarcity bonds might become due when the trader had no new tobacco to export for debentures, with consequent strain on his financial position. 14

An elaborate system of checks and counter checks was developed to secure a proper accounting of duties on imports /
imports and exports, but quay side smuggling in one form or another was constant. Tobacco—often stolen—was removed from ships and the customs bypassed through connivance between merchants and tradesmen, porters, crews of ships and lighters, coopers, and other port workers or officials. Damaged tobacco cut off for burning and for which importers were compensated at the rate of one penny per pound was stolen and made into snuff. The main frauds at the ports were committed through officers who set down less than actual weights for hogsheads imported and excessive weights for exports, with consequent gains to the merchants on duties and drawbacks. Other tobacco was run in on isolated coastal areas. On the east coast some was relanded from the continent, especially Dunkirk, and from the Channel islands. In the west the coastal islands and particularly the Isle of Man served as entrepots for illegal trade. It seems most of the run tobacco was first legally entered and re-exported before being secretly relanded and distributed for home consumption. Letters from the Scottish Board of Customs to the Collectors at Greenock refer frequently to loads of re-exported tobacco from Bristol which it was suspected were to be run in on the
the Scottish coast. Occasionally the suspect load was out of Whitehaven or Liverpool, or a Glasgow ship had set out ostensibly for Europe but lingered unaccountably along the coast. When accosted, contrary winds were blamed for delays in sailing.

The volume of illegal trade cannot be estimated. Occasional figures for seizures give no clues to the quantities which escaped. Transactions in smuggled tobacco, as in wine, are not reflected in statistics on Scottish trade, but gains were large enough throughout the century to overcome fears of the severe penalties dealt out in cases of discovery.17

A view of the main volume of tobacco imports and exports, the fluctuations as well as the growth, is available from Scottish customs records. Port books which detail quantities of imports and exports are available for Scottish ports only from 1742. Annual accounts of revenues provide an estimate of the extent of the tobacco trade from 1707. Tables have been drawn up to show the leading Scottish tobacco ports, the volume of tobacco imports and exports in those years for which figures have been preserved, and the relative importance of the American trade to the total Scottish trade.18
The impost on tobacco collected at the six leading tobacco importing ports in Scotland, 1707-1776.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Port Glasgow</th>
<th>Ayr</th>
<th>Dumfries</th>
<th>Leith</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Montrose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1707-1712</td>
<td>95,575 11 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,881 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712-1717</td>
<td>138,405 11 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,076 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717-1722</td>
<td>232,776 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,038 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722-1727</td>
<td>256,208 5 9</td>
<td>1,178 4 9</td>
<td>9,358 8 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727-1732</td>
<td>258,528 4 5</td>
<td>9,190 14 4</td>
<td>9,343 16 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732-1737</td>
<td>172,019 17 9</td>
<td>14,026 5</td>
<td>16,488 12 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737-1742</td>
<td>279,586 4 11</td>
<td>39,691 3</td>
<td>27,040 8 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742-1747</td>
<td>523,827 4 5</td>
<td>37,681 2 10</td>
<td>36,349 11 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747-1752</td>
<td>789,516 16 4</td>
<td>60,687 13</td>
<td>46,920 15 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752-1757</td>
<td>736,948 14 1</td>
<td>74,645 1 6</td>
<td>22,591 11 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757-1762</td>
<td>1,241,008 19 9</td>
<td>51,123 11 9</td>
<td>2,386 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762-1767</td>
<td>1,503,558 17 1</td>
<td>34,937 15 2</td>
<td>2,113 6 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767-1772</td>
<td>2,091,624 4 1</td>
<td>22,857 14 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-1776</td>
<td>1,601,475 10 8</td>
<td>3,936 7 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from the Comptroller-General's Cash Accounts, annual volumes, 1707 to 1776, Register House, Edinburgh. Duties levied on tobacco included the Old Subsidy, the New Subsidy, the Additional Duty, the One-Third Subsidy, and the Impost on Tobacco, all levied before 1703, and additional penny subsidies levied in 1748 and 1758. L. C. Gray, Agriculture in the Southern U.S. to 1860, 244-245. The revenue cited above is from the Impost on Tobacco only. Ayr, Dumfries, Leith, Aberdeen, Montrose, Kirkcudbright shared in the tobacco imports in the order named, but their duties totaled and added to those of other scattered Scottish ports were substantially less than those given for the Glasgow ports.
TABLE II.*

Imports and exports of tobacco in pounds for Glasgow and for Scotland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lbs. of tobacco</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1742</td>
<td>9,983,955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1742-0ct</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>6,719,528</td>
<td>4,462,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743-</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>4,783,128</td>
<td>1,394,718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>5,717,115</td>
<td>10,643,079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745-</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td>4,192,576</td>
<td>3,053,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746-June</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>3,857,584</td>
<td>3,013,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1747-0ct</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>6,971,667</td>
<td>5,448,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1747</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>7,233,653</td>
<td>6,434,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748-</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>7,192,025</td>
<td>7,167,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749-</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>5,526,016</td>
<td>5,214,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>4,096,142</td>
<td>4,920,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lbs. of tobacco</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>Exports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1761-</td>
<td>23,863,733</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>24,048,380</td>
<td>23,525,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1762-</td>
<td>27,217,104</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>27,339,433</td>
<td>26,694,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1763-</td>
<td>30,010,302</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>31,613,170</td>
<td>30,613,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1764-</td>
<td>26,524,077</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>26,310,219</td>
<td>25,902,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1765-</td>
<td>32,748,616</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>33,889,565</td>
<td>33,379,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1766-</td>
<td>24,294,413</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>32,175,223</td>
<td>31,723,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1767-</td>
<td>31,687,467</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>29,385,343</td>
<td>28,871,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1768-</td>
<td>38,818,327</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>32,261,427</td>
<td>32,483,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1769-</td>
<td>37,511,691</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>35,920,685</td>
<td>34,714,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1770-</td>
<td>46,327,916</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>39,226,354</td>
<td>38,408,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1771-</td>
<td>42,885,110</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>49,312,146</td>
<td>48,488,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1772-</td>
<td>46,805,183</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>43,748,415</td>
<td>42,806,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1774-</td>
<td>46,788,240</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>40,457,589</td>
<td>39,533,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1775-</td>
<td>gap</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>55,927,542</td>
<td>30,324,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1777-</td>
<td>970,270</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>294,896</td>
<td>5,515,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1778-</td>
<td>gap</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>2,884,574</td>
<td>2,374,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1779-</td>
<td>3,396,742</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>3,138,464</td>
<td>2,468,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1781-</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>5,125,638</td>
<td>3,127,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1782-</td>
<td>2,553,092</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1,952,243</td>
<td>1,788,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1783-</td>
<td>1,998,818</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>2,624,807</td>
<td>934,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1784-</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1785-</td>
<td>9,503,623</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Imports and exports of tobacco for Scotland, 1722 to 1731 (Michaelmas 1721 to Michaelmas 1722, etc.) from House of Lords Documents, Ap. 12, 1733, Account of quantities of tobacco imported into and exported from Scotland Michaelmas 1721 to Michaelmas 1731; 1761 to 1782 from D. Macpherson Annals of Commerce, III, 583; IV, 37; Imports at Port Glasgow and Greenock, Oct. 1742 to Oct. 1785 compiled from Custom House Accounts, Greenock, I-XL; Custom House Accounts, Port Glasgow, I-XXXIX.
### TABLE III.*

Imports and exports of tobacco in pounds for England 1761 to 1782.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>47,065,787</td>
<td>36,788,944</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>51,493,522</td>
<td>49,784,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>44,102,491</td>
<td>36,445,951</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>55,928,957</td>
<td>50,349,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>65,173,752</td>
<td>40,940,312</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>56,048,393</td>
<td>44,829,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>54,433,318</td>
<td>54,058,336</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>55,965,463</td>
<td>43,880,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>48,306,593</td>
<td>39,121,423</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>7,275,037</td>
<td>16,521,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>43,307,453</td>
<td>32,986,790</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>2,146,051</td>
<td>2,905,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>39,140,639</td>
<td>36,400,398</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>9,077,153</td>
<td>2,068,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>35,545,708</td>
<td>30,864,536</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>14,017,431</td>
<td>3,704,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>33,784,208</td>
<td>23,793,272</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>12,299,172</td>
<td>2,823,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>35,187,037</td>
<td>33,238,437</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>11,386,725</td>
<td>3,950,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>58,079,183</td>
<td>41,439,586</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>7,203,262</td>
<td>2,529,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV.*

Value of imports from and exports to North America, 1740 - 1782.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>52,146</td>
<td>82,089</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>326,347</td>
<td>169,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>86,118</td>
<td>78,950</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>353,984</td>
<td>270,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>101,724</td>
<td>108,653</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>349,970</td>
<td>233,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>119,798</td>
<td>130,460</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>423,885</td>
<td>185,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>103,494</td>
<td>89,655</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>384,242</td>
<td>184,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>124,139</td>
<td>97,207</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>379,159</td>
<td>274,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>99,980</td>
<td>174,953</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>408,069</td>
<td>237,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>117,191</td>
<td>190,559</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>476,471</td>
<td>272,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>162,676</td>
<td>191,634</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>486,376</td>
<td>339,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>178,580</td>
<td>114,819</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>611,583</td>
<td>375,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>160,797</td>
<td>127,196</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>575,382</td>
<td>303,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>199,520</td>
<td>164,110</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>525,028</td>
<td>240,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>187,011</td>
<td>155,188</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>504,572</td>
<td>260,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>215,217</td>
<td>157,542</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>540,860</td>
<td>41,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>167,481</td>
<td>121,313</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>95,596</td>
<td>71,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>185,481</td>
<td>110,085</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>11,277</td>
<td>256,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>162,150</td>
<td>111,665</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>32,891</td>
<td>120,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1757</td>
<td>209,430</td>
<td>123,793</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>38,952</td>
<td>235,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1758</td>
<td>315,969</td>
<td>137,840</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>83,913</td>
<td>254,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>209,856</td>
<td>160,543</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>49,826</td>
<td>183,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>389,396</td>
<td>186,013</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>110,637</td>
<td>73,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>314,722</td>
<td>153,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Annual values 1740 to 1761 from House of Lords Document, Nov. 20, 1775. Account of value of exports and imports to and from North America and Scotland, Christmas 1739 to Christmas 1773; annual values 1762 to 1782, compiled from The value of all Goods, Wares and Merchandize imported into and exported from Scotland... commencing Anno 1755, Melville Papers, 60, (National Library Scotland).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>Exports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>95 12 6</td>
<td>196 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. North</td>
<td>349,970 10 8</td>
<td>233,090 10 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>117,720 1 2</td>
<td>69,047 13 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den. &amp; Norway</td>
<td>37,427 13 2</td>
<td>38,449 18 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>1,679 11 8</td>
<td>17,596 18 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>8,804 8 8</td>
<td>307,540 17 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,448 10 -</td>
<td>30,031 15 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td>3,690 8 -</td>
<td>128 12 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>117,929 4 2</td>
<td>313,638 11 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>82,766 10 -</td>
<td>209,416 17 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1,445 14 6</td>
<td>1,583 12 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Man</td>
<td>400 -</td>
<td>5,393 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>15,300 16 10</td>
<td>1,837 9 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeira</td>
<td>11,706 8 6</td>
<td>1,169 18 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6,904 17 5</td>
<td>272 - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>92,339 9 1</td>
<td>7,299 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>6,904 18 -</td>
<td>6,834 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>30,200 5 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>886,352 11 1</td>
<td>1,243,927 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Between 1755 and 1775 the estimated values of imports from America each year ranged from one-third to one-half of the total Scottish imports. PRO Customs 14/1A and ff.
The trade indicated in the Scottish customs records was supplemented by transactions through London and other ports and by business conducted entirely outside Scotland but whose profits eventually returned there. Only in business records not at present available could such activity be traced. Wheat was sent from North America to South America on accounts of Glasgow merchants, and Custom House Accounts contain notices of licenses granted from the Commissioners at Edinburgh to ship rice from South Carolina to Europe south of Cape Finisterre. Uncounted Scottish traders lived and worked for years in America with possibly no direct economic links to Scotland, but finally returned to Scotland to live in retirement on American made fortunes. For example, in the letters of Charles Strachan (1763 to 1776) - Mobile, Alabama agent of the firm of Charles Strachan and Company - are many references to Scotsmen trading in America, but there are no references to trade specifically between Scotland and America. The letters passed chiefly between Mobile, Alabama, and Charleston, South Carolina. Strachan traded with Creek and Choctaw Indians in the back country, and with the French and Spaniards at New Orleans; he had other /
other connections with traders in Pensacola, Florida; Savannah, Georgia; and the West Indies. He dealt in textiles, mostly chintz and calico, in beef for military supplies, and to some extent in logwood and planking. The letters contain an occasional reference to London and Bristol suppliers, but none to Scottish concerns. Scottish names, however, are frequent. A shipload of slaves was delivered to Pensacola consigned to Messrs. McGillivray and Struthers. Strachan expressed hope for a good profit for Mr. Telfair on a shipload of slaves sent from Antigua to Georgia. Frazer, Forbes, McIntosh, McNab, and McGillivray were trading contacts at one time or another in South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama. In 1769 Charles Strachen returned to Scotland where he succeeded to his grandfather's estate at Kinnaber. In the fall of 1770 McGillivray returned to Inverness.²³

The American trade was of basic importance in Scottish economic development during the eighteenth century. It was an important factor in the development of manufacturing in the west of Scotland, for the requirements of goods to exchange for tobacco were greater than Scotland could supply. Perhaps three fourths of the Glasgow exports to America were /
were English produce or manufactures, but the almost unlimited demand for linen cloths, lawns and cambrics and the high demand for farm implements and for saddlery and shoes were strong inducement for the development of textile, iron, and leather manufactures in Scotland, and the profits of the trade provided development capital. The thread industry of Paisley dates from 1732 (and in twenty years employed 93 mills) while linen making was introduced to Glasgow in 1725, to become the most important Glasgow industry until superseded by cotton in the last quarter of the century. Iron smelting was negligible in Scotland until after 1760, but due to commercial demands bar iron was a common raw material import even at insignificant ports. At Glasgow, trade in iron, which had risen specifically in response to American demands, dated at least from 1732, while items such as nails, hoes, and tomahawks moved in the trade much earlier. Iron making at Glasgow dates from the late 1720s or early 1730s, and the Carron Works was established in 1760.

The importance to Scotland of the American trade gave Scottish merchants a vital interest in the problems which developed in relations with the colonies after 1763.
When the Stamp Act was passed, the most telling colonial response was the organization by the merchants of a non-importation agreement to take effect January 1, 1766. Countermanded orders and orders made conditional on repeal of the Act brought trade with America to a virtual standstill, unemployment spread, and collections on old debts could not be made. A campaign to secure repeal of the act was set in motion by the London merchants who brought evidence of the cancelled orders to government leaders and through a committee of correspondence urged inland towns and outports to apply for redress. By February 27, 1766 the House of Commons had received thirty-five petitions, and special deputies accompanied many of the petitions to plead the case for repeal.29

The city of Glasgow was unique in Scotland for its American trade, but it was one of several British cities whose prosperity depended heavily on that trade. Consequently the reports of British commercial difficulties which appeared in the summer of 1765 were of concern to Glasgow merchants. The hardships of American traders were noted in the Scottish press as early as June 1765 when an extract from a London letter told of several large orders sent /
sent from New York "countermanded, on account of the new American Stamp-duties.\textsuperscript{30} In December there was news of counter orders from America for goods "said to amount to £700,000."\textsuperscript{31} Concern over the fate of extensive colonial debts was accentuated by the report that "there being above two millions owing, the very delay in paying so large a sum must be hurtful to trade."\textsuperscript{32} In January came news that remittances from America "in Spanish dollars only, have fallen last year short of the usual quantity upwards of two millions."\textsuperscript{33}

When the London merchants organized a campaign for repeal of the Stamp Act, the Glasgow merchants participated along with the American traders in the other outports and trading towns. A letter from London reported the arrival of several eminent merchants "from Glasgow and other considerable trading towns in Britain, to join their interest with the Americans about getting the Stamp Act repealed, which it is now confidently said will be done upon certain conditions."\textsuperscript{34} Another letter disclosed that the petition of the Glasgow merchants had been presented to the House and read. The petitioners presented themselves as greatly affected in their fortunes by the disturbances due to the Stamp /
Stamp Act and prayed relief, and the seriousness with which Glasgow merchants viewed the situation is indicated in a letter to Burke from one of the Glasgow merchant deputies. After referring to alarming aspects of the situation he cited particularly the difficulty of collecting debts due to the suspension of court sittings, and to the hypothetical suggestion that English judges be sent out he asked, "But how are the decrees of such judges to be put in execution? By armed force alone, if the whole people are refractory. I forbear to say any more upon this subject ..." The gentlemen deputed by the Glasgow merchants to represent them in London and to solicit repeal or amendment of the American Stamp Act returned after two months absence with the agreeable news of repeal. "On this occasion all concerned in the trade and manufactures of this place who are so deeply interested in the prosperity of the colonies expressed a more than common joy and satisfaction."37

How much the Glasgow trade suffered during the period of controversy is difficult to ascertain. The colonies did not ban exports so that the re-export trade in tobacco could continue. In fact, the quarterly import figures for tobacco /
tobacco at Glasgow, computed in pounds and hogsheads, hardly show more than ordinary fluctuations through 1765 and 1766. Nor did shipping completely cease, for newspaper notices list ships outward bound for various colonies during the boycott period. At least some of these may have sailed in ballast. The exports of England and Scotland to the colonies were reduced. Exports from London to the commercial colonies declined from £1,410,372 in 1764 to £1,197,010 in 1765; exports to the tobacco colonies declined from £515,192 to £383,224. The Scottish exports to North America dropped significantly in 1765 and 1766, as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>£270,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>233,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>185,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>184,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>274,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After repeal of the Stamp Act the trading slump disappeared quickly and in mid March it was reported from Glasgow that since the news of the resolution to repeal the Stamp-act arrived there, the spirit for trade is again revived, and in the course of last week no less than 22 ships have sailed for foreign parts, one half of which number are bound for America; so that it is hoped the trade from this country will very soon be in as flourishing a state as ever.
The colonial reaction to the Townshend Acts was accompanied by less violence than occurred in connection with the Stamp Act, except in Boston, but the Americans again resorted to a boycott of British goods. As early as July 1768 it was reported that merchants and manufacturers in town and country concerned in the American trade were as greatly alarmed at the prospects as before the repeal of the Stamp Act. The boycott, instituted first in Massachusetts, was slow in spreading through the colonies, but it gained effectiveness and there were heavy losses by American traders. On the other hand, little actual distress was experienced in England during this period. Better than average harvests reduced food prices while the Russo-Turkish war, beginning in 1768, along with other unusual circumstances increased demands for textile manufactures and reduced the effect of the non-importation program.

There is reason to believe the Glasgow traders suffered even less in this period than the English because of their concentration on southern staples. Non-importation agreements were formed later in Virginia and Maryland than in the north, and enforcement was more lax in the south. The economic discontent among the debtor planters was less due to /
to the Townshend duties and restrictions than was the case in the north, and the Scottish and English factors who handled much of the business in the south could not be expected to cooperate fully in non-importation. The distribution of population and especially the absence of large trading centers was also a handicap to enforcement. Imports from England to the plantations actually increased in 1769 and 1770 (most of the non-importation agreements were adopted during 1769), whereas in the commercial provinces they declined two-thirds in 1769 as compared with 1768, and in 1770 they were still below the 1768 level even though the agreements collapsed in 1770.44

There is almost no complaint of commercial distress in Scotland, although a few extracts from American letters indicate some difficulties for Scottish traders. A merchant in New York, for example, explaining to his correspondent in Glasgow why he had not sent an order for goods, cited an agreement signed in New York and other provinces to stop imports from Britain, "which agreement I was obliged to come into. A few individuals could not, notwithstanding their inclination, oppose so popular a measure."45 But the export figures for this period indicate /
indicate a general immunity for the Glasgow trade from the colonial commercial coercion, as illustrated in the following comparison of exports to America from England and Scotland respectively. 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>2,372,225</td>
<td>274,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>1,628,077</td>
<td>237,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>2,337,832</td>
<td>272,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>4,586,882</td>
<td>339,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>4,586,882</td>
<td>375,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small damage to the Scottish trade may explain the scarcity of letters in the Scottish newspapers on the dispute over the Townshend Act.

Scottish trade with America reached its highest point in 1771 and continued strong until the final non-intercourse agreement became effective in the autumn of 1774. Financial difficulties in Scotland between 1771 and 1773 led to the collapse of the Ayr Bank and brought ruin to many merchants. The lists of bankruptcies which appeared in the newspapers in 1772 included some tobacco traders, but Glasgow suffered little in comparison with Edinburgh. 47 The revival of the colonial crisis in 1772 and the succession of acts of violence, radical agitation, economic pressure, coercive measures and finally the Continental Association were /
were another matter. With the growing possibility of American independence the tobacco traders were faced with the elimination of the chief article of their commerce, the suspension indefinitely of hopes for collecting on the American debts, and the prospect of properties in America confiscated by the new governments or destroyed by mobs prejudicial toward the Scots. These prospects for an important segment of the Scottish economy were the cause of much concern, and in 1775 the merchants evidenced their fears in many ways.

In April 1775 the disconcerting prospect of other nations entering the colonial trade was underlined by a report of a vessel loaded with tobacco arriving at Dunkirk directly from Virginia and of ten more vessels en route. A correspondent from Glasgow complained, "this is the first open infringement of the navigation act that we have heard of. If these proceedings are allowed to go on, what will be the consequence?" The report proved false, at least as regards the fleet of ten vessels, but there was much else to worry the merchants. Reports of property destruction in the colonies made it clear that Scottish properties were a special object of vengeance. Trade may have increased /
increased with London and Holland and with the loyal colonies, but it was stopped with the rebellious colonies. For a time notices were frequent of ships sailing to America in ballast and there were fears they would return without cargoes if at all. A letter from a merchant in Glasgow to a merchant in Whitehaven expressed a pessimism that must have been shared by many tobacco traders.

There is not the most distant prospect of finding an American freight here. The present unhappy situation is likely to shut up that channel, and our merchants begin to be afraid that the vessels they have lately sent out will be obliged to return empty, or lie in the country till some alteration of affairs is effected; for by late advices from Virginia, the people seem to be more turbulent than ever ...

In September 1775 it was reported no ships from America had arrived in the Clyde for several days, "from whence it is supposed that the exportation from America is stopt." A few late entries were reported, and in December two ships delayed by hurricane damage arrived to be duly noted as the last of the American trading vessels expected on account of the present troubles.

One of the important elements influencing the attitudes of the Glasgow traders toward American questions was the /
the correspondence they received from their agents in the colonies. These letters discussed current business affairs in America, the prospect for the future, and the significance of colonial political developments for the trade. Some of the views of a tobacco factor as well as some of the problems faced by both the factor and the merchant in the crucial years of 1774 and 1775 are illustrated in a series of letters from Alexander Hamilton, a factor in Maryland, to the firm of Messrs. James Brown and Company, merchants in Glasgow. These letters, dating from December 1773 to March 1776, are concerned primarily with business matters. The writer discussed prices, the quantity and quality of goods on hand, and the most suitable items to be included in forthcoming shipments. Occasionally he discussed personal items relative to members of his family and the disposition of his father's estate in Scotland. He worried about local incidents such as an "Emission scheme" by which the Maryland Assembly arranged to emit bills of credit to the amount of 266,666 2/3 dollars to be divided among the counties "agreeable to the number of Taxables in each." Since the bills were not legal tender, they threatened to affect adversely the exchange rates /
rates and prices.

Hamilton also reported faithfully the political events which threatened to affect the trade. After the Boston Tea Party and the Coercive Acts had given a new stimulus to resistance and revolutionary activity, the Glasgow firm received frequent reports on the revolutionary movement in Maryland and in the colonies generally. Hamilton informed them of struggles between colonial moderates and radicals, and warned early in 1774 that the trade would have to be abandoned if the radicals prevailed. He thought the people in general were averse to violent measures, but was convinced that the Americans would not submit to internal taxation and that the late Coercive Acts must be repealed. He deprecated colonial measures which made more difficult the collection of debts. He described the burning of a tea ship, cited animosities against the Scots traders, and warned of possible confiscatory action by the American Congress. In November 1774 he gave instructions to send no more goods unless the controversial acts were repealed. A general hope frequently expressed in 1774 for an amicable settlement became in 1775 a firm conviction that conciliatory measures by Britain were essential or all commercial /
commercial intercourse with the colonies would be at an end. He did not engage in polemics against the government's policy and he evidenced indignation at the American radicals and more at the mobs, but it is safe to say that the general import of his advice clearly favored such alterations in government policy as would conciliate the Americans. The overruling consideration was the welfare of the trade, and he saw only disaster in a continuation of the administration's American policy.

There were few letters which did not include some reference to the problem of collecting on debts. The following extract is merely typical.

... from the state I sent you last, you will see that I have Sued a great many, few or none of which I received any Payment from yet, nor do not expect before the 10th day February next, although I expect to get Judgment against them at August Court. I shall not receive the payment then, as they will Superside until february. You are very well acquainted with the tediousness of the Law here and the generally litigious disposition of the people, how well they are acquainted with every chicanery that the Law will admit of to keep off payment of their Debts and what good use they make of that Knowledge. Last Charles County March Court I expected Judgment against several people whom I had Sued the March preceding. The Court was adjourned until the 26 instant and has since been adjourned a further time. By such things as these I have been prevented making you a better remittance ... 54
In several letters he lamented the patriotic resolutions passed by various bodies, for he feared they would encourage the delinquents to delay payments either by their example of defiance or in anticipation of a breakdown of existing authority. He described the action of "a few men of desperate fortune" in gaining the adjournment of the Charles County Court with the argument that

by continuing to administer Justice impartially the Trader would receive the payment of his debts and of course be enabled to make remittance to his constituents, and which would be furnishing our enemies with weapons to fight us, and which we ought by every Method in our power to prevent them from receiving."

The matter of adjourned courts was a serious one, for so long as they were closed Hamilton could not secure payments and his remittances to Glasgow were reduced. As the date for non-importation drew near and the violence and excitement increased, Hamilton expressed ever more grave fears of extensive losses on the debts if an accommodation with the colonies were not arranged.

From the time when he first heard rumors that the Congress planned a non-exportation program, Hamilton warned of inevitable price rises and of an eventual dearth of /
of tobacco. In the summer of 1775 he was urging the firm to make the most of what must be their last opportunities for a time. The firm, he wrote, should

Most strenuously and unanimously endeavour to make the most of the present remittance, as it will be the last for some considerable time, if not for ever. The Debts that are now good and would be received were the exportation to continue, must many of them turn out bad. We therefore ought to look on this Collection as an equivalent for all the Debts that are now due, and as such endeavour to make it turn out ... 56

As the September deadline for exportation drew near, he wrote of feverish efforts to collect everything possible on the debts and to buy up the largest possible amount of tobacco for a last shipment. Meantime, he wrote with spirit of his determination to remain on the scene after non-exportation, refusing to submit to military service and making collections until he was forced to leave. 57

The virtual ending of the tobacco trade did not result in such disaster as might have been expected. A number of bankruptcies occurred, including some of the leading tobacco merchants, and a distressing picture was given in a letter to the Caledonian Mercury in 1778. The writer was complaining of Scotland's ills and called for
a general review of the state of the nation. He declared,

one half of our merchants have lost their fortunes, and will involve many individuals in ruin. One million five hundred thousand pounds cannot be lost by 30 companies only. Tradesmen and money-lenders in great numbers, must be ruined. Two hundred merchants and young men are banished from America ... 58

On the other hand, a letter from Glasgow in 1775 reported that "more than half a million of the debts due from America to Glasgow, have by the prudence and activity of the storekeepers, been recovered, and sent home in the course of a few months past. What is owing to this country now, is very trifling. Furthermore, price rises following the end of trade were anticipated and a number of traders who secured ample stocks and held them for a time profited enormously. The heavy importation in late 1775 is described in a letter to the Collector at Port Glasgow asking relief from certain entry regulations. The correspondents, six prominent Glasgow merchants, noted the cessation of exports from September 10th in Virginia and Maryland and then informed the collector, ...

our Factors in these parts were obliged to hurry away our /
our Ships with Tobacco and other Goods, then on Board, otherwise we had been precluded from bringing them to a European Market, so hereby there has been a great and sudden Importation of Tobacco from these two Colonies; and altho' we entered our Ships Regularly as they arrived and proceeded to Discharge them as long as there was any Warehouse Room or other Conveniency for Receiving and holding our Goods, yet after filling up the Warehouses both publick and private, and lodging our Tobacco in Ships belonging to us, lying in the Port formerly discharged; and after erecting temporary shades, where our Tobaccos are liable to great pilfer-age, for prevention whereof we are at the Expens of a Nightly Watch, we have still a good deal of Tobacco which cannot be landed for want of places to put it in; and as we hope there may be soon a considerable Exportation, we must beg of you an Indulgence to allow our Tobacco, not yet discharged, to remain on board our Respective Ships, ... 60

Prices rose from three and four pence a pound in 1773 and 1774 to two shillings a pound wholesale in 1776, and large stocks were still being disposed of in the latter part of 1777. 61

The blow to the tobacco trade was lessened somewhat by the heavy importations in 1775 and by wartime prices, but these factors were superseded by more important developments. The introduction of new manufactures and the gradual development of new markets were the key to economic adjustments which first restored and then stimulated and enriched the Scottish economy. These developments were unforeseen /
unforeseen by the apprehensive merchants and manufacturers of Glasgow who opposed a loyal address in 1775.

In the several years prior to the American war there is little mention of unemployment in Scotland until in 1774 the textile industries suffered a severe depression, although meal riots and work stoppages occurred with fair regularity and the financial crisis between 1771 and 1773 caused some difficulties. The most serious meal riots of the period had occurred in Perth and Dundee in 1773 when county gentlemen were forced to organize under the sheriff to protect the farmers from the town artisans. In the same year sailors completely tied up port activities at Greenock over a wage issue and when troops were called in and fighting developed, sailors gathered "from all quarters" to a number estimated at 700 and rioted several days. The unemployment reported in 1774 was a more serious matter, affecting large numbers of workers and families and implying serious consequences for manufacturers from the American disputes. Public spirited gentlemen in Glasgow, impressed by the misery to which hundreds of tradesmen were reduced for want of employment, proposed to raise /
raise by subscription 500 to 1,000 pounds for the purchase of yarn to be made by the unemployed into readily sold coarse goods. The merchants, traders, and manufacturers of Paisley sent a petition to the House of Commons complaining of the decline of the linen and thread manufactures and alleging that many thousands of unemployed had been reduced to the utmost distress and many hundreds had emigrated to distant countries as a result. But early in 1775 there began a series of optimistic notices concerning the trade and manufactures of the Glasgow area which indicate that the unemployment was only temporary.

The effects of the closing of colonial trade in December 1774 were reduced, as in 1769 and 1770, because of compensating trade developments. The American colonies which did not join the Continental Association — Georgia, Florida, and Quebec — increased their purchases of British goods, apparently for distribution in the rebellious provinces. New and larger contracts for supplying the army gave employment to British workers. Some American orders were received in spite of the Continental Association and many British merchants continued to lay orders because they retained /
retained hopes that the non-intercourse agreements would collapse. Added to these factors was an increase in the European trade occasioned by the timely conclusion of war between Russia and the Porte. Opportunities for trade with Persia and other countries through Russian trade routes, facilitated by an existing commercial treaty with Russia, provided a needed diversion for British commerce. 65

An extract from a London letter in January 1775 gives evidence of increased trade with the peripheral American colonies. The letter reported large orders from Quebec, Nova Scotia, Georgia, East Florida, and West Florida. These provinces did not participate in the Congress resolutions, and their merchants were described as resolved to prosper by the state of affairs and to smuggle into the other provinces. Sixteen ships were at the time of writing loading for Georgia alone. 66 A letter from Glasgow which gives the following picture of trade in that city after colonial non-importation had gone into effect can be duplicated many times.

Trade /
Trade has not been so brisk in this place, at Paisley, etc., these many years bygone, as it is at present. Not a single hand unemployed— weavers, wages all raised, and 10, 15, and 20 shillings often given as a premium to engage them. Our demands are chiefly from Holland and London; and I am well informed there are more orders in this place for silk gauzes, long lawns, etc., than can be answered for three months to come.67

A series of letters and reports from the west of Scotland indicate that the new demands promoted a bustling prosperity in the early years of the war, and there is little evidence of unemployment at any time during the war.68 A further stimulus was given to Glasgow shipping and manufactures by the new military and naval requirements. Several vessels belonging to Glasgow went into service as transports in 1775, and in January 1776 commissioners arrived in Glasgow to contract for 7,000 tons of shipping to transport troops to America. Eight transports were reported engaged in Greenock, to be ready by March first. The commissioners also purchased large quantities of rum, "bedding, water casks, biscuit, and butcher meat." In February 1776 nearly 80 coopers were reported drawn into Edinburgh from different parts of the country to make butts for the American service, not enough hands having been available in town to manage the orders.69

Even /
Even the trade with America rebounded in a surprising degree after the first two years of the war. Exports dropped from £260,003 in 1774 to £41,637 and £71,559 in 1775 and 1776. In 1777 exports rose to £266,169, almost equal to the figures for 1774, and continued high for a time. Trade with America was open through several channels. The increased demands from the loyal colonies have been mentioned. A system by which British ships were licensed to convey stores and provisions to the forces in America was apparently abused considerably. Wherever the British forces were in control, as at New York and after 1780 at Charleston, South Carolina, there was trade despite prohibitory legislation. The exports from Scotland to North America from the peak year of 1771 were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>£375,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>303,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>240,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>260,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>41,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>71,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>£256,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>120,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>235,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>254,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>183,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>73,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consequences of the war for the trade were considerable. Added to the dislocation in the American trade and a number of disasters among Glasgow merchants were /
were general commercial and manufacturing disabilities which accompanied the war. Insurance rates rose; ships were lost to privateers; ships had difficulty in manning vessels because of the inroads of impressment. The fisheries suffered some from the high prices of salt, tar, hemp, and staves, and from the drain on manpower. The demand for linens was sharply reduced. On the other hand, the blow to the tobacco trade had important effects on other elements in the Scottish economy. Merchants who survived recouped their fortunes by shifting their non-tobacco exportation to continental markets or by entering more vigorously into the West Indian sugar trade and into new textile industries. Energy and capital released from the tobacco trade and existing weaving skills were available to help the cotton and woolen manufactures meet new demands. The transfer of energies and markets was facilitated by capital already accumulated and by the enormous profits gained by some traders in the first years of the war. The iron industry was boosted sharply by war time demands for its products. The shift in business activity was further aided by the fact that Scottish merchants had a long history of trading relations with the continent /
continent and in the eighteenth century were important middlemen between the colonies and the continent. Their agents were well established in business communities in Holland and elsewhere in Europe. In addition, many tobacco firms had engaged in supplementary trade, which could be continued or expanded, with the West Indies and through London branches with various parts of the world.

A remarkable adjustment, then, was made by the commercial community in Glasgow in the train of the disaster to the tobacco trade. This adjustment was enduring, for the American trade as it existed before the war was ended. There was no possibility, once the colonies were independent, that Scotland would continue to supply Europe with American tobacco or to fashion American iron into implements to be re-shipped to America. The details of fortunes won by a few merchants and lost by others are unimportant beside the enforced shift in Scottish markets and the diversification of Scottish manufactures.\textsuperscript{75}
CHAPTER II

THE TOBACCO TRADE
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15. The checking system and abuses are described in detail in the Parliamentary Reports, ibid.; Complaints of pilfering and instructions for preventing it are recurrent in Letter Books of the Scottish Board of Customs Commissioners to the Collectors at Port Glasgow and Greenock, I-V.
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from Virginia according to the investigating committee's report in 1783, Parliamentary Reports, op. cit. 605. In 1771 the Collectors at Port Glasgow and Greenock received the following information: "Observing from a state of the medium difference betwixt the Plantation and imported weight of hogsheads of tobacco at Port Glasgow and Greenock for several years and a comparative view of such differences in England that the medium of difference is increased at Port Glasgow and much more so at Greenock since the year 1765, it having been at that time forty five pounds and for the years 1768 and 1769 sixty pounds and that both greatly exceed such difference in England, for which variation no sufficient reason is to be assigned from any special circumstances in the manner of importing tobacco, you are to acquaint the Surveyor General, land surveyors and land wasters at Port Glasgow and Greenock that we will for the future admit for no excuses whatever for the least deviation from the Order of the 13th December, 1765 directing that the beam be brought to an equilibrium, and the two pounds deducted from the weights in scale .."

Letter of Feb. 11, 1771, Letter Book, Scottish Board of Customs Commissioners to the Land Surveyors, Port Glasgow and Greenock, III.

17. In 1722 the Scots were charged with supplying England with almost four million pounds of undutied tobacco in three years. In the seventeen years preceding 1750 over a million and a quarter pounds were seized along the English coast. Gipson, The British Empire before the American Revolution, III, 136-137. In a letter of 1770 to Governor Botetourt of Virginia an effort was made to estimate the extent of the illegal trade in tobacco between the American Plantations and Scotland. The writer estimated that 80,000 hogsheads of tobacco were raised in Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina, and that 60,000 hogsheads or 54,000,000 pounds exported to Britain were accounted for in the King's Books. Of the 20,000 hogsheads or 18,000,000 pounds remaining, not over half could be absorbed in the American market and the illegal markets of the French settlements. About 10,000 hogsheads or 9,000,000 pounds were left to be smuggled into Great Britain. The writer continued: "It is difficult to say exactly in what proportion the Fraud is extended to Scotland, but several Reasons concur to make it probable that two thirds of the smuggled /
Smuggled tobacco being 6,000,000 pounds may be allotted to that country. The two principal reasons for this opinion are first that the chief agents or factors in America, with whom the fraud commences, are Scotch gentlemen connected mostly with the tobacco merchants in Scotland, and very little with the tobacco merchants in London, Bristol, or Liverpool. Secondly, that the islands of Mull, Egg, Sky, and others on the western coast of Scotland may be easily used as so many warehouses for depositing the tobacco till suitable market offers, they being as it were formed by nature for smuggling purposes. From these islands it is highly probable that part of the tobacco is smuggled on the opposite coast of Ireland, and the remainder conveyed into the interior parts of Scotland, to answer so much of the home consumption as is not supplied by the quantities regularly entered in the king's books, and for which the duty's have been paid. Letter to Governor Botetourt of Virginia from John Williams, enclosing "Observations on the tobacco trade in America and Scotland", 1 Jan. 1770, PRO, Treas. Papers, In Letters, 479. There is general information on smuggling with some reference to Scotland in Alfred Rive, "A Short History of Tobacco Smuggling", Economic History, I (Jan., 1929), 554-569.
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27. /

28. A letter from George Bogle to John Govan in London, 25 November, 1730, lists the following goods to be shipped to America: rugs, blankets, nails, hoes, tomahawks, welsh cotton, gunpowder, drop shott, printed calico, and pewter (plates, sorted dishes, middle sized basons, quart tankards, and porringers). Govan was given the names of agents on three rivers in Virginia to enable him to find a ship more easily. *Bogle Family Papers, Letter Book of George Bogle, 1729-1742*. Articles exported to America included all the manufactures required by the colonists. Textiles were the major export, the yardage equaling almost two million in 1771. A *Customs House classification* of exports listed 179 categories in which the one category of iron manufactures included all wrought-iron goods needed on farms, such as nails, hoes, spades, axes, hinges, grates, locks and kitchen furniture. W. R. Scott, "Economic Resiliency", *Economic History Review* II (1929-30), 292.

The effects of the commerce penetrated deeply into the agricultural and domestic economy through the stimulus it gave to the manufacture of textiles. These manufactures in mid-century were chiefly linen and wool, with linen the most important, and their production was closely related to Scottish agriculture. Almost every farm had a small plot of flax, and most reared sheep for wool, while in 1760 the domestic system of production was still prevalent and the individual household remained the typical unit of textile manufactory. J. M. Dickie, "Economic Position of Scotland in 1760", *Scot. Hist. Review*, XVIII (Oct., 1920), 18-19.
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40. The Value of all Goods, Wares, and Merchandize imported into and exported from Scotland compared with the Excess of each Country, commencing anno 1755 (to 1782), Melville Papers, (National Library of Scotland)


45. Another extract of a letter from Port Royal, Rappahannock River, Virginia evidences the slow progress of non-importation in the south. "Trade is very dull here at present. Our friends to the northward are still going on/
on with their opposition, but we here-think ourselves very happy in not being possessed of that seditious spirit. Though we have some disagreement among ourselves here, occasioned by some innoculators having got in among us, and the arrival of some vessels from the West Indies with the small pox... several gentlemen in Norfolk and Portsmouth have removed their families into the country in order to be inoculated, which has greatly irritated the party that is against introducing inoculation. The cry at present here is, No innoculators no inoculations, and to the northward, Liberty, and no British taxations". Cal. Mer., Oct. 24, 1768, letter dated Sept. 6.

Another letter from Virginia after the non-importation agreement had been signed in that province indicates some pressure from Glasgow agents for repeal of the duties. The letter disclosed that the Glasgow factors in that colony have entered into an association to store all the goods that shall be sent to them from Great Britain, and to sell none of them till the American revenue acts are repealed; and have also wrote to their principals here, insisting on their petitioning parliament, as soon as it meet, for a repeal". Edin. Eve. Cour., July 31, 1769.

46. Figures compiled from annual tables with places distinguished in David Macpherson, Annals of Commerce to 1801 (London, 1805), III, passim. The figures total exports to all North America, i.e., including Hudson's Bay, Newfoundland, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and Florida, but the quantities distributed to America outside the thirteen colonies were not large.

47. An Edinburgh report declared that "it is not remembered by the oldest person, that so great a calamity in the way of trade, as the bankruptcies, has ever happened in Scotland", and, like many contemporary observers, compared the crisis to the Darien disaster. Cal. Mer., June 27, 1772. The collapse of the Ayr Bank and the crisis in Scotland are discussed in William Graham, The One Pound Note in the History of Banking in Great Britain, (Edinburgh, 1911), 105-119; and Andrew W. Kerr, History of Banking in Scotland (London, 1918), 83-84; also of interest is Charles Wilson, Anglo-Dutch Commerce and Finance in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge, 1941), 169-172.

49. A letter from Virginia reported "that all the Scots houses in that place have been destroyed by the Virginians, and the goods and effects distributed amongst the populace". Another letter reported that no Scotsman was safe in almost any part of the continent unless he joined the Americans, and named some Scotsmen who had been fined or made prisoner or both. Edin. Eve. Cour., July 6, 1776; Oct. 7, 1775. One third of the Tory property confiscated by the Virginians during the war belonged to the "hated Scotch merchants" of Norfolk. Miller, Origins of the American Revolution, 20.

50. Edin. Eve. Cour., April 19, 1775
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The letters of Alexander Hamilton from 1773 to 1776 are an especially useful series and have been selected for comment.
comment. Hamilton was of Scottish origin, and was agent for stores at Bladensburg, Virginia, and Piscataway and Lower Marlboro, Maryland.

53. In an interesting instance in which the Scots were singled out he wrote; "It is said the Bostonians have strongly recommended to the Southern Colonies to destroy as much as they can the trade from Scotland, giving for reason that the Scots members in the House of Commons were unanimous against them. But it is suspected that this is done to terrify the trade of Glasgow and force them to petition the Parliament for a Repeal of the Tea Act well knowing they have a Considerable property in this part of the continent ...." Ibid, Letter of May 30, 1774.

54. Ibid., Letter of May 28, 1774.


56. Ibid., Letter of June 30, 1775.

57. Ibid., A new series of letters beginning in 1784 reveals that Hamilton spent the war years in the back country of Virginia. He returned to Piscataway, Maryland in January 1784 to revive what he could of the old tobacco trade and to begin the long and frustrating work of collecting on old debts.


59. Edin. Eve. Cour., Aug. 19, 1775. The writer continued, 'While this anarchy and distraction distress America, liberty, concord, and a trade beyond our homes, bless this corner of happy Britain'.


61. In April 1775 a Glasgow correspondent reported: 'Our imports this year have been extraordinary; and so far from importers /
importers suffering from the American disorders, nothing better could have happened to them. On the simple article of tobacco, full £5 is cleared on every hogshead. This on 20,000 hogsheads now on hand, and in Holland, is no small capital of itself; and I dare say, betwixt this and September, 30,000 more hogsheads may be expected." Cal. Mor., April 8, 1775. In September 1776 tobacco was reported selling at Glasgow at 6d a pound which three years before sold for 3d and only recently for 4d. In November 1776 tobacco was reported selling wholesale at 2/- per pound. The correspondent who reported this advised West India merchants of Edinburgh and Glasgow to have their correspondents plant the article in those islands as it would yield a greater profit than sugar and rum and sell as quickly. Edin. Eve. Cour., Sept. 4, 1776; Nov. 20, 1776. In April 1777 after tobacco had not risen for four months, the price was reported beginning to fall and was down 2d with further decreases expected owing to no demands from foreign markets. Some merchants were afraid that from the great quantities they have on hand, the Americans will be reduced before they get it disposed of. Ibid., April 28, 30, 1777. In the summer of 1777 the Glasgow merchants made one of their last reported large scale tobacco re-exports when they sent to France a shipment which reputedly sold for £150,000 sterling. Cal. Mor., June 9, 1777; Edin. Eve. Cour., Aug. 30, 1777. Thomas Somerville, writing in retrospect of his attempt to grow tobacco in 1782, stated that Glasgow merchants then still had warehouses crammed and were selling at exorbitant prices. He also stated that tobacco prices in 1781 "reached the unprecedented rate of two shillings per pound, but, as noted above, tobacco had sold at this rate in 1776. My Own Life and Times, 1741-1814 (Edin., 1861), 201-204.

Meal riots had occurred in Scotland in 1763, 1765, 1766, and 1771. In 1763 the Edinburgh Town Council was threatened in an anonymous letter with dire consequences if the rioters who had been arrested were not released and if the investigation of the riots was not halted. Cal. Mor., Nov. 30, 1763. In 1771 an advertisement was stuck up in the King's Arms Tavern in Dumfries threatening anyone who participated in or assisted the practice of engrossing, forestalling, or exporting corn. Magistrates apprehended /
The state of the manufactories at Paisley was presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Loom</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silk looms employed</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen looms employed</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon looms employed</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looms unemployed</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the looms were said to be fully employed before the "late stagnation of affairs put a stop to trade". Signs of a revival were noted, however, "especially in the ribbon way, which, from the employment it gives to numbers of children, promises to be a most useful acquisition to the country". *Cal. Mer.*, Feb. 5, 1774.


68. In the absence of merchant papers for the period, newspaper items must be relied on for an estimate of the activity in trade. The following quotations illustrate the persistence of the reports, and the emphasis on manufactures should be noted.

Extract of a letter from Glasgow, dated May 17. "Notwithstanding there have been no goods sent to America (a few to Quebec excepted) since the end of August last, yet scarcely a week has passed but some vessels have arrived with tobacco, indigo, tar, rice, etc.; so that it is computed we have received to night the value of a million sterling within these eight months. In the article of tobacco alone, we have imported about the value of £650,000 Sterling worth. At the same time, the demand for our different manufactures is so great, the prices of most kinds have advanced; and hands cannot be got to complete the commissions from England and Holland.* Cal. Mer.*, May 20, 1775.

"A gentleman who has just made a tour through Glasgow, Port-Glasgow, Dunfermline, and some of the other manufacturing towns of Scotland, informs us that trade is exceedingly brisk, and that the manufacturers have many more orders from England for goods than they can get executed". *Ibid.*, June 17, 1775.
"By a gentleman from Paisley we learn that since cessation of exportation of manufactures to America, other markets have arisen providentially. In particular large orders come from Russia, England, etc., and trade was never known to be so brisk as at present". Edin. Eve. Cour., July 5, 1775.

Extract of a letter from Glasgow, dated Mar. 12.
"The demands for all our different manufactures still continue brisker than when the American trade was open. The orders from England and abroad are so very large, that it will not be in our power to complete them for three or four months to come". Ibid., Mar. 13, 1776.

Extract of a letter from Paisley, dated March 9.
"Never were our orders, both from London and Holland, etc., for silk gauzes and clear lawns, so great as those received this spring. By all appearances there will not be a single hand idle for at least six months to come". Ibid.

"By a letter from Glasgow we are informed, that the trade was never so brisk there as at present. The loss of the American trade has been of great advantage to the merchants of that place. Fortunes will be made by the advance of tobacco, and other American goods, of which great store is still on hand. At the same time every manufacturer has more orders for goods than he can complete for three months to come". Ibid, July 17, 1776.

Extract of a letter from Glasgow, dated July 22.
"All our goods are greatly advanced, and still continue upon the rise, notwithstanding of the trade being lost for the time. At present we have more orders from England and Holland, for our different manufactures, than it will be in our power to supply for four months at least to come". Ibid., July 24, 1776.

"A correspondent at Glasgow informs us, that trade in general was never known to be so brisk as at present. The demand for goods is much more than they can answer. Within these last six weeks, the merchants of Glasgow and Greenock have loaded, and sent out for New-York and Halifax, no less than ten or twelve ships, with all sorts of merchant goods."
goods, besides many ships lying-to daily for the same purpose. It is hoped, that, by the spring, trade to that part of the world will be carried on to a greater extent than ever. *Ibid.*, Jan. 8, 1777.

It was reported in April 1777 that merchants and manufacturers of Glasgow imported a large quantity of foreign yarns from Bremen and Hamburg because they could not get enough homespun to answer their demands. *Ibid.*, April 28, 1777.

In December 1777 a correspondent reported the manufactures of Britain "were never carried on with greater success than at present" and cited the flourishing woollen trade at Leeds, Sheffield, Bennington, Wolverhampton, and the linen trade at Darlington. *Ibid.*, Dec. 23, 1777.

70. D. M. Clark, *British Opinion and the American Revolution*, 105. A gentleman who left the Clyde in October 1776 wrote from Newport, Rhode Island to his partner in Glasgow in Feb. 1777 that he had sold his entire cargo amounting to £4,000 at very advanced prices, and that since sales were brisk and profits good another cargo should be prepared. He noted that the inhabitants had hid their money when the Congress paper appeared, but now with an army of about 27,000 and near 15,000 seamen in the area, sales were very quick and payments were all in foreign gold and silver coin. *Edin. Eve. Cour.*, April 28, 1777.

71. The Value of all Goods, Wares and Merchandize imported into and exported from Scotland compared with the excess of each Country commencing Anno 1755, (to 1782?) Melville Papers.

72. The rates on goods to the West Indies or North Carolina before the war were two or two and one-half percent. In 1778 the rate was twice that in convoy or fifteen percent without. Clark, *British Opinion and the American Revolution*, 97.

73. A contemporary review of the effects of the war on Scottish /
Scottish commerce cited the capture of 31 vessels, "many of them richly laden". John Knox, *A View of the British Empire* (1784), 102.


A parallel may be drawn between the tobacco traders at the time of the American Revolution and the British cotton industry during the Civil War. The cotton industry in 1860 was faced with a cotton famine on which the South counted heavily for securing British intervention in the war. Surplus stocks of cotton on hand, in both England and France, staved off a famine until 1862. During the American Revolution Scottish merchants were still disposing of their stocks of tobacco at the end of 1777. The fact of surplus stocks in the face of an approaching scarcity presented huge profits in both instances. Raw cotton rose from fourteen cents to sixty cents a pound, and the merchants as well as the related manufacturers sold at net profits of $400,000,000, while the larger mills continued to manufacture and hold against the rising markets. The cotton industry was refinanced on the basis of high-priced raw cotton and to the cotton-buyers, mill-owners and banking interests concerned the end of the war meant the end of a bonanza. Enormous profits were also made by other industries - linen, wool, munitions and shipping. These enormous material gains are credited with securing Britain's non-intervention in the American Civil War. Frank L. Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy*, (Chicago, 1931) ch. XIX.

Similar factors which operated to reconcile the tobacco traders to the war with the American colonies are obvious, for not only did traders stand to gain from high tobacco prices, but related industries - textiles, munitions, and shipping - also benefited from greatly increased demands. The parallel should not be carried too far, for during /
during the Civil War British imports rose steadily and exports, after an initial setback in 1861, also rose steadily. In 1864 the volume of British foreign trade was thirty-four percent greater than before the war. In 1775 and 1776 Scottish imports and exports were much more severely affected and pre-war figures were not actually regained until after 1790.
CHAPTER III.

EMIGRATION

The aspect of Scottish emigration to the American colonies of most concern for this study is the large scale movement which began shortly before the middle of the eighteenth century, reached mass migration proportions in the 1770's, and was then checked by the outbreak of war. A flow of Scotsmen to America, however, in the 17th and 18th centuries had preceded this movement and, in one respect, prepared the way by establishing centers of Scottish settlement and economic activity towards which most of the later migration was directed. Persons transported for political, religious or criminal activity, indentured servants; Scottish colonists, remnants of Scottish regiments serving in America, colonial and military officials, clergymen, persons involved in commerce, and casual adventurers comprised the earlier migration. Among these were the Scotsmen responsible for the strong economic ties with American sources of wealth, those who filled important roles in political and military affairs in the colonies and sometimes in Britain as well, and the literate men /
men, in public affairs as well as the preachers and teachers, who provided the channel for ideological exchange between Scotland and America.

Transportees banished as criminals increased from small numbers early in the 17th century to a scale after 1665 which made the cargoes of Scottish vagabonds and small felons a considerable and profitable part of Scottish trade with America before the Union. Between 1660 and 1688 the Covenanters provided additional subjects for transportation. After the first serious outbreaks in 1666, rebels who confessed to participation in rebellion but refused the oath of allegiance were scheduled to Barbados or the American continent. An Act of the Scottish Parliament in 1670 required subjects to testify of conventicles with which they were familiar on pain of transportation, and in 1684 the king approved transportation of all rebels who appeared penitent but refused to take the Test Oath. At least ten were brought to New York in the summer of 1684 and sixty or more were brought to Carolina; more were available in the autumn. A boost in numbers followed the battle of Bothwell Bridge in 1679 and after the rising and defeat of Argyll in 1685 over 200 were sent to/
to Jamaica and Barbados, more than 100 were conveyed to New Jersey, and fifteen were at least scheduled for New England. The total number of Covenanters exiled to the Plantations has been estimated at 1,700, some of whom it may be presumed never arrived.

The battles of Preston, Dunbar, and Worcester in the seventeenth century provided substantial numbers of Scottish military prisoners for transportation, for after Dunbar some 1,100 were assigned in two shiploads to Virginia and 300 in two more shipments to New England. Little is known of the Preston captives, but an unknown number were sent to New England, among them a shipment of 272 who were landed at Boston and dispersed in nearby towns. In 1654 and 1655 General Monck produced about 500 prospects for the Plantations, but not all of these were carried over.

More military prisoners and voluntary deportees were supplied by the eighteenth century rebellions. After the rising of 1715 a Liverpool merchant, Sir Thomas Johnson, contracted at 40 shillings per head to take prisoners to the Plantations where they were to be assigned for seven years. Johnson and his agents dispatched at least 639 rebels to the colonies in 1716. Three hundred and forty of /
of these went to America, 173 to the West Indies, and 126 either to Virginia or Jamaica. Six hundred and ten out of almost 3,500 prisoners were sent out of the country following the Forty Five. One shipment of 254 went to the West Indies, another shipment of 150 was captured by the French and the men freed, and two ships with 153 men arrived in Maryland. Other emigrants were a direct consequence of the Forty Five, for some participants had pardons bearing a condition of banishment, and some abandoned Scotland out of general despair at existing conditions. Nine hundred and thirty six were condemned to banishment while contemporary accounts indicate over a 1,000 left Liverpool alone about the time the prisoners were being sent from that port.  

The Scots made two efforts to establish colonies on the North American continent in the seventeenth century. A group of prominent Covenanters founded in 1684 the short-lived Presbyterian colony of Stuart's Town at Port Royal in South Carolina. The settlement was destroyed by a Spanish expedition in 1686 and the handful of survivors found refuge in Charleston. Scottish emigrants were arriving in appreciable numbers from 1683 in the Scottish colony /
colony of East New Jersey, established chiefly through the work of the Scottish Quaker, Robert Barclay. Perth was made the capital of the settlement, and eighteenth century emigrants from Scotland and Ulster to New Jersey occupied most of the northern counties, went south and southwest to settle the area around Princeton, and were prominent in the towns of Elizabeth, Newark, Middletown, and Shrewsbury, and in the surrounding countryside.7

Several settlements of Highlanders were also made in the colonies before the period of mass migration. The earliest and most important of these was in North Carolina one hundred miles up the Cape Fear River. Highlanders were there as early as 1729, and growth was steady. Three hundred and fifty Scots, mostly from Argyllshire, arrived with Neil McNeil of Kintyre in 1739. After the Forty Five the Cape Fear area received a substantial influx and it was estimated in 1753 that in the present Cumberland County there were 1,000 Highlanders capable of bearing arms – 4,000 to 5,000 all told, with more in adjoining counties. The area received many more in the 1770's, the MacDonalda d of Raasay and Skye being especially numerous. Royalist forces recruited from the North Carolina Highlanders /
Highlanders in February 1776 are estimated at from 1,500 to 3,000 men. 8

Other Highland settlements were made in Georgia and New York. In 1735 one hundred and eighty Highlanders recruited from the area of Inverness settled New Inverness on the Altamaha River in Georgia (now Darien in McIntosh County). This was one of several Georgia frontier posts settled by various national groups and which totaled 18,000 white inhabitants in 1773. What increment the Scottish post received is unknown, but it remained an almost purely Highland settlement until the end of the Revolution. 9

Land grants offered by the colony of New York brought Captain Lauchlan Campbell from Islay to America with eighty-three families in 1739 and 1740. After vicissitudes their settlement was made in 1763 in what is now Washington County, New York. A number of discharged Highland soldiers entered the settlement after 1764, but no further additions from Scotland are known. 10 When Sir William Johnson received his grant of 100,000 acres north of the Mohawk river, his agents sought settlers in Scotland. About 400 Catholic Highlanders from Glengarry, Glenmoriston, Urquhart, and Strathglass settled at Albany late in 1773. During /
During the Revolution this predominantly loyalist community moved to Canada and there formed the settlement of Glengarry, Ontario.  

The group settlements were not on a large scale, but the Scottish population in the colonies was augmented by the men in commerce, in colonial administration, and in the army and navy. Their importance is measured not by an estimate of numbers but by their work and influence. The colonial trade—so important in the Scottish economy—brought Scotsmen across the Atlantic where, independently or attached to mercantile houses, they served as agents, factors, and traders. In Maryland and Virginia the Scottish factor was a more integral part of the business community than elsewhere, but the Scottish traders ranged the continent, selling, buying, and bartering with the Yankee merchant in New England and with the Creek and Cherokee in the Alabama back country.  

Scotsmen also entered American life through posts in colonial administration. More Scottish officials and officers than English went out to America, and more upper class Scotsmen than Englishmen had relations in America or were intermarried with colonial families. In the course
course of extensive land speculation in America after 1763 a feature of the government land grants was the frequency with which they were given to Scotsmen. This was due to the large number of Scots among army officers in America and to the prevailing Highland emigration which enabled the grantees to satisfy the requirement of settlement by white protestants. Some of the Scottish officers who received grants settled in the country as planters, providing thereby a still closer link between Scotland, and especially Glasgow, with the American sources of Scottish trade. Additional numbers were added to Scottish settlements, meanwhile, from the Highlanders who served as soldiers in America during the Seven Years War. The 42nd, 77th, and 78th Regiments were given duty in America and during that time their basic strength reached a total of approximately 5,000 exclusive of replacements and new recruits. At the war's end they were given the option of returning home or of taking up land grants in the colonies, and many chose to remain.

In the period of the American Revolution an emigration movement developed which differed in its causes and character from the drift of Scotsmen to America before 1765. The sensational /
sensational nature of the new emigration should not be allowed to obscure the earlier movement which was co-ordinate with the development of basic economic and other ties with the colonies and which provided the essential pre-conditions of general familiarity with the country as well as logical destinations in the form of Scottish settlements. The correspondence of numerous relatives and acquaintances living and working in America as traders, officials, and soldiers; publicity concerning colonial schemes; missionary efforts; and political events—all added fact or fancy to the knowledge of America. Observers of the Highland emigration commented on the relationship with America which gave restless people familiarity with a place to which they could escape. The emigration of Scottish Highlanders began roughly in 1740 and reached its peak in the 1770's. It was checked in 1775 by the developing conflict in America, but after 1783 it began anew, slightly altered in character and directed into Canada, and though interrupted by the Napoleonic wars it continued more than half a century longer.

It is clear that the Highlanders who left before 1775 were /
were not poverty stricken peasants. The descriptions of Highland emigrants by Knox and other contemporaries are moving, accounts in the older histories of the Highlands suggest much peasant distress, and in contemporary discussions the chief blame was laid on "oppressive landlords," but too much attention may have been paid to graphic situations. In the main the first phase of the Highland emigration was a movement of the tacksmen, lessees of large farms and often privileged socially as well as economically. They took with them dependent tenants and there was some independent migration of the poorer peasants, but not until after 1783 did the peasant class provide the force of the movement. The tacksmen left because in the changing circumstances of the eighteenth century they were losing a position socially and economically advantageous. Rentals increased as traditional clan services declined while the tacksmen remained unwilling or unable to participate in changes in agricultural method and estate management. Absenteeism of clan chiefs strained loyalties, and the prohibitions and dissolutions of Highland customs after 1745 weakened the bonds which held the inhabitants in the glens. Tacksmen refused to comply with the /
the higher rents and the lands were let directly to the former subtenants. As men of substance and influence the tacksmen were able to persuade servants and dependents to accompany them to America. The lower classes in general did not leave; the position of many among them was improved rather than injured, at least temporarily, and their emigration on a large scale only occurred with the later introduction of sheep farming.  

The emigrants left from widespread areas. The most drastic movements were from the islands of Skye, the two Uists, Lewis, Arran, Jura, Gigha, and Islay. The bulk of the mainland emigration came from the glens of Inverness-shire, Strathglass, Glenmoriston, Glengarry, and Glen Urquhart. Others came from Perthshire, Strathspey, Argyllshire, Ross, and Sutherland. Embarkations from Glasgow or Greenock were likely to receive notice but unrecorded sailings from small Highland ports were frequent. Gigha, the Skye ports, Campbelltown, Dunstaffnage Bay, Fort William, Maryburgh, Stornoway, Loch Broom, Loch Errribol, Thurso, and Stromness all served as collecting centers and points of embarkation. Destinations in America were determined largely by the earlier Scottish settlements /
settlements and in the 1760's and 1770's the majority of Highlanders went to the settlements in the Carolinas and New York, to Nova Scotia, and in smaller numbers to Georgia. 17

The number of emigrants is conjectural, for existing lists of departures are far from complete, but two estimates by contemporaries or near contemporaries are frequently cited. Knox is quoted by Adams as citing 20,000 departures between 1763 and 1773. (In the third edition of Knox's book, published in 1785, the figure given is 30,000 emigrants between 1763 and 1775). Garnett in his Tour published in 1810 offers the figure of 30,000 emigrants between 1773 and 1775. The Scots Magazine noted emigrant sailings, and as a contemporary source its figures may be the most reliable, but its notices are hardly exhaustive. The total recorded by the Scots Magazine is under 10,000. Statistics in miscellaneous sources and in the Old Statistical Account are so scattered and vague as to be of little help. Knox's figures of 20,000 to 30,000 from 1763 to 1775, less than Garnett and more than the Scots Magazine, may be the most satisfactory approximation. 18
In the fifteen years prior to the American war, the tide of emigration excited much concern. It was a persistent topic of news and discussion in the press and was an object of special concern as the dispute with America deepened. From 1763 the exodus from the Highlands was evidence to many of a situation of distress which required the attention of government, while additional alarm was caused by the fact that skilled workmen were also emigrating. Advertisements called urgently for millwrights, house carpenters, coppersmiths, blacksmiths, brick layers, wrights and masons for the West Indies, New York, and other colonies. Notices told of nearly 100 journeymen silk throwers (from England) engaged for New York and Philadelphia, forty-seven young women engaged for Pensacola and Saint Augustine, "a great number of sawyers" engaged for Nova Scotia.

It is not surprising that letters appeared in the press calling attention to the emigration and discussing remedial measures to prevent the loss of useful citizens. "It is something remarkable," wrote a correspondent early in 1765, "that ever since the regulations were made last year, concerning the North American trade, we hardly read
a newspaper that does not mention manufacturers, of one kind or another, going from England, Scotland, or Ireland to settle in those colonies; which, if true, is certainly a matter that should to the last degree prove alarming to these kingdoms." The writer assigned the exodus of tradesmen to two complementary causes. Restrictions on the American trade made it more difficult for colonists to buy needed manufactures and therefore they were turning to their own manufactures, while, on the other hand, the want and misery of labouring people in Britain, evidenced by the numerous subscriptions being raised for their relief, induced workmen to seize the opportunities for employment in America.23

Another writer dwelt at length on the apparent lack of regard for country which was implied in the numbers departing. He wrote that in proportion as men find the comforts and blessings of life attainable in a country will they be attached to it. "Noble minds will flee from unworthy subjugation ... and ignobler ones from other miseries." He continued,

"These observations occurred to me on reading the frequent advertisements that appear of young men offering /
offering themselves for various kinds of service abroad, some with an express desire of quitting their country, for residence in particular places, others in any part of the world, and most with expressed indifference of service either abroad or at home; and yet perhaps there are few countries in the world in which there appears less of this kind of indifference than there does in our own; but still that there is so much of it here is a melancholy consideration, while there is such great room as at present for extending improvements and population at home. But that there does, I think, plainly points out that there are evil causes of such effects that much require to be removed; for such causes must be evil as tend to deprive a community of that love which its members should have for their country."24

The conviction of an "evil" situation which sent worthy people out of the country grew as the notices of departing tradesmen were supplemented increasingly in 1767, 1768, and 1769 with notices of Highland emigrants. Not only were their numbers large, but many of them were clearly farmers of substance. They were reported to be selling their properties, paying for passage, and purchasing land in the colonies. Not infrequently it was claimed they carried large sums abroad. A letter from the Western Isles in 1772 claimed that emigrants from that "poor corner of Scotland" had taken out 10,000 pounds in specie since 1768.25 The loss of wealth was as disturbing as the loss of tradesmen and excited comment in many of the /
the essays on the causes and the harmful consequences of emigration.

In almost all the essays complaints of the "tyrannical oppression" of the landlords recur. It was observed that the new settlements on the Mississippi and the Ohio would not want for inhabitants, "as in consequence of the oppression of the landlords in Scotland, we are assured that no less than 900 persons left Scotland in 1769, 1,000 in 1771, and at present 3,000 more are on the point of setting off." The report added the view that these migrations would eventually operate powerfully on the inexorable landlords to change their practices, but meantime they must be obliged to grant longer leases so that a farmer who lays out two or three hundred pounds in improvements has the prospect of securing a return on the money instead of being turned out in favor of a newcomer who, hoping to reap the fruit of the farmer's labour, pays an advanced rent which in turn brings about his own ruin. A group of 140 intending emigrants, described as having money and intending to make purchases in the colonies, "which is inducing numbers of tradesmen and labourers to go along," were reported part of a general movement of which /
which "the tyrannical oppression of the landholders is visibly the cause." The landholders were charged with letting their farms at very excessive rents and burdening the leases with restrictions and penalties which made the possessors liable to fines for every trifling failure and trespass. Ruin and misery resulted and the poor people had no recourse but to leave "that country where hardship and beggary are their inevitable portion." 27 Another writer who anticipated legislation to prevent emigration wrote indignantly of poverty among tenants, labourers, and tradesmen. Many had gone to the great towns of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Greenock only to starve. Many from different parts of the Highlands had already gone to America and others were preparing to go. "We are told, the parliament will make an act to hinder Emigrations: A cruel act indeed! to hinder free-born subjects, who are really starving, to go wheresoever they can find food and clothes! ..." 28

In view of undoubtedly harsh features of tenant farming in the Highlands, as well as the intermittent unemployment and scarcity of meal, some features of colonial life as presented by agents, letters, or other accounts were /
were especially attractive. Emigration was not so widely condemned before it reached its remarkable proportions after 1773, and in 1769 a sermon which encouraged emigration was printed and an extract in the *Scots Magazine* listed the advantages of settlement in America. The author proposed to discuss the excessive land rate in Scotland, to show the causes and the unfortunate consequences of it, and to show that as the Israelites were delivered from oppression by divine providence so the afflicted people of Scotland should seek the deliverance provided for them. No miraculous voice from heaven was needed, he continued, for facts, "the visible course of his providential administration," show the way to a relief more effectual and speedy than the Israelites had when Moses called upon them to leave Egypt. This relief "is in the wide and pleasant fields of North America."

And dare any man say, that such a large accession of territory to the empire of Britain, hath not been purposely provided by divine providence to afford a comfortable habitation to those who are so ill used and so much borne down in this country? It was when the Israelites were compelled to make bricks without straw, that the cup of the Amorites began to be full, Gen. XV. 16. It was when the rate of land in this country was rising so high that laborious farmers could not live by it, that the God of war and peace provided abundance /
abundance of room for them in a different part of the world. The advantages of living in North America are great and many: The people there are under the auspicious government of George III; the land is good in its quality, large in extent, cheap and gratuitously bestowed, civil and religious liberty flourishing there, and the passage to it is unexpensive, and made in a few weeks.29

The views of a group of emigrants are given by a correspondent who asserted that in response to questions a body of Highlanders embarking for America in 1773 gave the following attractive picture of the new world as their reason for emigration:

1. The price of lands is so low in some of the British colonies that forty or fifty pounds will purchase as much ground there as ten thousand pounds in this country.
2. There are few or no taxes at present in the colonies, most of their public debt being paid off since the last peace.
3. The climate in general is very healthy, and provision of all kinds are extraordinary good, and so cheap, that a shilling will go as far in America, as four shillings in Scotland.
4. The price of labour (from the scarcity of hands and the great plenty of land) is high in the colonies: A day labourer can earn there thrice the wages he can earn in this country.
5. There are no beggars in North America, the poor, if any, being amply provided for.
6. Lastly, there are no titled Lords to tyrannize over the lower sort of people, men being there more upon a level, and more valued, in proportion to their abilities, than they are in Scotland.30
The consequences of emigration for the mother country were conceived of primarily in terms of the loss of economic strength. The transfer of specie by farmers of substance, and the depopulation of a region "rather in the infancy of being civilized than improved," were alarming developments. Numbers of people are the truest riches and real strength of a kingdom, it was repeatedly asserted, "so no one of course can have too many of them; and to a country that wants people, any loss of them is the greatest injury it can possibly sustain." Public concern was stimulated in 1774 when widespread unemployment in the linen industry increased the number of skilled workmen among the emigrants. The merchants, traders, and manufacturers of Paisley petitioned the House of Commons on the decline of the linen and thread manufactures, which, they said, had caused thousands to be reduced to the utmost distress and obliged many hundreds to emigrate from Paisley to distant countries to save themselves from starving. As the disputes with America progressed, still another disquieting factor was aired, for the exodus contributed to colonial population and to their economic and military strength at a time when the colonies /
colonies were thinking too much of independence.

The State ... not only loses those useful members [the mechanics in Paisley] but also their families and offspring; and what is still more alarming, they go and naturalize themselves among the disobedient children of the Mother Country, and imbibe their destructive notions of anarchy. The Americans are already too prone to throw off the yoke, which, in my opinion, hangs gently about their necks; and every shipful of these emigrants that reaches their shores, will hasten that day when they shall throw off their dependence upon Britain altogether. Besides the great acquisition of these manufacturers to America, will proportionally be a loss to the Mother Country, as the many commodities that are in use to be exported from our markets will cease to be demanded, these articles being cheaper furnished by what I may call their new subjects...

Officials expressed alarm over emigration on several grounds. They were concerned at the indication of economic distress in the Highlands, at the loss of both agricultural and industrial producers, and at the adverse effects of emigration on the Highlands as a nursery of soldiers. The most unfortunate prospect, finally, was of an increase in colonial economic and military strength at the expense of Britain at a time when war with the colonies was imminent.

The Highland emigration was heaviest between 1773 and 1775.
1775 and during these years became so extensive as to force the attention of Scottish officials. In a report to the Secretary of State in October of 1773 the Lord Justice Clerk, Thomas Miller, wrote of a process at Glasgow which was complicated by the opportunities for emigration. A combination to raise wages formed by journeymen weavers at Paisley had resulted in riotous proceedings which interrupted manufactures in the area for several weeks. A prosecution was instituted during which twelve persons were brought to the bar, and, in answer, some thousands of useful weavers involved in the combination threatened to go off in a body to America. In the words of Miller, "the trial became very delicate," and he conducted the trial with utmost care, counselled leniency, mitigated the punishment of the seven convicted, and spoke "with warmth and tenderness" to all concerned. He reported complete success in laying to rest all thoughts of going to America on this occasion, but concluded, "I pray God, for the sake of this Country, that such Ideas of Migration to America may not become epidemical amongst the most usefull of our people."34

The chief reason which Miller gave for the emigrations was /
was the increase in land rents, although he thought a series of bad crops and current unemployment (1774) were also important. Henry Dundas also gave importance to a "precipitant and injudicious rise of rents" as the immediate cause of emigration in some parts of Scotland, but he insisted on the greater and the fundamental importance for the phenomena of emigration of the legislation which followed the Forty Five. The dispersal of Highland chieftains and their estates and the deliberate eradication of the spirit of clanship had unforeseen consequences. Highland chieftains who once valued their estates for the number of men they contained now valued their properties for the money they returned. The Highlands had always produced a surplus of men, but since idle men were no longer valued and the bonds of clanship were replaced by schemes for a profitable administration of properties, the surplus had no recourse but to search elsewhere for livelihood. The legislation was initially necessary, but there was no longer any semblance of disaffection in the north and the proscriptions ought to be abolished and clanship encouraged as a system of much potential usefulness to the government.
Miller set himself the task of informing the Secretary of State of the extent and dangers of the prevailing spirit of emigration. He was especially concerned over the tendency of the "Spirit of Emigration" to spread, and he observed that although it first began in the Highlands, it had begun to affect the lowlands and the manufacturing towns and villages of Scotland.

"What is most alarming, it seems to affect not only the lower class of people, but some of the better sort of farmers and Mechanicks, who are in good circumstances and can live very comfortably at home. Various associations have been formed for purchasing lands in the Colonies, upon a joint stock, to be afterwards divided among the contributors, upon their arrival in America; And if this idea of acquiring land property, so natural to man, and of improving that property in a better climate, shall cease the minds of such of our people, as can carry over money to purchase and clear the Lands in America, it may in time as effectually depopulate this Country as the Mines of Peru and Mexico have depopulated the Kingdom of Spain."

His warnings to the Secretary of State on the subject brought a request in November 1773 for information on the number of emigrants over the previous two years. Miller corresponded with the sheriffs of Argyll and Bute, Inverness, Ross, Sutherland and Caithness, and Moray and Caithness on the subject and had the sheriffs send circular letters to /
to the parish ministers for lists of emigrants for the years 1772 and 1773. His returns from Argyll and Bute, Ross, and Moray and Nairn, specifying parishes and distinguishing men, women, and children are without doubt the first effort at a systematic enumeration of the emigrants. Even if the ministers' reckonings were reasonably accurate, however, the limited number of counties included makes the lists illustrative at best, but the figure of 3,169 emigrants (including the years 1769, 1770, and 1771 for Argyll and Bute) is not insignificant, nor is the information that from the estate of the Countess of Sutherland alone 735 persons were lost to America in 1772 and 1773.

The fact that emigration continued in spite of the difficulties with the colonies and was even reported increasing in 1775 gave rise to apprehension that American sympathies may have spread in the Highlands. Miller expressed concern that the American agents he described as busily seducing the Highlanders might have corrupted their minds with American principles; that these principles and the number of emigrants might retard recruitment in the Highlands; and that the Highlanders in America might prove /
prove the best recruits for the rebel armies. The attachment of the Highlanders to the government was indisputable, at least when they are left to themselves, "but, when exposed to the insidious arts and falsehoods of American agents, they may be deceived and enticed from their duty to the King, as they are daily from all the tender relations of their country." The possibility that the emigrants had imbibed American principles or at the very least would contribute to the rebel soldiery was the immediate reason for the Lord Advocate's order ending emigration. Immediately after learning of the King's proclamation for suppressing rebellion and sedition he was informed of hundreds of passengers embarking for America and that many of them carried some money, arms, and ammunition with them. He wrote to Suffolk, "It is impossible to divine into the secret Intentions of these Emigrants but tho they are innocent, Yet there is great reason to believe they would, if landed in America, be put under the unavoidable necessity of assisting the Rebels." In September of 1775 the Lord Advocate issued instructions that no vessels be cleared through customs with more than a normal complement of hands on board.
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The agitation for a reform of municipal government and for a more liberal parliamentary franchise began in the twenty years following the Seven Years War. Before this time dissatisfaction with the existing arrangements found expression on several occasions, in the counties in more or less futile efforts to hinder the practice of large landholders in multiplying votes and in the burghs in the intermittent efforts of the trade incorporations to secure a stronger position in the councils. After 1763 the revisionist efforts gradually broadened. There was agitation for changes designed to enlarge the representation on burgh councils and to seriously reduce the voting strength of large landowners, while the burgh and county reform leaders gradually recognized common cause and called for mutual support. At the end of the American War committees representing the burghs and counties had been constituted.
constituted to prepare bills to Parliament and to petition in their support. In the burghs, with their growing trading and manufacturing population, the demand for extending the franchise was strongest and the lead in the campaign for burgh reform was taken in Edinburgh.

From 1469 Scottish town councils were self elective, and until the reforms of 1832 and 1833 political life in the Scottish burghs, including elections to Parliament, was dominated by narrow oligarchies perpetuated through the council self-elective system. The election of burgh M.P.s was even more restricted than the election of local officers, for the royal burghs, except Edinburgh, were joined into fourteen groups; of which each group sent one member to Parliament. The town councils in each of the four or five burghs comprising a group elected a delegate to a convention which in turn chose the member of the House of Commons. Edinburgh was exceptional in that its representative was not shared with any other locality, the member for the city being chosen by the town council. In a few instances the council privileges of self-election were modified before 1833, but the election of delegates to the conventions at which members of Parliament were chosen remained /
remained the prerogative of the municipal councils. A slight popular element obtained in some burghs in the share of the trade guilds in the election of magistrates and councillors, but this element was usually negated by the managing forces and in any case exerted little or no influence on the choice of the representatives. In 1832 there were still twenty-five royal burghs in which the magistrates and town councils were absolutely self-elective, and in most of the sixty-six royal burghs the inhabitants who were not directly connected with the municipal councils were excluded from any part in municipal elections.¹

Between 1763 and 1783 the question of burgh reform was agitated by several groups. The incorporations, reviving a struggle for stronger representation in the council, and the Merchant Company, demanding representation, joined their efforts and attempted to force alterations in the sott. The changes proposed were primarily in the interest of the societies but would, nevertheless, have weakened the oligarchic control of the council. The citizens' committees which came into being at the end of the period represented a wider selection of citizens and were /
were protesting not only the financial mismanagement and corruption in burgh administration — which had been publicised during the period — but the larger question of oligarchic control. The committee leaders and members were reformers in the sense that the achievement of their objectives would have resulted in a significant enlargement in the municipal franchise.

Without attributing to the incorporated societies and the Merchant Company higher motives than are justifiable, their part in the reform agitation in Edinburgh may be examined as one of the media through which dissatisfaction at existing political arrangements was expressed. The grievance of which the incorporated societies chiefly complained was a restriction on their freedom to choose their deacons, although they also wanted full status in the ordinary council for the eight deacons limited to participation in the extraordinary council. It was customary for each incorporation to submit to the council at election time a list of six candidates for the office of deacon; three were struck off by the council and one of the three remaining was chosen to head the incorporation. This arrangement was a compromise worked out in the Scottish burghs /
burghs over a long period. The Act of 1469, which gave councils the right to choose the new councils and burgh officers, implied the right to choose trade deacons since the deacons sat as councillors. The presence of several independently elected council deacons in any of the councils otherwise self-elected would have been disturbing, and the consequence was a compromise by which both the councils and trades shared in the choice of deacons. 3 The arrangement differed slightly in various burghs, and in dates of adoption (nor was it universally adopted), but in general the councils were able to force a concession and to continue dominant by their power to favor subservient trade guilds and to hurt those which insisted on independence. One result was a steady weakening of the guilds. Before the eighteenth century they had become of little influence, and in those burghs which chose delegates to vote for members of Parliament they were a negligible factor. 4

The Edinburgh town council was severely challenged in 1763 by the forces desiring a redress of power in the council. The reason for the vigor of the outburst that year is not apparent, unless it was due simply to an accumulation of /
of dissatisfaction and resentment. Two incidental
grievances were made the occasion for a campaign to
alter the city constitution. In December 1762 the Edin-
burgh town council made a presentation to Lady Yester's
Church which the incorporations and unrepresented socie-
ties considered contrary to accepted practice and expres-
sive of the arbitrary character of the council. In
September 1763 the council ruled against the election of
Alexander Miller as deacon of the masons on grounds he
did not pay scot and lot within Edinburgh and was there-
fore ineligible, but this despite the fact he had been
included on the shortened list of approved candidates.
A candidate who had gained twenty-eight votes to Miller's
forty-five was given the office, to the great indignation
of the trades.

The Merchant Company and a minority of the town coun-
cil joined the incorporations in opposing the presentation
to Lady Yester's. Pamphlets were published by the general
sessions, the magistrates and councils, and by individual
protagonists, and the incorporations inserted resolutions
of protest in the newspapers. In June 1763 the incor-
porations, the Merchant Company, the Barbers, and the
Candlemakers /
Candlemakers (the latter three lacking any representation on the council) requested from the council an act empowering each incorporation to choose its own deacon annually without submitting a list of candidates for review by the council. A rump council of nineteen members and including the eight extraordinary deacons (sixteen of the nineteen were thus tradesmen) passed such an act to become effective on confirmation by the Convention of Royal Burghs. The Lord Provost and other opponents applied for a bill of suspension in the Court of Session and an interim interdict shelved the effort to alter the set for a time. The presentation to Lady Yester's church touched off this sequence of events, but the question of representation on the council was the issue and the unrepresented societies joined the agitation for a free election of deacons as a first step towards representation. The support of the Merchant Company for the incorporations in this regard is of special interest and is illustrated by a petition in which the Merchant Company asked the town council for the "withdrawing the presentation granted by them to Mr. Drysdale, and likewise with respect to the alteration proposed in the act, for a free election of Deacons." The petition expressed /
expressed concern at the failure of the act of revision passed by the (rump) council and assured supporters of the measure "that this company will concur with the Incorporations, in every lawful measure, to obtain an alteration of the act, and a free election of independent men to be Magistrates and members of Council, who will maintain their religious and civil rights, without encroaching upon either."

The craftsmen intensified their attack on the council when in September 1763 the deacon chosen by the masons was ruled ineligible and was replaced by the candidate who had received the second highest number of votes. Immediately following the council's action, the Incorporations of Mary's Chapel published charges that the disqualification of Miller was on notoriously specious grounds in that other council members did not pay scot and lot, that such payment was not required in the burgh constitution, and that the council action was intended to make the trades completely dependent on the men in power by allowing only subservient representatives from the incorporations. A committee was appointed to seek redress in the courts, and in the House of Peers if need be, and support was asked from the Merchant Company and other incorporated societies in Edinburgh.
A resolution addressed "to the other incorporated societies and all the free and independent citizens of Edinburgh" drew attention to the issue which later became paramount in the reform movement, the mal-administration of the council. After recounting injustices suffered and noting "an opposition which is happily become formidable," the resolution expressed confidence that the efforts of the incorporations would find general approval in view of the dreadful progression by which mal-administration and tyranny have increased here within these few years; ... the circumstances of the water bill; the letter surrendering the city's right to choose a Representative in Parliament; their procuring a suspension of an act of Council for allowing the free election of Deacons; the presentation to Mr. Drysdale, and the management of Heriot's hospital; particularly the appointment of a notorious bankrupt to be its Treasurer, in order to prevent his competing for the office of Provost; which last step ... has reduced the funds of the hospital to so low an ebb, that they cannot afford to take in one boy this year ... so that the doors of charity stand at this moment looked up by POLITICAL SACRILEGE. 12

Through October and November the separate incorporations published resolutions restating the craftsmen's view of the election, declaring support for the incorporations and the Merchant Company in the struggle with the town council, and, usually, calling for an alteration in the sett /
At the year's end the incorporations published a report summarizing their grievances and reviewing the action taken for redress, but recognizing that their campaign for changes in the city government was ended for the time being, at least so long as the interdict of the Court of Session remained in effect.

The contest in 1763 was limited in so far as popular participation was concerned. Election quarrels in which only a few vested interests had any part were frequent and hardly affected the populace. Any concession by those in power, however, would have broadened the base of the burgh government. Council deacons chosen independently from the membership of the fourteen incorporated trades would have added a relatively independent element into the council and into the choice of the city member of Parliament. Support for the incorporations from the Merchant Company and the societies of barbers and candlemakers suggested a continuing enlargement of the council. The large number of pamphlets and letters in the newspapers on the contest indicate a vigorous clash of forces and, by implication at least, reflect awareness of economic and political ideas to which existing outmoded and provincial practice /
The impression is left that the semi-popular elements represented by the incorporations and Merchant Company would continue their challenge to the oligarchic control and hints are given of a growing challenge. Occasional reference to financial mismanagement pointed to an issue eventually of primary importance in the reform struggle, and some letters to the newspapers suggest an interest in the quarrel from outside the circle of yested groups. One of these letters, under the signature "A Citizen of Edinburgh", proposed as a solution to the problem of city government a drastic change in the constitution which would have liberalized the election of councilmen from the city societies and certain other organizations, but would also have included ten or twelve magistrates for life. The constitutional plan was not remarkably liberal, but the reasons given for a thorough going revision are of interest. The writer belittled the prospects of any benefits for the citizens even if the opposition party should gain its ends. Such a victory "might change names, but probably not measures." Could there be any change "while we have such an ugly set of the town, that for the first six months, our Magistrates are /
are employed in learning the ABC of their administration, and the last in triguing [sic] for their successors?"

The existing government was fatally deficient because it was formed when the reigning power was an aristocracy. The union with England, where a democracy seemed to prevail "has introduced a greater knowledge of, and struggle for liberty, among all ranks of men; and this is, or ought to be, the struggle, and not merely a change of masters ... "15

The contest in Edinburgh virtually disappeared from view after 1763 and for a decade municipal politics suffered only the usual annual manoeuvring and disorderly illuminations. Renewed efforts of the incorporations between 1774 and 1778 to strengthen their position in the council were coincident with evidence of a wider interest in burgh reform which eventually superseded the campaign of the craftsmen. Even while the struggle centered on the question of the election of deacons, the letters, protests, and resolutions, as well as the action, show this question was becoming too narrow to meet growing demands of the unrepresented. The discussion included an emphasis on the mal-administration of the burgh, a recognition of the /
the need for more extensive changes than the trades proposed, and the association of the question of changes in the city administration with the question of electoral reform in the counties. Analogies between reform bodies and the colonial rebels testify to the prominence of American affairs in the news.

A dispute over the choice of the city member of Parliament in 1774 was the occasion for a revival of the struggle for control of the city government. Sir Laurence Dundas was chosen but was protested against on various grounds, the most damaging being a letter from Dundas to a political agent implying bribery during elections in the burghs of Dunfermline and Inverkeithing. The dispute was narrowly factional and not all the incorporations joined the protest, but much of the discussion centered on the close control of the council. A letter complaining of the decision for Dundas, for example, contains severe reflections on the council.

... it is not the qualifications of the member that is looked to. It is he who is best able to serve one or two leading men in the council that must be preferred. He [Dundas] has shown his abilities in that way already; and gratitude, requires he should meet with his proper return. But, it may be said, though this great man has served one or two of his friends, he has done nothing for /
for the majority of the council, upon which depends his success. To those who argue in this manner, if there are any so ill acquainted with the politics of Edinburgh as to do so, let this short answer suffice: That none are admitted into council but those who engage to pay implicit obedience to the dictates of these one or two, be they ever so absurd, or contradictory to their own ideas of the matter brought before them. It is even said, they must find caution for so doing.

In 1776 a factional struggle in the council gave the incorporations an unusual opportunity. Provost James Stoddart, who had unsuccessfully contested the Parliamentary election with Sir Laurence Dundas in 1774, led a faction in opposition to Baillie John Walker, a Dundas supporter. The Duke of Buccleugh and the Lord Advocate Dundas, also opponents of Laurence Dundas, lent support to Stoddart, and Stoddart in turn associated himself with the ambitions of the incorporations for alterations in the sett of the city. The societies welcomed his support and as the municipal elections of 1776 approached they renewed their attacks on the oligarchic burgh council. A statement of policy by the incorporations, referring to Stoddart's support for the revived campaign to alter the sett, noted "the wished for turn which the politics of the city of Edinburgh have taken ... " A letter signed "A MECHANIG" claimed "an opportunity offers to throw off the /
Letters called for trade representatives certain to assert their independency.

The council elections went against Stoddart, the incorporations, and the Lord Advocate, but contrary to the former practice of limiting their efforts chiefly to the election period, the societies on the occasion of this defeat organized their most determined campaign for revision. Within the crafts some supporters of Sir Lawrence Dundas were opposed to the Stoddart scheme for "revolution", but the election of the Deacon Convener was won by the Stoddart group, and the societies passed and published resolutions in support of the plans of Stoddart for revision of the mode of council elections. It was then decided that the several incorporations should choose delegates to meet with the Deacon Convener and other parties concerned on measures for removing the old grievance. The merchants were urged to cooperate and were eventually invited to send delegates to concur with the trades delegates. Only when the Merchant Company and other bodies of merchants joined with the trades, wrote a "Grocer", "may we see sitting in Council, a set of free representatives both of Merchants and Traders. At present, the Council are in no /
no sense the representatives of the community, but rather
... of themselves."\(^{26}\)

The committee of delegates was an innovation in the
campaign for changing the burgh constitution, but the ob-
jectives were still limited to improvements for the trades
and the Merchant Company. In February Provost Stoddart
raised the issue in council by moving an application to
the Convention of Royal Burghs for an alteration of that
part of the act relating to the election of deacons.\(^{27}\)
The motion was postponed and after much discussion blocked
by a bill of suspension, one of the grounds being that a
previous bill of suspension against a council action on
the same question in 1763 had yet to be discussed.\(^{28}\)
During consideration of the motion the delegates from the
incorporations published their approval of it and their
confidence that so just, reasonable, and salutary a measure
would be passed.\(^{29}\) On the other hand, an address handed
about at the cross vigorously attacked the efforts to alter
the act. The meeting of the delegates appointed to con-
sider the revision was likened to a "Congress" and the
signer of the publications of the delegates was described
as "the redoutable HANCOCK of the Brotherhood." The
meetings /
meetings of the "Congress" and all its measures were termed "illegal, criminal and seditious."\textsuperscript{30} The bill of suspension placed the issue of revision in a stalemate once more and public discussion of the issue almost ceased. An occasional letter declaimed for the liberty of the tradesmen, classed the incorporations with the colliers and salters, and urged them to continue efforts to alter the sett even though they be considered as factious, seditious, and rebellious.\textsuperscript{31} The committee of delegates submitted to the incorporations in the late summer of 1777 a report surveying the progress and prospects of their campaign, but aside from asserting the absolute necessity of the free election of deacons the report had little to suggest but the selection of candidates under the present system who were the most independent of mind, free of obligations, and interested in the freedom and independence of the trades.\textsuperscript{32}

During the municipal elections of 1777 letters protested the incendiary activities of the incorporations and the scurrilous pamphlets resounding with the name of liberty which appeared every day. The "sons of liberty" were accused of intending to raise a Porteous mob at the visit of /
of Sir Laurence Dundas at the risk of the loss of city privileges. "Every day," it was charged, "our streets are pestered with indecent and inflammatory papers in favour of the Trades; and every night the peaceable inhabitants are put in terror of having their property destroyed by the partisans of the Champions for freedom." This imitation of Wilkes's method of attaining freedom for the deluded citizens of London was an excess which called for intervention by the Magistrates. But the elections passed quietly and though the delegates of the incorporations expressed satisfaction with the selection of deacons, the council remained in hands friendly to Laurence Dundas and opposed to any alteration in the burgh constitution.

In January 1778 the court of Session sustained the suspension granted against action by the town council to alter the Edinburgh constitution, and in August a reclaiming petition for James Stoddart and the deacons of the trades against this judgement was refused. The judgement determined "that the alteration proposed to be made in the set of the city of Edinburgh, in favour of the trades, by abolishing the shortleets, cannot take place; that the constitution/
constitution of the Town Council must remain as it at present stands; and that the convention of Royal Boroughs have no power or jurisdiction to alter the set or usage of any of the burghs of this kingdom. This pronouncement ended the effort for a limited alteration of the city constitution in favor of the trades. In the summer of 1778 meetings were reported between members of the trades and the Merchant Company to consider Edinburgh politics, but the new council chosen in the fall were again all reported to be friends of Sir Laurence Dundas. From that time until 1782 municipal politics were undisturbed by campaigns for change. When the call for reform was revived in 1782 the incorporations were superseded as the major dissatisfied element by the Merchant Company and a citizens committee, and the changes then demanded were much greater in scope than had previously been the case.

Between 1774 and 1778 there were signs of the issues which were to prove most important in the reform movement at the end of the American war. The alienation of public funds and property, made possible by the almost total absence of accounting checks, was a feature of Scottish burgh administration throughout the eighteenth century and before.
and there was little possibility of any remedy until the self-elective council system itself could come under attack. In 1774 Henry Kames published his *Sketches of the History of Man* and included in an appendix an account of mis-appropriations effected by the town councils. It was a brief but powerful indictment of the existing system of municipal government, and it was followed in 1775 by a similar essay, inspired by it, in *The Edinburgh Magazine and Review*. Constitutional reform was not mentioned in these charges, but that they were effective reformist propaganda is illustrated in the following excerpts from the second of the essays. It was headed, "An address to the Right Honourable the Lord Chief Baron and Barons of His Majesty's Court of Exchequer."

By Lords

... The decline of the royal boroughs has proceeded, of late years, with an alarming rapidity ...

To the venality of the magistrates who direct the royal incorporations, these evils are more immediately to be ascribed. They act without control; and, in such a situation, every possible mismanagement, every real corruption is to be expected from them. Nor do they deceive us ...

... It consists with the jurisdiction of your Lordships to apply a remedy to their malversation. You can annually call into your court the accounts of the royal boroughs; and, by attending to the administration of their revenues, you can restore them to industry /
industry and good faith, to riches and order. The enormities of their magistrates are everywhere pronounced to be flagrant and ruinous; it is your duty to oppose and to restrain them; and the public voice invokes you to the exercise of powers, the most expedient and salutary.

After commenting on attempts to deal with burgh corruption up to the time of William and Mary, the writer continued:

From the union, however, to the present times, the evil formerly so dreaded, and so destructive, and against which the law has so efficaciously provided, have been advancing to a fatal extremity. The annual production in the Exchequer, of the accounts of the boroughs, has been neglected; the delinquency of the magistrates has passed without legal notice; the regulations which provide so forcible a check to their corruption, have been forgot. Impunity and success have given them courage to prosecute, with indocency and violence, the basest and the most criminal measures. In some incorporations, habits of atrocity and vileness, extinguishing every generous and honest sentiment, have taught them to brave even infamy itself; and, in most of them, policy and address are employed to perpetuate a power, which is uniformly exerted to the destruction of the community. The governing knots or confederacies, in many royal boroughs, are linked together by guilt and interest; the magistracy goes in rotation to their creatures and little tyrannies are established, of which the consequences are already too sensibly felt in a shocking depravity of manners, a ruinous decline of trade, and an universal defalcation of public money.

The writer gave examples of Scottish towns brought to the verge of bankruptcy by corruption and appealed to the Exchequer to remedy the situation by applying the laws giving power /
power to handle just such problems. He concluded by quoting Lord Kames on the beneficial results which would follow such action. 39

It is also of significance that during the years 1773 to 1776 the interest in limiting nominal and fictitious voting in the counties was associated in several publications with the interest in correcting the anomalies of burgh government. The author of "Two proposed bills concerning the qualifications of voters" printed in the Scots Magazine in 1775 would have broadened the franchise in both shires and burghs, eliminating votes on bare superiorities and lowering the required valuation in the one case and giving a vote for the burgh member of Parliament to all resident burgesses in the other. 40 Some letters to the newspaper editors reflected the same common sympathy for a reduction in burgh and county privileges. The following appeared in 1776 when delegates of the trades and merchants were being appointed to work for changes in the Edinburgh constitution.

Sir,

I read with very great pleasure ... a letter, signed by Mr. Lindsay, and addressed to your late Lord Provost. The grievances he touches upon ... to wit, the 'restoring of /
of that freedom and independence which ought to prevail in all matters of election,' must meet with the warmest applause ... from every honest heart in this kingdom. For, without the enjoyment of this truly inestimable privilege, the much boasted liberty of the British Constitution, is nothing but a name; as the people's rights are only to be maintained and defended by the people's representatives in the House of Commons. And, if these representatives are chosen by bribery, or aristocratical power, what security have the people then, for the maintenance of their just rights and privileges? The power that buys will naturally sell; and the balance of the Constitution is gone, if Members of the one House, appoint Members for the other. These are gross and glaring faults; and I fervently wish to see them amended. I could likewise wish ... to see the commendable Freehold Reformers, who bestirred themselves a good deal last year, in respect of the qualification of Freeholders, to elect Members of Parliament. I hear little now of these Gentlemen's intentions, from whence I infer they have dropped them, which is strongly to be deplored; for when I consider, that by the present law of Scotland, a person can, and very often does, give a vote for the choice of a Member to defend a property which he never had, nor perhaps hopes for, it is so an ant a mockery, of every principle of law, reason, or common sense, that I cannot restrain my

INDIGNATION

Between 1778 and 1782 there were no election campaigns in which revision of the burgh constitution figured prominently and there was very little public discussion on the issue, but the agitation of the past few years plus the failure of the incorporations to achieve change and perhaps the general dissatisfaction engendered by the state of national affairs contributed to the formation of a genuine /
genuine reform movement. A letter in 1780 indicates the growing demands of those who by this time may be more fairly described as reformers. The writer asserted that the citizens desired a different line of conduct than that followed by the magistrates and council, and to the question as to how the citizens' will should be made to prevail he replied,

By a total abolition of the present slavish constitution of the city which to the disgrace of the country, has so long exposed the citizens ... to the most shameful tyranny. Let us embrace this favourable opportunity to assert our natural privileges. Let the power of electing, not only our Representatives in Parliament, but likewise our Magistracy, be rescued from the hands of the Council, that pitiful self-created oligarchy; and let this most important power be vested in the collective members of the whole community. This is pointed out by reason and nature; and the alteration proposed, besides being supported by the principles of the British Constitution, and by the universal practice of the southern part of the island, stands on the firmest foundation of justice and liberty.42

From 1782 onwards the signs of reform sentiment are numerous and are marked by interest in the franchise in burgh and county. In the issue of the Courant containing Pitt's speech in the Commons on reform of the representation, the following companion item appears.

Mr. /
Mr. Dempster deserves very great credit for his motion to take into consideration the representation of Scotland, which stands as much in need of reform as the representation in England. What can be more contrary to the spirit of liberty and the idea of a free representation, than that the members should be elected by Town Councils, a junta of men who are not chosen by the people at large, but elect themselves ad infinitum. If we look to the counties, the shameful practice of giving nominal and fictitious votes, so productive of perjury, so contrary to common sense, and to the spirit of the election law, requires no less the hand of reformation.

An interesting indication of the increasing persistence of the reform sentiment is given in a letter describing an occasion seized to press for reform. A general meeting of the burgesses and inhabitants of Edinburgh was called by the city magistrates to consider the Earl of Shelburne's plan for arming the citizens. About four score men attended and most of them favored taking arms, but they objected to that part of the plan which gave the chief magistrate of each burgh power to name the commanding officers. One inhabitant declared he would never take arms under a magistrate toward whose election he had no vote, but if the magistrates would write Lord Shelburne to use his interest in getting the burgh sett altered to allow burgesses to choose annually by poll election.
election their magistrates and council, then, he thought, most inhabitants would join him in taking arms. The presiding magistrate argued that this was an improper time for such an application, but the inhabitant replied by reviewing the circumstances whereby the magistrates were annually elected by the very small proportion of the community comprised in the town council, and declared that this was a most favorable time for getting free of a long-standing grievance. A vote was proposed, 'whether to take arms under the present Chief Magistrate, or upon condition the Magistrates agree to apply for a poll election.' The junior magistrate presiding refused to put the latter part of the question, and all except eight or ten men then left the meeting. In consequence a proposal was raised among the burgesses and inhabitants to write to Lord Shelburne of the above circumstances and offer to take arms if they were allowed to nominate their own commanders; also, if they were joined by the other burgesses in Scotland, they would petition Parliament at the next session for relief from the grievance of self elected magistrates and town councils and ask that these be chosen annually by poll of the whole burgesses. These changes, in /
in the view of the burgesses, would tend to the "police" of the burghs and make them really represented in the House of Commons.  

The first two of Zeno's letters "To the Citizens of Edinburgh" were printed in December 1782, the author being a wealthy Edinburgh burgess named Thomas Macgrugor. A similar series of letters was published about the same time by John Ewen, an Aberdonian, under the signatures "Civis", "A Citizen of Aberdeen", and "A Burgess of Aberdeen". To these two individuals the origin of the first effective agitation for burgh reform has been ascribed. Zeno, in the most able manner in which the reform appeal had yet appeared, summarized the outstanding political grievances, noted the significance of the concurrent county reform movement, and urged the timeliness of immediate efforts for reform. But his arguments were timely rather than new. The response which followed a reform recommendation advertised by the Merchant Company early in 1783 indicates how well the ground had been prepared.

On February 18, 1783 the Merchant Company of Edinburgh considered the following motion.

That /
That as his Majesty's ministers have given intimation of their intending soon to bring in a bill for effecting a more equal representation of the people in parliament, and as the freedom of election is very confined in the boroughs of Scotland, particularly in Edinburgh, where so numerous and respectable a body as the Merchant Company have no voice in electing either the magistrates or the members of parliament; it is therefore suggested, that this Company appoint a committee of their number to draw up a petition, to be laid before the House of Commons, that the election of magistrates, and the representative for this city may be put upon a more enlarged and liberal plan.

The meeting was reported as "the most numerous and respectable ever remembered." A committee was appointed to correspond and co-operate with any other societies or individuals disposed to join in the measure, with a view toward preparing a plan on a liberal foundation such as would meet the approbation of the citizens at large. 47

The initiative of the Merchant Company met an immediate response. Concurring resolutions of societies were inserted in the advertisement columns of the newspapers, and numerous letters to the printers gave more extended discussion to the question of reforms. A list of the resolutions indicates how widespread was the interest in reform. Support was announced by the merchants, 48 the Nine Incorporated Trades, 49 and the Three United Trades of
of Masons, Wrights, and Slaters of Dundee; by the Merchant Company of Stirling; the Merchant Burgesses of Aberdeen; the principle inhabitants and merchants of Montrose; the Merchants Burgesses and other Freeholders of Irvine; the Incorporated Trades of Irvine; the Merchants and Guild Brethren of Aberbrothock; the Residing Meritors and Burgesses in Dingwall; the Five Incorporated Trades, Merchants and other inhabitants of Dumbarton; the Guildry of Dunfermline; the Burgesses of Pittenweem; the Burgesses of the Burgh of Elgin including the Guildry and the Six Incorporated Trades thereof; and the Free Burgesses and Incorporated Trades in Brechin. The burgesses of Montrose, in addition to publishing their support of the Edinburgh Merchant Company action, approved a petition on the mode of elections to be forwarded to the Honourable Archibald Douglas of Douglas, who had agreed to present it.

Some of the advertisers announced the formation of committees to cooperate with the committee of citizens of Edinburgh and of other societies. Other advertisements included expositions of the advertisers' reasons for joining the campaign. Six point statements of grievances accompanied /
accompanied the announcements from Dingwall and from Dumbarton, and a paragraph from the announcement of the Burgesses and Trades of Brechin illustrates views in some of the smaller burghs.

The meeting were unanimously of the opinion, that the present mode of electing Commissioners to Parliament by delegates chosen by the Town Councils, is not only unconstitutional, but diametrically contrary to the liberties of the people, who ought, agreeable to the privilege of free citizens, have the power of choosing their own representatives. The Meeting was further unanimous, that the hardships and grievances the Burghs in Scotland in general lie under, both in the method of electing the Commissioners to Parliament, and of the Magistrates and Counsellors electing themselves and their successors, (and more particularly in this Burgh, where, for near forty years past, the Magistrates and Council have not only been self-elected, but in a manner hereditary, the father filling up his place in Council with his son) call loudly for redress.

One of the letters which particularly reflects the growing strength of the campaign for reform, addressed "To the Citizens of the Royal Burghs in Scotland," follows in part.

It is with the greatest pleasure I observe the spirit of liberty has taken a northern direction, and begins to infect the people of this country ...

... in every struggle for liberty, we have left the English without support. But if we understand our own interest, we will no longer remain idle spectators. Equally interested, let us join our efforts, though weak, to those of our fellow countrymen, and nobly stand or /
or fall together ...

Several letters have appeared under the signature of Zeno (a second edition of which is now in the press). These have been followed by meetings and resolutions of the most respectable Boroughs in Scotland. Their associations are most strictly legal, and he merits no reply who ignorantly asserts the contrary. Their petitions will be presented to Parliament by members the most respectable; and they desire, and will (at least) have the satisfaction to hear their grievances seriously taken into consideration. To Zeno is not altogether to be imputed that spirit of liberty which at present pervades this country.

It is not in the spirit of party I take up my pen. Actuated by a nobler motive, I wish to rouse my countrymen to a proper sense of their consequence as men and citizens. I will use my honest endeavours to rescue my country from the thraldom in which it has long been held. Hereditary jurisdictions are no more; and hereditary councils and members of Parliament, I trust, have not much longer to exist.

A great, a virtuous, a highly-esteemed character, has declared himself our advocate ... The present Secretary has likewise declared himself our supporter ... If the people are in earnest, and thank God there is now no reason to doubt it, they must and will be relieved.

ATTICUS SECUNDUS 65

The Merchant Company decision to petition Parliament was taken in anticipation of government proposals on representation. At a meeting on April 22 they decided, not without opposition, to delay further action until the fate was known of the plan which Pitt was to lay before the /
the House of Commons. The defeat of Pitt's motion marked the end of Merchant Company promotion of reform. The defection of the Merchant Company, however, only shifted the burden of effort. A meeting of citizens to consider the mode of elections for Edinburgh had been held on April 10, for which Thomas Macgrugar, writer of the Zeno letters, was chosen secretary. A committee chosen on the 10th arranged a general meeting of citizens for April 24 when preparations were begun for a convention of delegates from the burghs. Correspondence in the first few months of 1783 between Wyvill in Yorkshire and the Secretaries of the reform committees in Edinburgh and Stirling testifies to the reforming spirit of the committee leaders. The continuation of the campaign was announced in a letter addressed to the burgesses of the burghs of Scotland.

The enemies of your country and of your liberties have endeavoured to propagate an opinion, that the fate of Mr. Pitt's motion involves the fate of the petitions from Scotland. The claims of the Scottish burgesses to elect their own Magistrates and Members of Parliament must be regarded as subjects of consideration totally distinct from, and unconnected with those propositions of Mr. Pitt. The Burgesses of Scotland request no addition to their representation; they require only a restoration of the exercise of those ancient rights which their forefathers enjoyed.
A system of government, which allows 20 or 30 men, self-elected and self existent, to hold the exclusive management of every public matter, and speak the unauthorized sense of many thousands, is evidently an absurd system ... The Citizens of Edinburgh, therefore, and the Burgesses of the other burghs, far from being discouraged by the rejection of Mr. Pitt's motion, ought the rather more determinedly to proceed in the business they have undertaken ... 

A FRIEND TO LIBERTY 70

On December 20, 1783 the citizen's committee published an announcement in the Edinburgh newspapers addressed "To the Citizens of Edinburgh" and requesting that all who disapproved of the existing mode of elections should meet at St. Mary's Chapel on December 24 at 11 a.m. for important business. 71 At this meeting the citizens called for the general convention of delegates from the burghs which was held at Edinburgh on March 25, 1784 and which was attended by delegates from 33 of the 66 royal burghs of Scotland. 72 It was the first of a series of assemblies held in Edinburgh annually for the next ten years to promote reform with 54 of the 66 Royal Burghs eventually represented. 73
The system of voting in the counties came under frequent discussion in the eighteenth century, although no legislation was enacted to add a popular element to the electorate and in 1832 the electoral legislation stood as it did in 1707. The vote rested in superiorities - in the fact that land was held of the crown rather than in the possession of land - and was attached to holdings valued at 40 shillings of old extent or, where the old valuation was unknown, at £400 Scots. Early in the century large landowners made votes in their interest by conveying in trust pieces of land qualifying for votes. Oath laws in 1714 and 1734 made the practice more difficult, but the fact that the vote resided in the superiority as distinct from the property allowed votes to be made by splitting the freehold qualifications, and the large landholders continued to make votes to the full extent of their holdings. Voters who held a superiority in trust but were otherwise unconnected with the land comprised about half the county electors in 1832. The creation of nominal and fictitious voters, resulting in the rise of a new class of electors whose voting rights were based on an artificially created superiority, was the abuse which chiefly /
chiefly engaged the county reformers. 74

Between 1773 and 1776 the question of limiting nominal and fictitious votes was aired throughout Scotland. A bill designed to curb the practice by abolishing wadset and liferent superiorities was drawn up and presented to Parliament in 1775 but was not allowed to pass into law. The bill was the cause of much discussion, however, in county meetings and in the press, in 1775. The published announcements of county meetings at this time are less informative than similar announcements on a later occasion, usually noting only that the meeting approved or disapproved the measures proposed to eliminate nominal votes. In some instances a minority faction published its disagreements with the county resolution and attempted to show that the meeting was unrepresentative, the resolution passed by trickery, or, if the measure was disapproved, that the majority of those disapproving were fictitious voters. 75 The substance of the debates of a Mid-Lothian county meeting were published and the arguments, which turned chiefly on conflict between large and small landowners, probably illustrate very well the tenor of argument in the county meetings generally. The principal objection /
objection argued against the bill was that it put a man with an estate of £200 a year on equal footing with a man of £2,000 a year. The latter had ten times the property, the taxes, the interest in the welfare of the state, and he should therefore have more votes. He should, in fact, have votes proportional to his qualifications. Those who approved the bill argued the danger in a system by which the landed interest of Scotland came increasingly into the hands of a few very wealthy men. Or, if any were as politic as Henry Dundas, who was in the chair, they argued the beauty of the British Constitution under which once in seven years a man of £200 a year dared to look a man of £5,000 in the face.  

There were some suggestions in 1774 and 1775 that the franchise should be extended. A letter written in 1774 and anticipating an election bill asked that the county members be elected "by the people, by the majority of householders or heads of families, and do not let us be cramped by paltry qualifications of 40s or any other sums the propriety of which must vary according to the inevitable changes in the value of money. The only standard that does and ought to stand forever is Men . . ."
The election bill of 1775 was criticized because it included no arrangement for broadening the electorate. It would reduce fictitious votes, but would also reduce the total number of votes. The Scottish plan of reform thus compared unfavourably with English schemes which embodied the principle of enlarging the bottom.78 The county of Orkney while approving the bill expressed the wish "that the plan of the bill had gone further, so as to have diminished the sum of the valued rent necessary for a qualification."79 But suggestions that the electorate be enlarged were not numerous and the county reform issue did not equal that of burgh reform in the variety and popular nature of sentiments produced.

After 1776 the issue of county reform was not given much public discussion until 1782, but a pronounced change in sentiment apparently took place, for its revival, like that of burgh reform, was vigorous. The impetus for renewed discussion came in the spring and summer of 1782 when the counties of Inverness, Moray, and Caithness each published resolutions on fictitious votes and appointed commissioners to consider the question with other counties.80 The commissioners met and published the following resolution /
resolution in July.

The Gentlemen now at Edinburgh, named by the above Three Counties [Inverness, Moray, Caithness] as their Commissioners, impowered to meet at Edinburgh, and concert measures for carrying their resolutions into execution, beg leave to acquaint the landed proprietors of all the counties of Scotland at present in Edinburgh, that there is to be held in Princpo's Street Coffeehouse, at one o'clock on Monday next the fifth of August next, a meeting for taking into consideration the subject of the resolutions of the counties of Inverness, Moray, and Caithness, and for concerting proper measures for considering what may be the proper means of collecting the sense of all the other counties of Scotland, upon a subject of so much national importance.81

On August 5 the meeting thus advertised was held with landed proprietors from 23 counties in attendance. They elected standing committees, resolved to take a sense of the landed proprietors from each county, and decided to receive donations — one guinea from each proprietor — for defraying the expense of an application to Parliament. A committee was scheduled to meet on August 9 to prepare a draft of a bill to Parliament for correcting election abuses, and a general meeting was called for November 21.82 A country wide response was evident as once more the county meetings published resolutions, and, in contrast to the resolutions of 1775 which evidenced considerable opposition to /
to the election bill, those published in 1782 were almost unanimous in favor of reform.

In the newspapers, a series of five letters, signed "AN OLD FREEHOLDER" and addressed "To the Real Freeholders of Scotland," presented a careful discussion of the historical background and legal antecedents of the county election system and concluded with a call for action to eliminate the accumulation of abuses. The call to action was sounded with more or less vigor by a number of other correspondents, while occasionally a letter called for less speed or even condemned efforts to change the system. Abuse of the provisions for voting qualifications was the principal subject of the attacks, but in some letters a radical note was sounded. The following was written in response to a letter which had argued modestly for the elimination of nominal voting.

I have observed ... that your arguments for a more equal representation, are by no means urged with that liberality of reasoning which the people, and the friends of constitutional freedom, will require from the man who professes himself their champion. The reform which you support is of a nature so very limited, that no essential benefit can be expected from it. To reduce the fictitious Freeholders, narrows, indeed, the bounds of aristocratical influence, by lessening the power of the wealthy proprietor ... But let it be well remarked, that, supposing this alteration to have place, a /
a change of masters only is obtained; for the suppression of fictitious votes disseminates liberty no otherwise, than by bringing the number of wealthy proprietors in a county to be of equal consequence, and to enjoy the same freedom, with the one or two 'more wealthy', whose valued rents formerly were superior to all theirs.

Thus, if our views terminate there, the people, I affirm, continue no less slaves, and the dispute degenerates into a contention between the few and the many tyrants.

Perhaps we are incapable of receiving liberty upon a more extensive scale. That wound is dangerous to probe. I shudder at the thought. On a future day I hope addressing myself to the people of Scotland; and it would give me pleasure to have the good opinion and assistance, upon the broad basis of general and constitutional liberty, of one whose writings at once pronounce him erudite and intelligent.

JULIUS 84

The committee appointed from the counties, meantime, prepared two drafts of a bill to Parliament, sent them to the counties for consideration, and then reconsidered them in the light of the county reports. In March 1783 a bill with moderate provisions for eliminating votes upon life rent superiorities and wadsets but leaving further relief to the wisdom of the legislative body was transmitted to Parliament. An extract of the committee proceedings and of reports from the counties on opinion regarding freehold qualifications was sent to the committee agent /
agent in London. In September a draft of another bill was reported sent to the agent in London, and when word came that an April meeting of Scots in London had decided the most suitable action was to petition Parliament, the Scottish counties decided to send petitions to the House of Commons and to instruct their members to support them. In the last months of 1783 notices of county petitions to Parliament, and sometimes the petitions themselves, appear in the press.

There is little to indicate that the Yorkshire reformers had any influence in Scotland before 1784, although their meetings and some of their debates were reported in the press, and literature from the Yorkshire committee distributed in Scotland brought some cautious responses as well as indignant rejections. It is probable that some of the motivation for county reform, like that in England, was indirectly related to the war. The landed interest became alarmed at the increasing taxation brought about by a war fought, it seemed to them, largely to protect commercial and manufacturing interests. In Scotland the peculiarities of a more feudal representation were an added stimulus to reform, if also an added handicap to its progress.
progress. There were no immediate legislative results from the agitation, and after 1785 the reformers seem to have turned to the courts rather than to Parliament for redress.\textsuperscript{91} The reluctance of numerous voters to "swear" in 1788\textsuperscript{92} and the reduction in the number of county voters from 2,662 in 1788 to 2,417 in 1811\textsuperscript{93} suggests the effort to check abuses was not without effect. That a widespread conviction of the necessity for reform was a fact by the end of the American war, however, is evident from the extensive support given the movement in 1782 and 1783. Agreement on the form to be given the electoral changes and sufficient impetus to bring the changes about had to wait on the reforming currents which followed in the aftermath of the French Revolution.

* * *

Lay patronage was a part of the Scottish Church system from the Reformation, except for a short period in Cromwell's time. In 1690 lay patrons were deprived of their right /
right of presentation, but an act of 1712, passed chiefly through Jacobite influence, restored the old lay rights, to the dismay of the Scottish Church, and laid the basis for serious contentions which lasted through the century. Enforcement of the patronage law produced numerous disputed settlements after 1730, frequently accompanied by riotous proceedings and involved litigation, while important secessions occurred in 1733 and 1761. The unwillingness of political managers to part with the patronage involved, the reaction of the landed class to an effort in 1750 for an augmentation of clerical stipends, and the growing wealth of the controlling classes in the burghs in which rights of patronage were vested in the town councils all contributed to an uncompromising resistance to any effort to enlarge the popular element in the choice of ministers. Shortly after the middle of the century, a group of young moderates led by Robertson organized and confirmed support for patronage in the General Assembly, and during the period of Robertson's ascendancy, from 1762 to 1780, the highest court of the church ruled firmly against the lower courts in favor of the patronage system. Discipline was gradually restored to the Church courts, though popular hostility /
hostility and resistance continued and the dissatisfied elements contributed to the growth of the secession churches.

Extremely difficult cases of settlement occurred between 1750 and 1763, while meantime the Popular and Moderate parties engaged in trials of strength in the General Assembly. The debate on schism in 1766 marked a decisive victory for the Moderates, and from that time the Moderates were dominant until the opponents of patronage re-opened the controversy after Robertson’s retirement in 1780. The renewed effort was made in the context of considerable sentiment for legislative action to reduce political grievances, and it was not merely coincidental that the opponents of patronage attempted to achieve their ends by an appeal to Parliament, nor that at this time a prominent place in anti-patronage literature was given to arguments of a political character. The movement was unsuccessful. In 1784, the Moderates succeeded in eliminating the annual instruction to the Commission to watch for an opportunity to secure the repeal of patronage, and, after another year of agitation and another General Assembly victory for the Moderates in 1785, the agitation subsided. The debate in...
in the period of the American war is of interest for what it reveals of the growth of political awareness in Scotland. 94

The pamphlets on the patronage question between 1763 and 1785 were numerous. The disputants examined the apostolic church, the early centuries of Christianity, the Scottish church immediately after the Reformation, the Revolution settlement, and other periods of history for evidence that popular election was or was not the practice and the prerogative of the Church in its best days. The opponents of patronage pointed to the importance of religious instruction as a stabilizing force among the lower classes and argued that since the people would not listen to ministers forced upon them, the result would be a growing disregard for Christian instruction, a lack of discipline, and violence. 95 They pointed to the growth of the secession churches, variously estimated to include from 100,000 to 150,000 members, as a consequence of arbitrary presentations, and deplored the expense of duplicate churches, the loss of support for the government in a divided church, and the emigration to America of people driven out by the hardships of the patronage system. The Act /
Act of 1712 was declared a violation of an essential condition of the Union since congregational participation in the choice of ministers, as provided for in the Act of 1690, was among the tenets of the Revolution settlement which could not be altered by the post-1707 British Parliament. These and similar arguments from church experience of old and recent times formed a substantial part of the literature on patronage, but analogies from the contemporary political situation and thought were too obvious to be ignored. As the discussion of politics and political reform expanded in the press and pamphlets, the debate on patronage increasingly reflected political arguments and concepts.

The political element in the debate was most obvious after 1780, but it was not completely absent before that time. A pamphlet written in 1767 referred to attempts to reduce fictitious voting as evidence of Scottish dread of excessive aristocratic power. The writer asserted that the rise of a spirit of independence among gentlemen would result in due attention to the arbitrary exercise of the right of presentation, "for how contemptible soever our livings in certain lights may appear, a right of disposing of them in the same manner in which the office of an excise-
man is bestowed, will be found no contemptible engine of power, if, as I am informed, above seven hundred are in the hands of the Crown and nobility, and but a very small proportion in the hands of gentlemen." The number of livings in the hands of the Crown and nobility was made the subject of complaint in a pamphlet in which Andrew Crostic contrasted the political consequence of the call and the benefice. Granting that the practice of the call might produce some local "stir" or contention, he argued that the stir might have beneficial results, for to the practice of the call "we owe chiefly those ideas of liberty that the lower class of mankind in Scotland feel." The limited franchise in the counties and burghs, he continued, does not diffuse the spirit of liberty or make people aware of their political existence; instead it "tends to introduce aristocratical ideas and to deprive the lower class of people of every feeling of liberty." "But in the call and election of ministers, the people felt their own weight; and the little struggles and disputes that happened ... tended to rouse and excite some sense of liberty, and spirit for preserving it. The whole system of Presbyterian church-government tends to excite ideas of liberty, and to animate men with an affection for it."
By contrast, the patronage of the 994 established clergymen of the Church of Scotland is distributed as follows: in the hands of the Crown, 334; the nobility, 309; landed gentlemen, 233; borough, 45 (more than half in Edinburgh and Glasgow); colleges and Universities, 18; boroughs of barony, 2; heritors and elders, 3. Here there was great opportunity for corruption for political purposes, especially on behalf of the Crown, and experience showed that the opportunity was exploited.

The most striking use of political arguments occurred when the patronage struggle was renewed after Robertson's retirement in 1780. To write of "laudable attempts ... by the friends of liberty, to rescue us from the wretched thralldom of patronage ..." was to use phraseology common to the debate, but whereas a pamphlet in 1768 asserted as a first principle the divine right of the people to choose their own pastors, pamphlets after 1780 frequently assumed pastoral election as an "evident natural Right."

The connection between the secular and church agitations is perhaps best illustrated in a pamphlet entitled An address to the people of Scotland on ecclesiastical and civil liberty. The author claimed that in all Europe any degree of civil liberty possessed by the people was due /
due initially to the love of ecclesiastical liberty. He derided the gentlemen who passively accepted a situation in which "a minister is obtruded on him, his family, and his tenants, by the influence of a deacon or a bailie in a country burgh, who has the merit of having voted for a member of parliament ..." He described the close connection which existed in the past between the clergy and the people and the firm support given to government by the undivided church. The restoration of patronage in 1712 was an attempt by the Tories to introduce tensions into the church and thus weaken its support of the government. A drastic alienation of the minds and hearts of the people has been the result. How, he asked, could our rulers accept and even zealously promote such an alienation? The answer lies in the fact that "patronage is an engine of political power."

Corruption and venality have always distinguished a Tory administration; your clergymen of Scotland have become the tools of your enemies — to them they have sold you; the price is those emoluments they have so carefully monopolized; the leaders among them have engrossed to themselves, and to their creatures, all that the Crown can give to churchmen in this part of the island; their acquirements are the price of your liberty — I say, of your liberties and rights; for, if you have not liberty to choose your own minister, you are deprived of one of the most essential rights of Christians. Do patrons and proprietors assert their exclusive right of chusing /
choosing because they pay the clergy? — Nothing can be more obviously futile and false. Stipends are a part of the public stock, to which the meanest man who labours in the field contributes, as well as the first subject in the realm. It is your money, the money of the public, the fruit of your productive labours, that constitutes the stipend of the clergy: And will you suffer yourselves to be robbed of a right to which you are as much entitled as to the bread which you earn by the sweat of your brow? 102

He noted the objection that divisions and animosities occur in the course of popular settlements while presentations are decisive, and replied, that "despotism is the most decisive form of government," that arbitrary rulers regard "every exertion of liberty and all its ebullitions, as faction and sedition," but that liberty is a gift too precious to be possessed without alloy and "disputes originating in the passions of men are inseparable from freedom." He concluded the section of the essay on ecclesiastical liberty with an expression of hope for deliverance from the intolerable yoke of patronage through the new administration, "of unequalled ability and liberality of sentiment ... raised up, we hope, at this tremendous crisis of public affairs, not only in support of civil, but also ecclesiastical liberty." These rulers, he wrote, have expressed a just jealousy of the increasing power of the /
the Crown. If we show then that patronage has been used in Scotland solely to promote the interest of the Court in Parliament, that it has fostered corruption and contributed to the destruction of that freedom of Parliament which is essential to political liberty, that it has alienated the people from government and members from the established churches, then they will be convinced that the Act of 10th Queen Anne must be abrogated or so qualified as to eliminate the evil. Experience has proved no relief can be expected through the General Assembly. Therefore the numerous opponents of patronage must enable themselves by association to bring their case to the government.

Significantly, the second part of the same pamphlet was a strictly political reformist tract headed "On Civil Liberty." It begins with the assertion that events of the times give reason to believe that many people have discovered their rights and have courage enough to set limits to arbitrary power. North America has exposed herself to most cruel calamities, and is become free. Ireland has vindicated her rights, and her noble endeavours are crowned with success. The Commons of England seem to emerge from venality and corruption, breathe a purer air, and emulate their ancestors in their zeal for liberty and virtue. The grand object of our patriotic ministers, to purge the House of Commons of servile dependants, and to rectify /
rectify the representation of the people in Parliament, must interest the wishes of every honest man. 103

In the midst of these developments, he continued shall Scotland be distinguished by servility and indifference respecting their most valuable rights, those liberties which add dignity to human nature? Since 1707 Scotland has enjoyed a proportion of liberty inferior to that in England: A despotic aristocracy has been in control and "with all that boast of liberty, which hath been so loud and clamorous, the middle and lower ranks of this country have hardly been able to taste the sweets of freedom." But why, he asked, may not Scots be as free as their neighbors? "Why are the rights of the representation of this country wrapped up in mysterious laws, which the learned alone can explain? Forty shillings of landed property intitles an Englishman to vote ... In Scotland near the same number of pounds, of old valued rent, are necessary." Further, why should a mean fellow in a trifling burgh be entitled to vote for a member of Parliament while a gentleman in the county of rank and affluence is unqualified? Why do a few men who have got in power in a city remain in power forever, to the exclusion of thousands of more ability /
ability and fortune, while "the great body of the people, those of most respect and usefulness in the commonwealth, shall have no representation, no protection of their rights, no liberty!" Why should an aristocracy be able to saddle with taxes a people who are disqualified from remonstrating against them? In the light of these, and more, anomalies and injustices, the men of Scotland must claim their natural rights. At this propitious time, urged the author of the address on ecclesiastical and civil liberty, when "sentiments of liberty are breathed in every department of government" and the rulers "will exult at the prospect of a nation claiming their natural rights under their auspices," "the happy moment ... invites you to vindicate the blessings of free-born Britons."

Examples could be multiplied of the satisfaction with which church reformers saw hope for ecclesiastical and political reform in the new administration and in the campaign for changes in burgh and county representation. Letters in the press as well as pamphlets applauded electoral reform and the reformation of the patronage in successive paragraphs with only minor changes in wording. It was noted with satisfaction that proposed reforms in the burghs /
burghs, where presentations were vested in the town councils, would "go well nigh to remove the corruptions in their ecclesiastical state also," and it was obvious that a reduction in the power of the large landholders would lessen the authority of those who held rights of patrons.

To the repetitious arguments drawn from church history and from the experience of the working of patronage in recent times were added concepts from rational philosophers which had recently contributed to dissent from political authority. One pamphleteer began a section with the succinct statement,

"We appeal, with confidence to the plain and obvious principles of natural liberty, upon the authority of which, we cannot hesitate to affirm, that pastoral election is the natural and fundamental right of the people."

Enlarging on this principle, the writer argued that man must have entered civil society to improve his conditions, and therefore could not have accepted any limitation on his right to the exercise of his natural liberty. When people are deprived of the natural right of choosing their own pastor, an act of violence is committed to which they ought not submit, and the existing law of patronage is an open /
open violation of the natural liberty of the people in an important matter. The writer continued with a warning of the indifference which results when people are excluded from political or religious liberty. The denial of a Scottish militia was passively accepted because of the political indifference of large numbers of unenfranchised landholders. A lack of popular participation in religious affairs has similar results, for unlimited submission to patronage impairs sentiments of liberty, both civil and religious, and introduces the ideas of slavery in place of those of liberty. "In this way the total annihilation of religious freedom will be superadded to the extinction of political liberty, already almost entirely lost among the great body of people ..."\textsuperscript{105}

The importance for the period under consideration of the treatment of pastoral election as a prototype of political freedom can be exaggerated if it is forgotten that the opponents of patronage tended to identify every struggle for liberty in Scotland as waged by Presbyterians and every administration favorable to Presbyterianism as favorable to liberty. Nevertheless, the anti-patronage literature after 1780 contains references and concepts absent /
absent from the earlier writings and reflects not only the spirit of political reform but received inspiration for its cause in the progress of political reform. Frequent use is made of the concept of natural rights — it does not seem to appear in patronage literature before 1780 — and references to political corruption and the inadequacy of the representation are coupled with assertions that pastoral elections will contribute to the needed reform of local and national administration. Although a bias is occasionally apparent in claims for the antecedence of ecclesiastical liberty, yet both civil and ecclesiastical liberty become essential goals and share the same pamphlet or letter. When the opponents of patronage greeted the fall of Lord North as a propitious moment for the achievement of their objectives, they may have been excessively credulous in so far as the repeal of the Patronage Act was concerned, but these same men comprised the party in the church which had opposed Lord North's American policy and there is no reason to doubt their genuine sympathy with the movement for political reform. Henry Erskine, for example, was as active in the post war struggle for burgh reform as he had been with the Popular party in the General Assembly.
Assembly. For these reasons the development of the anti-patronage movement from 1763 to the end of the war is properly considered an integral part of the general political awakening of the period. 106

* * *

After the close of the Seven Years war it was possible for a Scottish nationalism — rooted in Scottish history and community feeling, tested for loyalty in the war, taking pride in economic and intellectual achievements, and defensive in the face of English invective — to exert itself in dissociation from the charge of Jacobitism. The complaint which developed and was publicised against the ministerial control of the poerage elections, though not an entirely new complaint, was in part an expression of Scottish nationalist sentiment. A more important and popular assertion of national rights was made in regard to the question of a Scottish militia, a question which was aggravated by the American war. 107

There /
There was little complaint at the determination of peerage elections by the third Duke of Argyll or Lord Bute, but after Bute's retirement indignation flared at the practice of circulating before elections a list of recommended candidates chosen without benefit of a Scottish manager. In 1768 Lord Buchan published a letter offering himself as a candidate and urging the Peers to assert their independency by ignoring the ministerial list in the approaching election. It was the first of several unsuccessful attempts by Buchan, Elibank, Selkirk, and others in 1770, 1771, 1774 and 1782 to free the peerage election from domination by the ministry, and on these occasions the propriety, constitutionality of the list were debated by the peers, protests were entered after elections, pamphlets were published, and the newspapers gave considerable space to the contests. In 1780 an advertisement by Buchan for a meeting of peers to discuss the nominating procedure drew only a small attendance, and in 1782 Buchan offered himself again as a candidate, ineffectually urging his election as proof of a reassertion of the independence and the dignity of the Scottish peerage and declaring his intention to renounce his political connection.
with the peerage if defeated. The only result seems to have been a more discreet circulation of the ministerial list.

There was liberal use of reform phraseology in the speeches and publications on the issue - free and independent elections and the end of a "shameful bondage" were demanded - but the issue of the Scottish peerage elections was not related to the broader movement for reform as expressed in burgh and county agitation. There was naturally no suggestion of the dissolution of privileges. Some of the disputes were no doubt factional struggles for a seat in the House of Lords, and Buchan seems to have genuinely desired a political position. But the primary emphasis in the debates, letters and other writings was on the dignity of the order. The cry for the liberty and independence of the peers was a part of this emphasis and the issue of local freedom in the elections was a means toward it. The campaign was a demand for a recognition of the rights and dignity of the Scottish order, and as such it was an assertion of confidence and pride in Scottish life and institutions in a period when economic, military, and intellectual achievements were providing Scotland /
Scotland with an answer to the denigration from the South. It may be compared with the question of a Scottish militia as an expression of Scottish nationalism.

The question of a Scottish militia was distinctly more nationalistic than any other of the controversies which appealed to Scottish sentiment between 1763 and 1783. The militia was first given serious consideration after a French squadron threatened the Clyde in 1760. An extension of the English Militia Act of 1757 was then proposed, but it was rejected in terms which clearly expressed a humiliating distrust of the Scots. During the reappearances of the question during the next twenty years, a genuine need for protection from privateers or invasion was a factor, particularly during the American war, but the openly expressed unwillingness to trust a Scottish militia and the almost as openly expressed desire and practice of considering Scotland a recruiting ground for the army and navy at the expense - in the Scottish view - of minimum requirements for domestic defence aroused a strong nationalist sentiment which demanded equal treatment with England.

In 1760 there were genuine fears of attack by the French /
French, but nationalist sentiments were apparent in the outburst of demand and protest, in the pamphlets, and in the letters and resolutions printed in the newspapers, circulated among the burghs, and sent to the members of Parliament. The Poker Club was founded in 1762 to promote a Scottish militia, and the project was advocated periodically, if chiefly by Poker Club enthusiasts, during the next fifteen years. In 1775 the fact of the American war was enough to revive the militia question, even though there was little threat to the Scottish coasts at the time, but the militia was again defeated in Parliament early the next year. When the war on the sea reached the coasts of Scotland, as it did in 1777, the militia enthusiasts renewed their efforts and continued them to the end of the war, although they were most insistent immediately after excursions by John Paul Jones in 1778 and 1779. A militia bill was introduced in Parliament for the second time during the American war in 1782, but without success. In 1776 the Scots considered the discrimination implied in the denial of a militia to be completely unjustifiable. After 1777 the militia was argued not only as a right but also as an immediate necessity.
When the militia bill was debated in Parliament in 1776, the opposition speakers argued against militias in general as potential instruments of aristocratic tyranny, but their chief argument was on grounds of disproportionate tax levies in England and Scotland. They argued that since Scotland paid such a limited proportion of the land tax, the fund from which militia expenses were paid, the expense of a militia would rest largely on English landowners. The Scots argued that a militia was necessary to preserve liberty and would have prevented the eighteenth century rebellions in Scotland; that most of the landed income in Scotland was spent in England, thereby enabling the English to pay their taxes; and that Scotland's narrower means should not deprive her of the security and protection necessary to increase her wealth. In 1782 some of the same arguments were presented as in 1776, but opponents of the bill cited in various ways the disadvantages of increasing the home defences of Scotland at the expense of recruits for the army, while Scottish members continued to demand equal rights with England in a militia.

The fear of invasion or of attack on local centers was considerable. Already in 1777, for example, American privateers
privateers were reported anchored in the Solway Firth, varying numbers of vessels were reported captured off Ireland, in the North Channel and elsewhere near by, and prisoners released from a privateer brought word of declared intentions to visit the Clyde. In July 1777 the Provost of Glasgow ordered 300 stand of arms sent from Dumbarton to Greenock, and the merchants of Glasgow, Greenock, and Port Glasgow were reported to have subscribed £2,900 for fitting out letters of marque to protect the trade in view of government failure to give assistance. Jones ransacked the home of Lord Selkirk in April 1778 and sailed up the Forth with four ships almost to Leith in 1779. An American privateer landed on the Banffshire coast in June 1778 and from the time of France's entry into the war rumors of landing were more numerous than ever. Three single-battalion fencible regiments were formed for home defence in 1778 (and another added later) but they were considered inadequate. Reports to the Secretary of State indicate how seriously the situation was regarded locally. James Adolphus Oughton wrote that the attack on Lord Selkirk's house threw all the western coast into consternation and demonstrated the defencelessness of the /
the entire coast. At the same time the price of meal was so advanced that mobs had arisen and more were apprehended while there were no forces with which to answer the magistrates' calls for assistance. "The People complain that, after having furnished near 12,000 Men to the Army and Navy they are exposed to the insults of Mobs, and the Ravages of every insignificant Privateer." After the appearance of an enemy squadron off Dunbar in September 1779, the Provost of Edinburgh communicated to the Secretary of State "a very universal Complaint of the Citizens of Edinburgh, that they are not at present favoured with a force of military protection, equal to that which was given them during the last war."124

The demand for more protection was made use of in continuing efforts by the proponents of a Scottish militia, but meantime, in lieu of a militia and in spite of the fancibles, irregular formations of volunteers for home defence were formed. In Aberdeen an Association consisting of the principal burghers as well as "young gentlemen" and reported to number 120 to 160 of a proposed 400 men made up a uniform and began training in the use of arms.125 Similar associations were begun at Ayr, Campbelltown, Dumfries /
Dumfries, and other places, and the orders of the Secretary of State to halt the illegal arming were received with "no inconsiderable disgust." Artillery and other arms were sent to Aberdeen, Ayr, Dundee, Greenock, and Campbelltown in the summer of 1778, but in 1779 the demands for more protection were even more insistent. Proposals for arming volunteer units were revived and increased in number from both counties and corporations, and exercises were begun in many towns. Toward the end of 1779 a communication to Dundas reviewed the impropriety of the manner in which volunteer associations were formed but left open a possibility that proper proposals might meet with success, the proper proposals being conditions designed to assure government control of the forces. The volunteer associations, however, never received a legal authorization from the government, and it was necessary to be content with increments of artillery at Leith, Aberdeen, and Greenock, small arms at other towns, and the addition of the 25th Regiment of Infantry to the garrison at Edinburgh, as supplements to the fencibles.

It was in the letters to the press after the raids by John Paul Jones that the nationalist fervour for a militia /
militia received its most vehement expression. The refusal in December 1779 to sanction the volunteer associations was considered as much evidence of distrust as the denial of a militia, and several letters in 1779 and 1780 argued that the injustice paid Scotland in view of her contributions to the war and her sufferings was so great as to merit defiance of the Secretary of State. A letter, probably from Alexander Carlyle, advised the county gentlemen who had been active in organizing associations to break off correspondence on the subject with the Secretary of State if they could not accept all his conditions and to carry on with the county associations. Another correspondent who reviewed at length the vulnerability of the Scottish coasts, the attacks of Jones, the prejudice in favour of England, and the inadequacy of the fencible regiments concluded,

"A militia bill for Scotland has been twice rejected; sorry I am that it was. But in an hour like this, are there any laws against providing themselves, and the people of every rank and condition, with arms to defend their country? Is there any construction or sophistical wresting of the laws against rioters and poachers, which can apply to the best friends of their country arming in her cause? Demand by all means a militia. Demand, in every proper manner, the most legal arms. But in the meantime remember, that you are /
are men, and free men; the first law of Nature is with you; the law of self preservation, written on the heart of man by the hand of God himself."

From the spring of 1780 until May of 1782, when the Marquis of Graham introduced a militia bill to Parliament, the controversy was absent from the press. County gentlemen met in 1782 to express support for the bill and to consider alternative ways of arming if the bill was defeated, and letters in the press continued to refer back to the exploits of John Paul Jones as evidence of the need for a militia. The rejection of the bill brought forth a last indignant series of letters which protested the continued utilization of Scotland as a nursery for recruits, argued against an address on the recent changes in the ministry since the rejection of the militia made it impossible for Scots to approve the new ministry, and berated the Scots for not supporting more vigorously the attempt to secure a militia. The concessions to Ireland and America gave occasion for a greater feeling of injustice.

"The Ministers ... ascertain mens rights by the degree of latitude in which they live, and while they declare England entitled to a militia of upwards of 30,000 men, they leave us nothing but our poverty to trust to for protection. Scotland is, I believe, the only part of the globe that can make a request which the present Ministry /
Ministry have courage enough to refuse to comply with. Their concessions to Ireland kept pace with all its demands.

To America almost everything is offered that Britain has to surrender. From Holland they are suing for peace and pity, at the expense of that privilege on which our rank among the maritime powers has hitherto been thought to depend. Yet amidst all this boundless liberality, Scotland cannot obtain the humble privilege of carrying arms for its own defence!135

The issue was destined to lose its urgency with the end of the war and already in 1782 the supporters of a militia were divided over the proposals of Shelburne for raising corps in the principal towns of Britain. The proposals were a compromise between fancibles and a militia and after their publication in the Edinburgh newspapers in June, the campaign for a militia shifted into a discussion of the merits of the Shelburne plan, with considerable sentiment in its favour evident in letters and resolutions in the latter months of the year.136

The significance of the issue in relation to the growth of political awareness in Scotland lies in the fact that for several years the denial of a militia had challenged the Scots. The hazards of an exposed coast stimulated their ardour and buttressed their case, while their indignation justified extra-legal defence formations in place of /
of a militia. Until the war ended the issue had a united Scottish support and enthusiastic Scottish champions. With the conclusion of peace, the fervour subsided and the question was not seriously revived until in the next decade a militia was created and met the surprising opposition described by Meikle.\textsuperscript{137} In 1783 the question of electoral reform succeeded as the major domestic political issue in Scotland.
1. The most detailed description of the Scottish burgh and county electoral system is found in E. and A. Porritt, The Unreformed House of Commons (Cambridge, 1903), II. Also useful are: C. E. Adams, View of the Political State of Scotland (Edin. 1887), Intro.; Henry Meikle, Scotland and the French Revolution (Glasgow, 1911), chs. I, II; Holden Furber, Henry Dundas, First Viscount Melville, 1742-1811 (London, 1931), part II, ch. I; Alexander Wight, An Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of Parliament, chiefly in Scotland (Edin. 1784), Br. IV, chs. 1-3.

2. The constitution of Edinburgh was formulated in 1583 by arbiters representing the merchants and trades. This sett, slightly amended in March 1729/30 by a ruling of the Earl of Islay, was still in force in 1763. It provided for an ordinary town council of 25 members made up of the lord provost, the four bailies, the dean of guild, the treasurer (all merchants), the seven previous holders of these offices, three merchant and two tradesmen councillors, and six of the fourteen deacons of the Incorporated Societies. Deacons from the eight remaining incorporations were added to the ordinary council to make up the extraordinary council of 33 members. Seventeen merchants and eight tradesmen were represented in the ordinary council. The Merchant Company, the barbers, and the candlemakers had no representation on the council. Scots Mag., XXV (July, 1763), 378-380; A. Wight, An Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of Parliament, 381-384.


4. Porritt, Ibid., 64.

5. The incorporations had protested their grievances on many/
many occasions. The decrees-arbitrary pronounced by Lord Islay in 1730, which strengthened slightly the position of the deacons in the council, was a result of trades agitation, and pamphlets on the election of deacons appeared intermittently between 1730 and 1763.

6. _Scots Mag._, XXVI (May, 1764), 239; _Cal. Mer._, Jan. 5, 1763.

7. _Scots Mag._, XXV (Sept. 1763), 526.


9. _Scots Mag._, XXV (June, 1763), 357.

10. _Cal. Mer._, Aug. 29, 1763.

11. _Ibid._, Sept. 24, 1763; _Scots Mag._, XXV (Sept., 1763), 526.


13. The following is typical of the resolutions: "The Incorporation of Weavers being duly convened . . . DO think it proper to DECLARE their disapprobation of the said act of the council, as subversive of the constitution of this burgh; as destructive of the privileges of the incorporated societies, particularly of the Corporation of Weavers; and as enabling the present and succeeding councils (however odious their administration may have rendered them to their fellow citizens) to continue themselves in authority, in opposition to the laws and to the general voice of the city . . ." _Cal. Mer._, Oct. 3; also Oct. 26, 29, 31; Nov. 5, 21, 23, 1763, and other dates.

14. The promoters of changes in the constitution, "formed in a rude age and upon principles little favourable to liberty," claimed that "they pursue objects essentially connected with public prosperity. Craftsmen and Manufacturers cannot promote their own true interest, without advancing that of their country . . ." Their complaint was /
was of an election restriction: "which is altogether unknown in the southern part of this island . . . . . " They appear, as supplicants for the birthright of British subjects; they humbly ask leave to choose their own representatives . . . the natural, the inoffensive privilege of committing the guardianship of their own right . . to men of the greatest integrity . . . . " An Address in behalf of the Town Council, the Fourteen Incorporations of Craftsmen, the Company of Merchants, and the Societies of Barbers and Candlemakers, of the City of Edinburgh, to the Members of the Royal Boroughs of Scotland (Edinburgh, June 30, 1763) (broadside); An Address to the Freemon of the Several Incorporations of Edinburgh (June 25, 1763) (broadside); The Query, Can the City of Edinburgh be hurt by the proposed alteration of the set in favour of the Trades? (Edin., July 11, 1763), 1.


18. Scots Mag., XXXVIII (1776), Appendix, 718-719.


23. The language and sentiment in the resolution from the Weavers are typical: "(we) return our most sincere thanks to him (Stoddart) for his spirited endeavour to throw off that servile dependence that has, these many years past, taken place in the election of the Magistrates and Common Council . . whereby few or none were chosen but such as were thought or known partizans of a patron, or of their own representative in Parliament. As by the sett of the city, the Common Council's power /
power of shortening our leets has almost always deprived us of the person we wished for to represent us in Council, we cannot help expressing our gratitude to the Lord Provost for concurring in the plan proposed to him for relieving us from that long complained of engine of power, made use of to deprive the worthiest persons in the Incorporations from having any share in the management of the city concerns . . . " Cal. Mar., Sept. 28, 1776.


28. Ibid., Mar. 19, 22, April 9, 12, 1777; Scots Mag., XXXIX (Oct. 1777), 563-564.


30. To the Members of the Fourteen Incorporations (Edin., 1777) Cal. Mar., Mar. 15, 1777. John Hancock was president of the colonial Continental Congress. In 1776 several letters to the newspapers drew analogies between Edinburgh politics and American affairs. Stoddart and the incorporations were described during the elections of 1776 as the Provincial, and the council stalwarts as the Regulars, while the contest was described in military terms. The delegates were reported as busy as the "Congress in framing minutes and resolutions, and tribute was paid to the excellent manner of expression of the manifesto of the delegates to the American Congress in contrast to the vulgar and illiberal papers of the Edinburgh delegates.

A letter which acclaimed the American spirit of liberty was in part facetious but nevertheless expressed dissatisfaction with the limited objectives of the trades. The author, under the signature 'Barber Politicus', protested the lack of representation for barbers and other societies and wrote: "Seeing myself excluded from politics, I betook to news. I was charmed with the rising spirit of American liberty."
I wished it to cross the Atlantic to the shores of Caledonia; and my heart dilated with noble ardour at the names of The DELEGATES and The CONGRESS.

I conceived, however, some hopes of political freedom on hearing the name of liberty sounded in our walls and, along with certain of my brethren surgeons, in a delirium of gloomy joy, I broke a great man’s windows. However, certain ominous appearances made me dread, from the first, that this spirit of liberty was of the mongrel sort. It sprung up upon a difference between our Member and our Mayor; then did my brethren wonderfully discover the oppressed state of the political body.

But what convinces me, Mr. Printer, that this is not a struggle for liberty, but a contest for power, is, that my brethren trades are seeking for themselves an influence in the constitution which they never before possessed. While at the same time, not one word is urged in behalf of the injured and despised barbers. Mr. Printer, do these patriots endeavor to emancipate from thralldom the town of Leith? Do they propose giving a vote to the sailors, the traffickors, the maltmen, or the Trades? No; upon enlarged, upon real principles of liberty, they cannot pretend to act.

Cal. Mer., Aug. 25, 30, Sept. 1, 14, 1776.

31. Ibid., July 16, 1777.
32. Ibid., Aug. 30, 1777.
33. Ibid., Sept. 10, 1777.
34. Ibid., Sept. 15, 1777.
35. Ibid., Sept. 22, Oct. 1, 13, 1777.
39. /


44. *Cal. Mer.*, July 15, 1782.


46. Archibald Fletcher, *A Memoir concerning the Origins and Progress of the Reform proposed in the internal Government of the Royal Burghs of Scotland; which was first brought under discussion in 1782* (Edin., 1819). Fletcher was a participant in the reform movement from 1784 when he was a delegate from Dumbarton to the assembly in Edinburgh. In his Memoir Fletcher outlined briefly the long history of attempts to reform burgh abuses as evidenced in the records of Parliament, of Royal Commissions, and of the Convention of Royal Burghs, but he assigned the origin of the reform movement to the year 1782 when the letters of Zeno and Ewen appeared, "who brought to public view the mal-administration of the Burghs", and when the burgess committees for reform were organized. Pp. 1-15. Meikle, *Scotland and the French Revolution*, 16.

47. *Scots Mag.*, XLV (Feb., 1783), 108.


52. *Ibid.*, April 14, 1783.

53. /
53. Ibid., Mar. 17, 1783.
54. Ibid., Mar. 22, 1783.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid., Mar. 29, 1783.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid., April 2, 1783.
59. Ibid., April 14, 1783.
60. Ibid., May 5, 1783.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., April 19, 1783.
63. Ibid., April 16, 1783.
64. Ibid., April 19, 1783.
65. Ibid., April 14, 1783.
66. Scots Mag. XLV (May, 1783), 278-279.
67. Cal. Hor., April 12, 1783.
68. Ibid., April 21, 1783.
69. Christopher Wyvill, Political Papers chiefly respecting the Reformation of the Parliament of Great Britain (York, 1794-1804), III, 1-14; additional papers and resolutions relating to the Edinburgh Committee, 15-41.
70. Cal. Hor., May 17, 1783.
71. Ibid., Dec. 20, 1783.
73. /
73. A. Fletcher, 'A Memoir concerning the Origin and Progress of the Reform of the Royal Burghs of Scotland', pp. 11-15. The Memoir contains a full account of the proceedings of the Conventions of delegates to 1794 (pp. 19-131) and has reprints of many of the relevant documents, addresses, letters and speeches. A survey of burgh reform activity from 1783 based on Fletcher and supplementary material is given in Maikle, Scotland and the French Revolution, ch. II.

74. Most of the works which discuss burgh electoral arrangements also describe the system of voting in the counties. The most complete description is in Porritt, The Unreformed House of Commons, II, 143-181. Of the others cited, supra, fnote. 1, Wight has the most detail, Bk. III, chs. 1-7. Also useful are H. Furber, Henry Dundas, Part III, ch. 1, and James Ferguson, 'Making Interest' in Scottish County Elections', Scot. Hist. Review, XXVI (Oct., 1947), 119-133.

75. E.g., the Lanark head court announced that the freeholders disapproved the bill, but a minority announced simultaneously that only 26 freeholders had been present and that the casting vote of the preses was required to register a majority against the measure. A subsequent letter revealed that "of the 13 disapprovers of the Bill, three of them have made all the liferent votes upon their estates that could be made; and that eight of the disapprovers would be struck off the roll, if that Bill took place". Edin. Eve. Cour., Oct. 7, 1775; Cal. Mer., Oct. 18, 1775.


77. Cal. Mer., May 7, 1774.


79. /
"At a full Meeting of the Gentlemen, real proprietors of the county of Moray, held at Elgin the 1st of May instanta, called for the purpose of taking into consideration, the present state of the representation of the people in Parliament, the Meeting came to the following unanimous resolutions:

"I. That the present mode of creating nominal and fictitious qualifications for voting at elections for members of Parliament is alarming and unconstitutional, and subject to the greatest abuses.

"II. That this Meeting will use every endeavour in their power to obtain a correction of such abuses, by pursuing every legal measure for putting elections of members of Parliament for this part of the kingdom upon a constitutional and equal footing.

"III. That for this purpose Sir James Grant of Grant, Baronet, and Francis Russel of Westfield, Esq., advocate, be a committee of this meeting, to meet at Edinburgh, and correspond and concur with the other counties of Scotland, and otherwise, without delay, to pursue in name, and at the expense of this meeting, such measures as to them may appear most conducive to this end.
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When the issue of a free peerage was conceived of in a wider sense than as merely the elimination of certain restrictions on the Scottish peers, the concept of freedom was still a very moderate one as is illustrated in the following paragraph from a letter of Henry Mackenzie. "I join'd my wishes to yours for the independency of the Scottish Peerage. We have unfortunately been accustomed for some time past to connect the idea of liberty with licentiousness & licentiousness with a set of men who were supposed to bear an antipathy to Scotland; from this deduction we have a little too indiscriminately condemn'd every measure that had Freedom or the pretence of Freedom for its basis, & thrown ourselves headlong into the purgative scale, because Lord Bute had a connection with the King, & John Wilkes abused him for bread". Letters and Papers of Henry Mackenzie, Henry Mackenzie to Miss Rose of Kilsavock Edin., Jan. 7, 1771 (National Library of Scotland).
Tho plunder of Selkirk's house in 1778 and the entrance into the Forth of the American squadron in Sept. 1779 created much excitement and filled many columns in the press. Oughton also described to the Secretary of State the reaction to the latter event. "My Lord, I have the Honour of acquainting Your Lordship that the Enemies ships, after having infested this Coast for several Days, and taken some small Craft have left us and steered Southward. Their Force was indeed but small; but the Apprehensions of the Inhabitants were by no Means so: some few, near the Sea, sent off their Families and Effects; but Numbers cheerfully offer'd themselves for the Defence of their Country. In a former Letter I mentioned what the town of Leith had done; The Magistrates of Edinburgh enrolled about five hundred old Soldiers to be ready when called on; the Gentlemen of Fife and East Lothian engaged to head their Servants and Tenants, requesting, Arms and Ammunition. As there appeared no immediate Necessity, I declined their Offers as civilly as possible; but I find all the Inhabitants of the Coast extremely sollicitous to be impower'd to defend themselves; as it is accessible everywhere, and liable to the Insults and Devastation of every Paltry Privateer. Three of the Enemies Ships, which I mentioned to your Lordship to have been separated in A Gale of Wind, were seen off Lerwick in Zetland, the 13th of this month: I/
I have not heard of them since. A Custom house Cutter, which I sent out to reconnoitre brings me word that the Fleet from the Baltic, and His Majesty's ship The Emerald arrived safe this morning. I have the honour to be, etc." Ibid. Sept. 24, 1779.
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131. Cal. Mar., Jan. 24, 1780, under the signature "Lysander".

felt in Scotland. It followed a recital of the dangers surrounding Scotland and of the two Parliamentary rejections of a Scottish militia. "Is every part of Britain armed as it ought . . .? England is armed, Ireland too; Why is Scotland so ignominiously distinguished from other nations? Why is our unhappy country peculiarly exposed, not only to depredation and insult, but to invasion and conquest? If the fleets of the House of Bourbon still prove . . . superior to ours next summer . . . why may they not detach a small squadron . . . to the Firth of Forth? There they may land almost without opposition. They may occupy and possess no inconsiderable part of Scotland, abandoned to them, surrendered and betrayed! Is it impossible to prevent this . . .? Have we been so long of taking arms, that it is too late to arm? . . . Everybody knows the contrary . . . Have the Scots been noted in history for cold and dastardly hearts? Have their enemies ever found them feeble foes? Now, I confess, if an invasion should take place, unarmed and defenceless as they are, the men of Scotland would be like so many women! This subject grows too much for me, and I must hasten to a conclusion: My heart beats against my ribs, and my blood boils with shame and indignation!"

Ibid., Jan. 29, 1780. Other letters with similar sentiments: Ibid., Feb. 2, 7, 14, Mar. 1, 1780.

133. Cal. Mar., June 1, 15, 1782.
134. Ibid., June 17, July 1, 1782.

135. Ibid., June 29, 1782; another writer insisted on "our right to share in that liberty and security, to which a Scotchman has as legal and natural a title as an Englishman, an Irishman, or an American". Ibid., July 1, 1782.


CHAPTER V.

THE PRESS AND THE WAR.

The eighteenth century periodical press in Scotland was centered in Edinburgh. The favorable location of the city with regard to communications with London, its heritage as the political capital of Scotland, its university and the intellectual revival around it, its courts, its expansion in the latter half of the century contributed to make the city the greatest center of news in Scotland.

Almost forty periodicals were published in Edinburgh between 1750 and 1789, about ten of which were newspapers. Three Edinburgh newspapers were published along with the Scots Magazine through the period of the American Revolution, while other news-sheets and numerous literary papers appeared for varying lengths of time between 1750 and 1789.

In Glasgow, meanwhile, one newspaper constituted virtually the whole of the local press from 1760 to 1778. A second newspaper was put into circulation in 1778. The few local magazines printed in Glasgow from 1750 to 1789 were undistinguished. The Aberdeen Journal was the dominant and only newspaper printed in the north of Scotland between 1763.
1763 and 1783. It was supplemented by shortlived magazines printed in Dundee and Perth, while to the south beginnings in periodical literature were made in Dumfries in 1773.

Newspapers expanded significantly between the end of the Seven Years War and the French Revolution, and printing establishments at or near Edinburgh increased from six in 1763 to sixteen in 1790. A leading factor in this expansion was the interest in news created by the American war and the greater part of the increase in the number of news-sheets corresponds with the period from about 1772 through the war years. Circulation figures are limited. Ruddiman's *Weekly Mercury* is reported to have had a circulation of 1,400 copies a week in 1779, and the *Weekly Magazine* or Edinburgh Amusement circulated 3,000 copies. The *Caledonian Mercury* is described as having the largest circulation of any Scottish newspaper. Improvements in roads and transport services as well as the development of circulating libraries, which included periodicals for their users, contributed to the expansion of the press, and readers numbered many more than subscribers.

The Scottish press, like the provincial press generally, depended /
depended almost entirely on the London newspapers and periodicals for its foreign news. A column of brief local news items was a regular feature, although the Edinburgh papers occupied a position in Scotland similar to that of the London papers for the country as a whole, and the Glasgow Journal sometimes took its news of Glasgow affairs from the Edinburgh papers. Letters "to the printer" were a form of editorial opinion which appeared intermittently until about 1773, after which they became more numerous. In English newspapers these letters, often written by leading men, were a characteristic feature between 1760 and 1775 and were a medium for free expression of opinion such as had not existed before. Leading articles began to supersede the contributed letters after 1775. In Scotland most letters to the printer on national questions before 1773 seem to be reprints from London papers, although letters on religious issues and a few on Scottish questions were locally written. After 1773 American affairs drew an increasing number of letters from Scottish correspondents. During the successive crises with the colonies private letters from correspondents in America were printed. They contributed on the scene descriptions of
of economic and political conditions, agitation, and riots, and contained observations on the probable course of events.11

The newspaper was the major source of public information in Scotland about America, and the colonies were an object of general interest long before quarrels focussed attention upon them. Dispatches from London papers described at length the Indians, their customs and warfare, and the activities of the Indian Commissioners. Long extracts from speeches of the Indian chiefs sometimes accompanied accounts of Indian treaty negotiations. There were descriptions of new colonial settlements in the south and west, of colonial flora and fauna, of George Whitefield's progress in America, of colonial medicine and education. In 1763 and 1764 notices of colonial complaints regarding restrictions on trade, on distilleries, on the export of iron ordnance, and suggestions for improving relations between the colonies and mother-country foreshadowed difficulties which were to arise.

Among the consequences of the Stamp Act episode was the important effect it had in focussing British attention on America. From the time of the Act's surprising reception /
reception in the colonies, the press and journals gave American affairs a prominence which increased, despite fluctuations, to a dominant position shortly before and during the war. The Scottish reader was able to follow the course of the Stamp Act from its first inauspicious mention and postponement in the latter months of 1764 through the whole of its controversial existence and consequences. The controversial nature of the Act appeared in June 1765 when the Edinburgh Evening Courant printed extracts from several letters from New York "arrived by the last packet." The letters described distress and alarm in the colonies on the arrival of the Stamp Act notice, anticipated an increase in colonial manufacturing on the ground that the people were unable already to pay for imported goods without paying the extra duty, and expressed resentment at the expected drain on colonial specie. 12

The first protests were followed by a growing number of items indicating dissatisfaction and resistance. Readers learned of fortress guns spiked at Philadelphia, of newspaper publications stopped or altered to avoid payment of the duty, and of burnings in effigy, while in the Virginia Resolves /
Resolves they read the alarming sentiments relative to the Stamp Act of a responsible colonial governing body. Letters from America described colonial economic distress and real or pretended alarm. A Boston letter, for example, reported,

Our trade is in a most deplorable condition, not one fifth part of the vessels now employed in the West India trade, as was before the late regulations; our cash almost gone before the stamp and post office acts are to operate; bankruptcies multiplied, our fears increased; and the friends of liberty under great despondency. What these things will end in, time only can discover.

Another letter listed reasons for alarm: the financial distresses occasioned by the late war, the pressure by creditors, the lack of specie, the colonial alarm at the new and burdensome stamp tax, the disturbing Assembly resolves on the rights of taxation, the dissolution of the Assembly. The writer concluded,

I wish any means may be thought of for quieting the minds of the people in America, which are universally inflamed by this supposed infringement of their rights. However just the measure may be, I am sure it is not politic and that you in England will first feel the unhappy effect of it.

The news and letters from America became steadily more /
more grave and frequently included special pleading. An item told of several families from Philadelphia about to embark for the Dutch settlements due to the late stamp duty, thinking such a move was a better choice "than to live where they have so little security for their properties; and where they are governed by laws, in the making of which they have not so much as the poor consolation of a consent."16 The tragic state of trade was further described in a paragraph, no doubt from an American letter, inserted without identification in a column of local news.

Trade, burdened beyond all possible bearing, bleeding, dying. The whole of English America in the depths of despair upon the loss of privileges, the most dear and invaluable; such as right to levy taxes by their own representatives, trials by Juries, and the secure and quiet possession of one's own house.17

By December 1765 newspapers were filled with descriptive letters, accounts of speeches, declarations by colonial officials and assemblies, and detailed descriptions of the harassment and forced resignations of the stamp-masters. Increasingly the notices told of defiance and resistance to the act.

In face of the disconcerting news of the colonial reaction /
reaction suggestions of uncertainty as to colonial policy appeared in the press as early as August 1765 when the Courant noted that "the disputes continually arising in the American colonies, joined to the struggle which they make for independence, it is thought will induce the British Legislature to new-model their system of government, and to allow them Representatives in the great Council of this Kingdom." Other items reported conciliatory action and noted the prevalence of reports that warm debates about the rights of the American colonies were expected in Parliament. In January and February the newspapers filtered reports of compromise, of colonial control of taxation, of merchants preparing for a resumption of trade, of plans for colonial representation in the legislature. When the news came of a vote in the Commons in favor of repeal, it was characterized as "to the great joy of the commercial interest of these kingdoms ..."

The flood of colonial tributes to William Pitt occasioned by the repeal of the Stamp Act was noted in detail in the Scottish press, but the easing of the tension was reflected in the limited space given to American news. There was a return to the incidental notices and descriptions unrelated /
unrelated to the conflict of British and colonial interests. The controversy over the Townshend Acts marked a revival of news on American affairs in the Scottish press. The enactment of the new acts received only brief mention and there seems to have been little apprehension of a renewal of difficulties with the Americans. The colonial reaction in 1767 also gave little indication of trouble to come, and the first intimation of a revived colonial opposition came at the end of 1767 with news of resolutions to encourage economy and manufactures in order to prevent unnecessary importations.²⁵

In 1768 notices of colonial dissatisfaction with the Townshend Acts became prominent. It was learned from the New York Gazette of January 16 that sundry seditious papers were being circulated against the new customs commissioners.²⁶ More resolutions encouraged economy and manufactures and discouraged luxuries and the importation of foreign superfluities.²⁷ A petition which listed grievances relative to the late act, and letters from Philadelphia noted that agents of the colonies were asked to join in soliciting repeal of the duties.²⁸ By June 1768 items in the press were revealing progress in Massachusetts and New York /
York in subscriptions to non-importation agreements. 29 In June and July the reports became steadily more ominous with accounts of general discontent, 30 of violence committed against customs collectors at Boston, 31 of numerous "anticipations" of trouble, and of naval and troop movements to Boston. 32 - One paragraph in a column of London news illustrates the uncertainty in the late summer of 1768. The paragraph carried a rumor of canons spiked at one of the American forts; a report of ten regiments of infantry to be sent speedily to America to support government measures effectually; an optimistic observation that "as the American Wilkes cannot bear the smell of gunpowder, and faints away at a drawn sword or bayonet, it is thought that the disputes will be ended there with much less difficulty ... than has happened in England ..."; and the hopeful information that conciliatory measures toward the colonies were to be adopted and that reports of the dispatch of twenty sail of the line and twenty regiments of foot to North America were without foundation. 33 The recriminatory exchanges which followed Hillsborough's demand for recall of the Massachusetts Circular Letter of 1768 provided copy for several issues. Through the second half of 1768 and
all of 1769 newscopy on American affairs was profuse. In issue after issue of the newspapers there were details of defiance, disturbances, the progress of non-importation agreements, developments in colonial manufacturing, addresses, petitions, and resolutions.

In February 1770 the end of the Townshend Acts was forecast by a report that a conciliatory plan was soon to be proposed by Lord North, "which, if it should take effect, will reflect immortal honour on the character of that Nobleman." 

Brief notices in April traced the passage through Commons of a bill repealing the American duties, and the agitation and the American newscopy declined, although the news of the Boston Massacre and its aftermath filled pages for the two months following and the continuing objection to the tea duty and consequent non-importation efforts found sporadic notice. But in August part of a letter from New York to a merchant in Glasgow revealed the ending of the non-importation movement in New York.

I have now the pleasure to inform you that the Merchants of this city, have at last broke through their non-importation agreement; and that we are now to import goods as usual (Tea only excepted). This resolution was strongly opposed by the mob, who were beginning /
beginning to be very outrageous. But a number of
Gentlemen being appointed to take a sense of the in-
habitants which was done two different times, and there
being a great majority in favour of Importation the
Magistrates, and a number of the most respectful in-
habitants assembled and soon suppressed the mob.
Yesterday all matters were settled, and the Merchants
are this day busy in sending their orders with the
pacquet, which they had detained these three days past,
on purpose to have these orders soon home.37

This encouraging news was quickly substantiated and was
soon followed by reports of general dissolution of non-
importation agreements in all the remaining provinces.38
The conflict of British and colonial interests once more
virtually disappeared from the press.

From the autumn of 1770 until the summer of 1772
American news again occupied only a fraction of the space
formerly given to it. Scattered items through the year
1771 referred to the chronic quarrels between the Massa-
chusetts Assembly and the governor, the unhappy fortunes
of the North Carolina Regulators, and the activity of
British and colonial land speculators as reflected in the
frequent notices of new settlements in the Ohio and
Mississippi country.39 The relations between the mother
country and the colonies were so peaceful as to excite
wondering comment. A London report quoted a gentleman
lately /
lately arrived from America who declared that

business is now carried on there with the same spirit and facility as if it had never known interruption; and that the natural affections of the people for the mother country are revived far beyond what could have been expected after such recent disturbances.40

In July 1772 came the disclosure of the burning of the Gaspee, and from that time the American problem continued dominant in the newspapers until the conclusion of the war. The Gaspee affair was recognised in Britain as well as in the colonies as a test case and the news of the incident was followed by the observation that if the British government acted as it should, there would be "fresh exclamations from the Sons of Liberty beyond the Atlantic, and if they do not, the colonies are immediately discharged from their dependence upon England."41 The investigation of the Gaspee incident, the reaction of Bostonians to a report that officials in Massachusetts were to be made independent of colonial salaries, debates on the East India Company and the Tea Act, and the storm over the Hutchinson letters were prominent issues through 1773, and a report in December of that year declared that "the ministry ... are now more perplexed about what measures to take with the Americans /
In the last months of the year 1773 notices of colonial resolutions not to accept or sell tea imported subject to duty were frequent, and extracts from letters disclosed private apprehensions of a storm over tea. In a familiar pattern the news items revealed a rising tempo in the anti-Tea Act campaign in January and February 1774. There was news of efforts to intimidate the tea consignees, of recently appointed tea agents at New York declaring their decision not to receive and sell the tea, of town meetings to discuss the reception of tea, of arrangements made on the initiative of the Boston Committee of Correspondence for the extension of the Committees, of the resolutions of the Sons of Liberty not to suffer the import of tea, verbatim excerpts from incendiary papers circulated in New York and Boston, and, finally, on February 12, 1774 a report in the Caledonian Mercury that three tea vessels arrived at Boston had been boarded on December 16 by "disguised persons." A London observer was again quoted on the seriousness with which the government viewed the crisis:

"The affairs of America at present occupy the whole attention."
attention of Administration; and it is agreed on all hands to be now the most important business that has come under consideration since the accession of the present King. 45

The progress from the Boston Tea Party to the outbreak of fighting was rapid. News of the Boston party shocked England and immeasurably strengthened the demand for a final reckoning with the colonies. So much space was given to American news in 1774, especially in the last months of the year, and in 1775 that its prevalence can only be indicated. In March and April 1774 the proceedings on the Boston Port Bill were followed step by step until its passage. A resume of its contents, a petition against it from "Natives and Inhabitants of North America," and finally the Act of Parliament embodying the bill were printed. 46 Although the Port Bill was followed most closely, the other measures in the series of coercive acts received only slightly less attention and, finally, resumes of the entire group, including the Quebec Act, were printed. 47

Meantime in May and June 1774 almost every issue of the Caledonian Mercury and the Edinburgh Evening Courant contained news from Boston and other American cities of meetings /
meetings of the Sons of Liberty, of riots, impeachment proceedings, further descriptions of the resistance to tea imports at Boston and elsewhere, and of colonial reaction to the news of the Boston Port Bill. In July the Americans were reported seeking the assistance of another power, and in August news items emphasized progress toward a union of the colonies as a result of the Coercive Acts. The beginnings of another period of commercial coercion became apparent in August with notices of a Solemn League and Covenant to suspend all commercial intercourse with Britain gaining support in New England and making rapid progress through South Carolina. Lists appeared of towns breaking off all trade and dealings with England. In November and December 1774 there was news of the First Continental Congress, September 5 to October 26, and its recommendation of the Continental Association. The resolutions of the Congress were printed in substance. Parliamentary proceedings relative to American affairs were reported in considerable detail, including the debates engendered by Lord North's conciliatory proposals in February. News of military dispositions at Lexington and Concord appeared in April 1775 and unofficial accounts of
the fighting appeared in the Scottish papers in June. The intense interest in the news of Lexington and Concord is underlined by the fact that the printer of the Caledonian Mercury found it necessary to explain that "the multiplicity of articles concerning American affairs ... obliges us to delay the debates in the General Assembly," and he postponed publication of the Assembly proceedings for three issues. Reports of Bunker Hill soon followed, and the military aspects of the conflict then became most prominent in the columns of news and in the extracts from American letters.

The successive crises in colonial relations were reported in the Scottish press stage by stage, essentially as they were reported in the London papers. "A column of local news, seldom as much as one fourth of the paper (apart from advertisements), included items of specifically Scottish interest concerning the colonies and included excerpts from private letters received in Scotland and probably written for the most part by Scots in America. The amount of space given to news and to discussion of the conflict with America makes it impossible to consider the Scottish public as uninterested in American affairs, and the inclusion /
inclusion of American materials gave the reading public considerable familiarity with the arguments of both sides. It is not to be expected that the papers and journals could avoid distortion of issues and events under the circumstances of eighteenth century journalism. The reliance upon copy from other papers, particularly on the official Gazette from London, and the frequent printing as news of petitions, resolutions, and excerpts from publications brought events and the discussion of issues into the same columns, and, added to the reports and letters from witnesses representing various careers and ranks, resulted in a generous inclusion of distortions, falsehoods, and imaginative figments in which sentiments of patriotism were often dominant at the expense of accuracy. The arguments for the British position were often supported by expressions of provincial and patriotic indignation at colonial insubordination and of fear for the economic and military security of the country. These sentiments added to the arguments of an economic and political character produced a balance in favor of the British policies as against the colonial opposition. On the other hand, the presentation of American views and of events as seen by Americans was frequent
frequent. The *Caledonian Mercury* in particular had frequent and effective expositions of the American arguments in contributions from American supporters at home and abroad. All papers printed excerpts from both American and British publications, and, in fact, the controversy was printed much as a debate with American and British contentions following each other and sometimes arranged in convenient parallels. Consequently, despite the weighted presentation of news and views, the colonial case was given a hearing. 51
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1. Edinburgh Evening Courant (1718-1886); Caledonian Mercury (1720-1867); Edinburgh Advertiser (1764-1859).


3. Glasgow Journal (1741-1841?); Glasgow Mercury (1778-1796); another paper, the Glasgow Weekly Chronicle, may have been in circulation from about 1766 to 1775(?)

4. Dundee Magazine, or a History of the Present Times (1775-1778?); North British Miscellany or Dundee Amusement (1778-1780); Perth Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure (1772-1773); Caledonian Magazine and Review (1783).
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CHAPTER VI.

SOME VIEWS ON THE WAR:

A. IN THE PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION;
B. OF SOME LITERARY FIGURES;
C. AMONG THE GLASGOW MERCHANTS.

Most writers on Scottish history in the period of the American Revolution have noted the support given to the government by the Scottish Parliamentary delegation.

One of the more vigorous statements claims that the support of the subservient Scots members "had momentous effects on the policy of England towards the American colonies ... and this support from Scotland unquestionably helped to give George III a larger measure of control over the House of Commons than had been directly exercised by any of his predecessors on the throne." The division lists included in the Parliamentary History are sufficient evidence of the solidarity of the Scottish members of Parliament in support of the government's American policy.

The seven lists between 1770 and 1782 include a total of fifteen names of Scottish M.P.s voting in opposition, at least two of whom were properly Englishmen sitting short periods /
periods for Scottish seats and several were Scots who spent as much or more time sitting for English as for Scottish constituencies. The record of Scottish contributions to the debates on American questions reveals a growing lack of confidence in the government after 1778 among a few hitherto loyal members, but with the outstanding exception of George Dempster their speeches reflect the same solidarity as the division lists.

Henry Dundas gave powerful support to the policy of coercion and the war until the end of the North ministry. In February 1775 he criticized the North conciliatory proposals in strong terms, declaring he could never agree to any concessions until the Americans acknowledged the absolute supremacy of Britain, and much less could he consent while they were in arms against her. He heartily approved of the bill for restraining the trade of New England, considering it mild in the face of the provocation experienced and properly coercive since coercion would bring the quickest end to the dispute. The charge that it would produce famine he described as irrelevant. He persisted in his support for coercion even to the point of bitterly satirizing Lord North for his conciliatory proposals in 1778, but at that /
that point he found it advisable to recant and declared that the misfortunes of Burgoyne warranted the view that taxation of America by Parliament was found to be impracticable, that since the government should not attempt impracticable things, measures must be indulged which might lead to conciliation. From that time it was impossible to insist that no concessions be made to the colonies and Dundas approved the federal union proposed by Governor Pownall as preferable to a total loss of America, although he spoke strongly against enabling the commissioner (in 1778) to consider acceding to colonial independence. As the war neared its end he remained firm in support of the government and the war, resisting demands to abandon the colonies in favour of the European war and defending the conduct of the war and the war policy as a whole. In the winter of 1781–82 he freely admitted America could not be reduced by the means which had been pursued and, while publicly supporting North until the ministry fell, privately urged the ministry to secure a truce and appoint commissioners to make terms. Throughout the war, in his role as a major support for the administration's American policy, Dundas was playing a larger part as a British legislator than /
Lesser known members of the Scottish delegation also contributed to the Parliamentary debates on America. Sir George Macartney, Frederick Stuart, and General Simon Fraser were unequivocally for "war-like measures", the latter in 1778 in debate on North's conciliatory proposals blaming the repeal of the Stamp Act for all the disputes that followed, declaring the Bostonians completely at fault for the tea destruction, and asserting that if the Americans refused the present offer, every exertion and risk must be undertaken "even to that of carrying on a perpetual war." Sir Adam Fergusson, sitting for Ayrshire, spoke moderately in October, 1775, noting that members could readily differ about particular points of colonial government, but when the question was no longer confined to taxation or any particular exercise of authority and extended to the "very being of sovereignty itself," then he was surprised at the differences of opinion. The colonies he continued, were now asserting complete independence from Britain. In view of the fluctuating conduct of American affairs since the Stamp Act no ministry since then could be altogether free of blame. But the opposition was also to /
to blame; for in their zealous support of America they seemed to forget the interest of the mother country and they were wrong to argue against the authority of the supreme legislature and to support measures tending to exempt the colonies from British dominion. Irrespective of who was at fault, however, Britain now had to decide whether to vigorously prosecute or to abandon America. He inclined toward the view that the loss of the colonies would not greatly hurt Britain, but who would be bold enough to advise such a course and who could answer for the effects of it? If no person would, nothing remained but to exert every nerve to reduce their rebellious subject to obedience. Only when they were reduced could indulgence be shown, for concessions made now would be considered as extorted by fear and not as a voluntary effect of goodwill. The final question was whether or not Britain could reduce the colonies and Fergusson thought this possible, although it was essential to act swiftly and with sufficient force to deprive the Americans of all ideas of resistance. Fergusson was thus less vehement on the American question than some of the Scottish members but was nevertheless a faithful supporter of government policy.
There were a few other Scottish members who were less consistent in support of the government, at least as the war dragged on, or even sided with the opposition. Sir Laurence Dundas, for example, voted against the government on Burke's proposals for economic reform and on Dunning's motion concerning the influence of the Crown. William Pulteney stated in 1780 that he had always thought the America war was unjust because he disagreed with taxation without representation, but his opposition was mild. John Johnstone vigorously attacked the bill for suspending the Habeas Corpus Act and on another occasion lamented the results of the violent and impolitic measures taken against America and the romantic dreams of American conquest and unconditional legislative supremacy; he desired the attention of Parliament turned to the dangers into which the country was led by the unexampled folly and obstinacy of a blind and infatuated set of men unfortunately entrusted with the administration of public affairs. Sir Gilbert Elliot, who succeeded his father for Roxburghshire in 1777, gave the government general support on the American question but gradually modified his views and was won over by Burke's speech on economic reform in 1780. It was not until 1782 that /
that he finally abandoned all hope for a favourable end to the war and at the same time ended all his support for the administration. In June of 1781 Charles Dundas expressed the view that success in the war was no longer possible and that peace, upon almost any terms, had become infinitely preferable to a ruinous and unsuccessful war.

William Adam, who on occasion warmly proclaimed his independence, supported a vigorous American policy, although by 1778 his faith in the ministry was shaken and he criticized them for their ineffectual conduct of the war.

The outstanding liberal exception among Scottish members was George Dempster. In Parliament his record was thoroughly consistent on colonial policy and on liberal questions in general. He wrote his friend Sir Adam Ferguson in 1775 that the American question was one of the few in politics on which he knew the sentiments of good men were diametrically opposite, and continued, "from the first proposing of the Stamp Act mine has been neat and decided; I spoke a few words against it and divided with 39 members." Speaking in the debate on the Boston Port Bill in 1774 he said he knew of no Act to which he more willingly gave his hearty consent than to the repeal of the/
the Stamp Act, that the attempt to tax the Americans was the source of all the consequent disorders, and that the Port Bill gave the King too much power over the Port of Boston. 16 He pled for leniency; opposed bringing Americans to England for trial as a direct breach of the constitution and a deprivation of the right of every British subject in America; opposed the limitations proposed on courts and town meetings, and even defended Franklin, "the ornament of human nature," terming him highly praiseworthy for the very acts for which he was castigated. 17 Several times he referred to deep study and reflection on the American question and the result was an opinion he expected to hold all his life; "that in my conscience I think the claim of the Americans is just and well-founded, to be left in the free exercise of the right of taxing themselves in their several provincial assemblies, in the same manner that Ireland now does ..." 18

When conciliatory proposals were in prospect in 1778, Dempster was on the continent, and he sent his views to Fergusson. He thought the proposals were due to two reasons: the fear of a French and American alliance, and a realization that the conquest of America would be far more costly.
costly than was expected. He thought the administration sincerely desired a reconciliation but was now handicapped by the fact that the Americans would settle for nothing less than independence; this Lord North could not grant, at least openly. The suggestion that the war be transferred to the sea and continued was laughable. "As if a people, who have braved death in every shape, who have seen their towns burnt, their fields laid waste, and their women and children a prey to a lawless soldiery, would be affected by the capture of a few ships and a temporary interruption of their commerce." It would be necessary for Lord North to invest his commissioners with unlimited powers, expressed in general terms, enabling them to consent to American independence, and this action would eventually be approved. "The limb is gangrened and amputation is better than death." 19

Dempster also associated himself with the demands for reform raised by the opposition. When Burke gave notice of his plan for economical reform in December 1779, Dempster joined the discussion with a sharp attack on the influence of the Crown, and when Pitt moved for Parliamentary reform in May 1782, Dempster described the particular need for electoral /
electoral reform in Scotland. His interest in electoral reform was of long standing. In 1762 he had written Alexander Carlyle that when the newly founded Poker Club got its militia, they should agitate for Parliamentary reform "so as to let the industrious farmer and manufacturer share at least in a privilege now engrossed by the great lord, the drunken laird, and the drunkener baillie." Perhaps the real reason for his interest in a more liberal electoral system was related to his interest in agriculture. In a letter written in 1771 he described a rich cultivation viewed from a Sussex hill, and admired the English farming techniques and soil. "What profitable crops!" he wrote, "Yet the land lots from 10 to 20/ per acre. And of course there are farmers upon the island worth 40, 50, 260,000. The forbearance of the landlords is the source of all the riches in England and for my life I cannot trace that forbearance up to any other cause but their popular county elections. Give but the landowner of £5 per annum a vote in the member with us, and give us two members to each county, and Lochabber is a vineyard. So much for hobby horses: this is mine."
Among the most prominent of the literary figures the American war was viewed with some of the originality characteristic of their activity in non political spheres. Hume, Lord Kames, and Adam Smith (all numbered among the friends of Franklin) expressed views differing from each other as much as from the government. Hume was scornful of the war. The few passages left by Kames show an early sympathy with the colonists, but deny constitutional aspects of their case. Adam Smith, after careful analysis, arrived at a solution of the American problem which he realized required more statesmanship than could be found on either side of the Atlantic. Adam Ferguson and William Robertson seem to have submitted to government views at the expense of earlier sympathies. The American war was one of two political questions on which Boswell differed from Dr. Johnson.

Hume's antipathy to the government and its American policy has been the subject of comment, although the rarity of opposition in Scotland to the war and the consequent tribute to his individualism may have been exaggerated. As early as 1768 he wrote, "these are fine doings in America. Oh! how I long to see America and the East Indies revolted totally /
totally and finally, the Revenue reduc'd... public credit fully discredited by bankruptcy, the third of London in Ruins, and the rascally Mob subdu'd... His wish to see the "total revolt of America" was repeated, but in association with his fulminations against London finance and with his desire to see "the Restoration of the Government to the King, Nobility, and Gentry of this Realm." The first intimation of his view that the colonies could not be held in subjection by Britain appears in 1771 when he wrote that the only hope of a prospering economy, in face of the sorry state of public affairs and the ruinous debt, depended "on our Union with America, which, in the Nature of things, cannot long subsist." This opinion he repeated frequently as the crisis became more acute.

In 1774 Hume wrote of a conversation on American affairs at Lord Bathurst's at which former instances of authority exercised over the colonies were cited. He observed that "Nations, as well as Individuals, had their different Ages, which challeng'd a different Treatment." A boy might properly and with benefit be given a whipping, but he is not similarly dealt with after he is grown, and...
"the Colonies are no longer in their Infancy." Hume did not consider the colonies fully grown at this time, but rather as in their "nonage", and he viewed Dr. Franklin's efforts to emancipate them from the mother country as premature. In the autumn of 1775 Hume sent to William Strahan a concise statement of his reasons for opposition to a policy of coercion. He noted with approval a reported proposal that the fleet and army be withdrawn from America and the colonists left entirely to themselves. Such a measure now, he wrote, was sound in that

this Measure only anticipated the necessary Course of Events a few Years; that a forced and every day more precarious Monopoly of about 6 or 700,000 Pounds a year of Manufactures, was not worth contending for; that we should preserve the greater part of the Trade even if the Ports of America were open to all Nations; that it was very likely, in our method of proceeding, that we should be disappointed in our Scheme of conquering the Colonies; and that we ought to think beforehand how we were to govern them, after they were conquer'd. Arbitrary Power can extend its oppressive Arm to the Antipodes; but a limited Government can never long be upheld at a distance, even where no Disgusts have interven'd; Much less, where such violent Animosities have taken place. We must, therefore, annul all the Charters; abolish every democratical Power in every Colony; repeal the Habeas Corpus Act with regard to them; invest every Governor with full discretionary or arbitrary Powers; confiscate the Estates of all the chief Planters; and hang three fourths of their clergy. To execute such Acts of destructive Violence twenty thousand Men will not be sufficient; nor thirty thousand to maintain them, in so wide and disjointed a Territory. And /
And who are to pay so great an Army? The Colonists cannot at any time, much less after reducing them to such a State of Desolation: We ought not, and indeed cannot, in the over-loaded or rather over-whelmed and totally ruined State of our Finances. Let us, therefore, lay aside all Anger; shake hands, and part Friends.27

Concerning the war itself Hume was pessimistic without reservation until his death in 1776, and he made frequent sarcastic comments on the conduct of the war.28 The only chance he saw for a British military victory over the colonies lay in the possibility that intercolonial quarrels would separate them and end their unified effort, a development he considered probable, but even then, he queried, what is to be done with them after they have been crushed?29 It was in accord with his views on the policy of coercion that he replied to a request in 1775 that he draft a loyal address on public affairs for the county of Renfrew. "I am an American in my principles," he wrote, "and wish we would let them alone to govern or misgovern themselves as they think proper." Government should concern itself first with unsettled problems at home before trying to exercise authority at 3,000 miles distance, with the "insolent rascals in London and Middlesex who daily insult him", and with the incompetence of Lord North, and the selection /
selection of a proper leader to replace "such a lukewarm coward as Gage." "These are Objects worthy of the respectable County of Renfrew, not mauling the poor infatuated Americans in the other Hemisphere." 30

Hume's opposition to the war was partly his Tory opposition to the government of Lord North and was possibly in part due to his view that the economic consequences to Britain of the loss of the colonies were commonly exaggerated. "My notion is that this matter is not so important as is commonly imagined," he wrote to Smith, and he thought the damages would be chiefly to the reputation of the government rather than to British manufactures or navigation. 31 He was also opposed, however, from a firm conviction that even if the British army and navy could win the war, which he doubted, the problem of continuing the subjugation of America was insoluble.

The much respected Lord Kames had an early sympathy with the colonies, though he opposed their arguments on taxation and representation. During the height of the Stamp Act controversy (and again in 1767) he wrote to Franklin on the subject of colonial representation in the British Parliament and apparently viewed a federal union as /
as the answer to inevitable conflict between the colonists and the mother country. However, when worsening relationships stimulated Kames to contribute to the discussion on American affairs, his analysis of an aspect of constitutional relationships between the colonies and Britain showed no sympathy for the colonial claim of no taxation without representation. A letter from Josiah Tucker to Kames in 1782 suggests that Kames had advanced a mode of reconciliation to the idea of colonial independence, for Tucker's letter was chiefly concerned to refute the contention that the colonies were once in the situation of infants but had since grown to maturity and were to be left to judge and act for themselves, that since they chose to submit no longer to British restrictions and burdens they neither expected nor had title to the benefits and protection Britain could bestow.

Adam Smith followed the American war closely. His association with the Glasgow merchants during his professorship there from 1751 to 1764, his close friendship with Franklin, his extensive consideration of colonial trade in the Wealth of Nations, made his interest in the American crisis inevitable. Smith's views on the colonies and /
and towards the war have been examined frequently, but they are of interest here in that his analysis of economic relations led him to an interest in a federal solution which was potentially of wide interest in Scotland in the light of Scottish experience with the Union.

Smith saw three basic disadvantages in the monopolistic colonial trade. The high profits derived from it drew capital from other branches of trade and by lessening the competitive capacity of British exports resulted in a decline in foreign trade. Thus, instead of adding to trade, the colonial monopoly merely shifted its direction. Secondly, the concentration of British trade in "one great channel" made it excessively vulnerable. Interruption of it was a disastrous prospect, as evidenced by the popularity of the repeal of the Stamp Act. Thirdly, the system of monopoly was not easily capable of reform. He added the further negative factor that the monopoly was chiefly in the interest of the merchants and the civil and military expenses involved in maintaining the colonial dependency were laid out primarily for the merchant class. For remedy Smith proposed a gradual relaxation of the monopoly resulting ultimately in colonial free trade; a renunciation of /
of sovereignty over the colonies; or, a new imperial arrangement in which the colonies assumed burdens of defence and civil administration.

Separation from the colonies with a type of free trade secured through a commercial treaty seems to have been the most satisfactory solution in Smith's view, and indeed might have relieved Britain of expenses while continuing trade relations on a basis more healthful for the British economy as a whole. But he did not expect Britain or any nation to voluntarily relinquish dominion, and his plan for imperial reform was devised as a substitute proposal. If an imperial arrangement continued, the difficult problem of civil and defence costs would also continue, and it was unlikely the colonies would ever contribute adequately through a system of requisitions. In consequence Smith proposed colonial representation in Parliament in proportion to taxation. The solution, then, was a federal one, but the "Imperial Parliament" he envisioned was not an end in itself; it was a means for procuring the revenue necessary to maintain the imperial connection.35

Having arrived at the necessity of a federal solution to the colonial problem, Smith made reference in support of /
of his view to the advantages of a union as exemplified
in Scottish experience. In this a response from his
countrymen might have been expected, for by 1776 the ben-
efits of the Union were almost everywhere in Scotland con-
ceded and were frequently acclaimed, while his advocacy
of free trade seems to have been exercised with consider-
able success in Glasgow before the war. The example of
the Union of 1707 did in fact enter some of the letters to
the newspapers in which the American problem was debated.
It was the subject of correspondence between Lord Kames
and Benjamin Franklin in 1765 and 1767, and Franklin made
a special point of Scottish and American relations with
England in a pseudonymous letter printed in the Caledonian
Mercury in 1769. In 1782 a committee was formed in Edin-
burgh to promote a federal union. However, the technical
difficulties in a system of colonial membership in Par-
liament as presented in English discussions on federal
proposals were also noted in Scotland, and Scottish in-
terest in a federal solution probably did not go beyond a
general receptivity occasioned by Scottish experience but
limited to those who were convinced the war would not pro-
vide a solution.

Principal /
Principal Robertson was unequivocal in his sympathies with the colonies at the time of the Stamp Act and equally unequivocal in his support of government policy in 1775. "I rejoice," he wrote on the earlier occasion, "from my love of the human species, that a million of men in America have some chance of running the same great career which other free people have held before them ..." In 1775, though critical of policies which had resulted in the union of the colonies, he thought it fortunate that American violence had "brought matters to a crisis too soon for themselves." The distinction colonists argued between taxation and regulation was mere folly and a pretense. Their real purpose was independence, which indeed one day they must attain but which must be prevented now. He expressed regret, "as a lover of mankind," that a prosperous growing state should be checked, but, "as a subject of Great Britain", he desired the colonies dependent and thought immediate action was essential to secure British control. "I will venture to foretell, that if our leaders do not at once exert the power of the British empire in its full force, the struggle will be long, dubious, and disgraceful. We are past the hour of lenitives and half exertions/
exertions. If the contest be protracted, the smallest interruption of the tranquility that now reigns in Europe, or even the appearance of it may be fatal." 40

Adam Ferguson was probably never inclined actually to sympathize with the Americans, although he was much in doubt as to the wisdom of the policy of coercion entered upon by the government. In 1775 he wrote of the Stamp Act as an "unlucky affair" which brought on a dispute possibly insoluble and in which Britain made a shabby figure. If British soldiers bullied the Americans, the British tradesmen suffered; and the question had become so complicated Ferguson could only wish it had never been started or that a return could be made to the position in which Britain possessed all the monopolies, "of Arms of Government and of Trade," and left to the Americans the right of taxing themselves. 41 But he feared Britain would "never have genius enough to turn the great resources which are presented to us in the East or the west to Account." 42

In 1776 after fighting had begun he still doubted ministerial policy, writing, "the only Question with me was what this Country in wisdom ought to do in the Situation at which the Colonys were arrived," although he also declared that /
that he never doubted the claims made for British rights against the claims of America. He contributed to the replies to Dr. Price with a moderately phrased pamphlet printed in London (1776), and the favourable attention he received for it was one of the factors which occasioned his appointment as secretary to the peace commission which traveled to the colonies in 1778. Prior to this appointment his lack of enthusiasm for a vigorous assertion of British rights had turned to deep pessimism regarding the outcome of the war. He not only thought no calamity could make the colonies submit, but, like Hume earlier, feared the problems of maintaining control in the event of victory were insurmountable.

On his return from America Ferguson was more grimly determined about the war and had also abandoned a liberality of outlook which had been present in his earlier writings. Of the war early in 1779 he wrote,

I am in great hopes nothing will be lost not even the Continent of North America. We have 1200 Miles of Territory in Length occupied by about 3,000,000 People of which about 1,500,000 with Johny Wetherspoons at their head against us and the rest for us. I am not sure that if proper measures were taken but we should reduce Johnny Wetherspoons to the small support of Franklin Adams & two or three more of the most abandoned Villains in the world but I tremble at the thoughts /
thoughts of their Cunning & determination opposed to us ...48

Unless those Americans friendly to Britain were supported, however, protected, secured from ruin, and their efforts joined to those of the British, the cause was lost.49 Sobered by the American experience while at the same time allied with government, he was extremely cautious about the pressing Irish demands. In October 1779 he noted much alarm in Edinburgh, and in which he shared, about Ireland and hoped that the government had taken warning and made arrangements so that it would not be driven "into concessions for which we shall receive no thanks & which in reality will lead to other Demands with which we cannot comply & end in a Flame which we cannot extinguish. The utmost precaution should be taken to prevent a Flame in that Countrey for if it once break out many years will not extinguish it nor relieve this Countrey of the Internal troubles that have already so Effectually served the Pur- pose of our forreign Enemies." He thought ultimately the best solution was a "compleat Union" with Ireland, which might be obtained over a period of years if opportunities were watched for and improved upon.50

In /
In 1780 Ferguson expressed confidence that even with the Dutch entrance into the war Britain should stand firm and was in a position to make great "and I hope successfull Efforts." More alarming than an additional opponent was "this Cloud that is gathering in Yorkshire." "That County seems to be forming itself into a Republic, with meetings continued by Adjournment, different departments & an Executive Council. It should in appearance be taken very Lightly by Government: but is in reality or may be a very serious matter." Country gentlemen who experience importance at public assemblies and receive the infection of party enthusiasm may go beyond all considerations of reason or public order. Since most country gentlemen are no doubt on the side of government and monarchy, the plan should be "not to Fly in the Face of Yorkshire: but by a moderate Address to Parliament express their Zeal to support the state in this Arduous situation of the Nation recommending at once Oeconomy & the necessary supplies. But the best way perhaps of Silencing all murmurs & discontent at Home is by vigorous & successfull Efforts in the War to fill the Gazette etc. ..."51

Ferguson's war time letters cease in 1780, perhaps due to /
to a severe illness he suffered that year and which re-
quired a lengthy convalescence. 52

Boswell seems to have been little interested in early
stages of the dispute with America, but in 1775 began to
give the question serious thought. He wrote Dr. Johnson
of his reservations concerning government severity towards
the colonists, especially in view of contractual political
relations which present policy might abrogate. To his
friend Temple he confessed in March 1775 his lack of
opinion on the American question, attributing his uncertain-
ty partly to lack of careful study and indolence and partly
to the smattering of information in the newspapers which
had caused him to change his mind several times. He was
uncertain that the colonists were "completely our sub-
jects" and was puzzled over the status of the Charters,
but he was certain the measures of the administration were
"ill-digested and violent." 53

Still in March, Boswell's growing conviction that
administration policy was wrong was evident as he avoided
discussing with Johnson the latter's pamphlet Taxation no
Tyranny because he "had now formed a clear and settled
opinion that the people of America were well warranted to
resist /
resist a claim that their fellow-subjects in the mother-
country should have the entire command of their fortunes, 
by taxing them without their consent." This comment, 
dated March 21, 1775, only three days after the uncertain 
letter to Temple of March 18, suggests a sudden conversion, 
but the latter comment may have been a retrospective ob-
servation which should not be so specifically dated. Bos-
well records a discussion in April 1775 which contributed 
to the formation of his opinion on the war. Sir John 
Pringle, bart., a Captain Campbell of the navy, and others 
were enjoying coffee while Pringle elaborated on the meas-
ures taken against the Americans. He argued that the 
colonists were condemned without being heard; that they 
had behaved so well in the last war that Parliament voted 
them money; that their Assemblies merely corresponded to 
the Irish Parliament; that they could be depended on never 
to refuse supplies and would never throw off Britain un-
less forced to by "severe usage"; that if strong measures 
were persisted in, the colonies might unite against Britain. 
Boswell concluded his note of the conversation with the 
remark, "he made a strong impression on my mind." By 
the end of the summer of 1775 Boswell was fairly well 
convinced /
convinced of the American case, and in August wrote to his friend Temple, also sympathetic toward the colonists, "I am growing more and more an American. I see the unreasonableness of taxing them without the consent of their Assemblies: I think our Ministry are mad in undertaking this desperate war." 56

Once his view on the American question was determined, Boswell adhered to it steadfastly. He read with regret of British victories over the colonists, 57 and was indignant at the ministers who prayed for the success of the King's arms. To Dr. Blair he wrote a letter expostulating on his praying against the Americans, and received "a very pretty answer" expressing different opinions but which "justly flattered" him. 58 He paid no regard to the fast day appointed for December 12, 1776, and at tea with friends maintained it was shocking for a nation to pray for success in destroying another nation. His friend Maclaurin agreed with him. 59 In 1778 when measures for conciliation were brought in, Boswell noted with pleasure that now the clergy who were for violent measures could no longer pray violently against the Americans, and he attended Dr. Blair's sermon with relish after an absence from his ministry /
ministry of more than a year.  

When an attempt at conciliation was made in 1778, Boswell made an effort to obtain an appointment with the commission. He wrote to Burke of his pleasure at the ministry's decision to seek a settlement and remarked on his profession of friendship for the fellow-subjects in America in so far as they claimed exemption from taxes levied by representatives of the King's British subjects. He differed with Burke in that he denied the declaratory act, but he was "a warm Tory, in its true constitutional sense." He concluded, "I wish I were a commissioner or one of the secretaries of the commission, for the grand treaty. I am to be in London this spring, and if his majesty should ask me what I would choose, my answer will be, to assist at the compact between Britain and America." His hopes were not fulfilled, for the appointment of secretary to the commission was given to Professor Adam Ferguson, whose sympathies had been more consistently with the government's American policy.

To the end of the war Boswell refused to "join in imploring Heaven's blessing on the arms of the present administration," and the news of Yorktown gave him such joy /
joy he had to restrain himself in order not to give
offence; he felt himself so "inspirited" "that though for
sometime I have been quite lazy in the morning, relaxed
and unable to rise, I this day sprung up."63

*    *    *

The prospect of difficulties for the Glasgow mer-
chants and manufacturers engaged in the American trade
makes their attitude toward the war one of special in-
terest. Materials concerning the merchants are not
plentiful, but the manner in which the Glasgow trade was
affected by the conflict has been described and a summary
view of their reaction to the war is possible.

Many letters to the newspapers were occasioned by
the dispute with America, but it is difficult to identify
any of those printed in the periods of the Stamp Act and
Townshend Act crises as of Scottish origin and therefore
as indicative of specifically Scottish opinion. Some may
have been written with the Scots particularly in mind. A
writer /
A writer who signed himself "William Pym" argued for colonial representation in Parliament and referred to the Scottish experience with the Union for support, but letters under the same signature appeared in the London Chronicle. The most able letters printed in Scottish newspapers on the Stamp Act crisis were two signed "Rationalis", but they also appeared, at least in part, in the London Chronicle over the same signature. During the Townshend Act crisis a vigorous letter against Parliamentary taxation of the colonies queried: "The late war could not have been carried on without America, not without Scotland. Have we treated America and Scotland in such a way as is likely in future wars to encourage their zeal for the common course ...?" The letter was signed "H.M.C.N.P.C.H.", one of the signatures used by Benjamin Franklin.

Prior to 1774, after which the number and variety of letters on American affairs greatly increased, commercial considerations were predominant in those printed. Some emphasized the danger to commerce in unwise legislation, while others dwelt on the propriety of the recent (Stamp Act) legislation but the impracticability of enforcement. A few ignored commercial interests and insisted on the need for /
for strong measures in view of colonial insubordination. On the whole, most of the letters printed in the Scottish press during the Stamp Act crisis favored yielding to the colonists on commercial grounds, and they may have reflected prevailing sentiment in Scotland. During the Townshend crisis very few letters were printed on American affairs. Whether this was due to the relative immunity of Scottish trade to the commercial restrictions of this period or to temperamental inclinations of the printers who selected pieces for publication it is impossible to say. The fact that few if any of the letters prior to 1774 seem to be of Scottish origin detracts from their interest in the present context. When letters began to appear again in 1774 in response to the renewal of conflict, commercial considerations were supplanted by political and constitutional arguments, and from that time letters can frequently be identified as local in origin. The attitude of the American traders in Scotland toward the course of events which led to war must be determined largely by what can be learned of their conduct.

The concurrence of the Glasgow merchants in the campaign for repeal of the Stamp Act has been noted. The united /
united front which the merchants presented in 1766 had been lost by 1770, in part due to the relative ineffectiveness of the non-importation agreements at that time but also because some merchants were alienated by the insertion of constitutional issues into the dispute by the Americans. The Coercive Acts of 1774 were an indication of the loss of British mercantile influence on the government colonial policy. In 1775 the London merchants again took the lead in a campaign for conciliatory measures, but the merchants were even less united than in 1770. Thirty five petitions were presented in 1775, but loyal petitions from several important trading towns served to counter the merchant protests, despite aspersions cast on the manner of collecting signatures for them. A number of factors helped to cushion the effects of the non-intercourse agreements, but the failure of the merchants to unite against coercion was also due to apprehension at the American trend toward free trade if not independence, a trend in conflict with mercantilist views of the proper economic relationship between colonies and the mother country. 67

A letter in the Caledonian Mercury in mid January 1775 signified an effort by Glasgow merchants to influence the /
the government toward leniency. The letter was addressed
"To the Merchants and Manufacturers of Glasgow, concerned
in the American Trade."

Gentlemen,

The present dispute betwixt the Ministry and our
Colonies, with its fatal consequences to the trade
and manufactures of Great Britain, hath at last roused
the English merchants trading to America. They have
come to a resolution of petitioning Parliament to put
an end to this most unnatural contest, by a repeal of
the unnecessary and oppressive acts passed last session,
which seem to have been dictated by a spirit of des-
potism, and ought to have been opposed at the time they
were brought in; but a torpid indifference appears
then to have taken place throughout the nation. However,
it is hoped by every friend to the commerce and manu-
factures of these kingdoms, that by the spirited app-
lication of the whole trading interest, this desirable
end will now be attained. The Ministry must see their
error, and affairs will be restored to their former
state. I dare venture to affirm, (whatever has been
alleged to the contrary) that America has many friends
among you, and that you will most heartily join in the
present application to Parliament, for the preservation
of our commerce and your own credit; for you must be
convinced, that if your American trade be interrupted
for a few months only, it must prove the ruin of your
trading city; an event that would involve all Scot-
land in its consequences. I am Gentlemen, your humble
servant,

MERCATOR 68

Meantime an Edinburgh report noted that "all the merchants,
traders, and others, concerned in the commerce of America,
have severally subscribed the sum of 10 guineas, for the
purpose /
purpose of defraying the expenses of meeting, petitioning, etc." Still in January, it was reported that the Glasgow traders had met and subscribed a petition to Parliament on American affairs. In addition they resolved to send two of their number to London "to inquire into the facts relative to the American dispute, and to consult what is proper for them to do at this important crisis." The petition was signed by "the most respectable merchants in Glasgow, in behalf of themselves and all the rest," and was transmitted to their member, Lord Frederick Campbell, to be presented to Parliament. The petition was described as in much the same terms as that of the London American merchants. It set forth the interrupted state of trade with the colonies, the fatal effects of this upon the manufactures, the extent of the property of the Glasgow merchants in America, and prayed relief. A letter from London reported its presentation to the House and noted that it was referred to the committee to which the London and Bristol petitions had earlier been referred. The petition itself was printed in the Edinburgh newspapers. In addition to general comments on the effects of the disruption of trade, it asserted that the petitioners had in /
in properties in America and in debts due them by the colonies the amount of "one million and upwards." The petitioners saw their relief in a "happy reconciliation between Great Britain and the colonies."  

After the battles of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill in April and June 1775 signalized the beginning of fighting, a large part of the country accepted the inevitability of a military solution and announced its loyalty to the King. In the autumn of 1775 and the following winter 77 loyal addresses were voted by public bodies in Scottish burghs and counties. The tobacco merchants, however, were still unconvinced and continued their opposition to the American policy. A Glasgow letter dated October 6 reported on differences in that city over an address.

The Magistrates and Town-council of this city having intended to send up an address to the King, the merchants assembled, when some of them were deputed to wait upon the provost, which they did, and remonstrated in very strong terms against such a proceeding. It is believed no address will now be sent up; but if there should, it is expected a petition will be signed by the merchants and manufacturers, begging that an end may be put to the present unnecessary, unnatural, and ruinous war.  

The opposition of the Glasgow merchants was apparently strong /
strong enough to prevent the city from joining the many Scottish burghs and counties in an expression of support for the King's American policy. The government supporters had to be content with a loyal address from the "deacon-convener, the deacons of the fourteen incorporated trades, and other members of the trades-house." Meantime an address was voted in Edinburgh only after a bitter struggle in the town council and some debate in the press. 75

Actually, as noted above, the predominance of commercial considerations had by 1775 been supplanted by political and constitutional arguments. As the conflict developed, the question of Parliamentary supremacy as expressed through taxing powers increasingly entered the letters, even though many who insisted on the assertion of Parliamentary authority did so on the ground that only by discipline could independence by prevented and the American market retained. In the many letters which began to appear in 1774 the arguments chiefly concerned taxation, property and liberty, obligations under the law, and natural rights, although the mercantile insistence on the political dependence of markets for commercial reasons may have been of primary importance in the final acceptance of war. 76
Violence and the destruction of property, the heavy burden of debt, and the increasing difficulty of collections weakened the merchants' partiality for the American case if not for the trade itself. When the colonists openly aimed at independence and their dependence became contingent on a military decision, there were few mercantilists who could argue for more concessions. The Glasgow merchants in preventing a loyal address from their city in the autumn of 1775 were among the last groups to give over their objections to the ministerial American policy. As the war developed in earnest, they accepted the situation, supported the government through addresses and subscriptions, and proceeded to make adjustments to the new economic factors.

The merchants suffered less as a group than had been anticipated, but they undoubtedly looked forward to the reopening of American ports. When dissatisfaction with the progress of the war began to find expression in the press in 1778, it is probable the merchants also were wearying of the conflict. The length of the war, and its spread, which threatened and reduced continental markets, made a settlement more desirable. In 1782 an abortive attempt /
attempt was made to end the war and prevent a complete loss of the colonies by the formation of a federal union with America. The advertisements published by the sponsoring committee in Scotland made it clear that the primary concern was trade. In a preliminary statement they noted their concern with the loss of blood and treasure and the usual calamities of war as well as "the declining state of the COMMERCE and MANUFACTURES of this country, in consequence of these unhappy disputes ..." They continued, "As a COMMERCIAL CONNECTION, therefore, between BRITAIN and AMERICA, is the great object that ought to interest the views of this country, the meeting were unanimously of opinion, that every step ought to be taken which can possibly promote a FEDERAL UNION WITH AMERICA." When changes in the ministry were made in 1782 as a first step in treating with the colonies, celebrations were held in many British manufacturing towns and business boomed. It was probably in anticipation of further steps toward a settlement that an advertisement was inserted in a Glasgow paper calling to a meeting all merchants of the Glasgow area "who were Traders to NORTH AMERICA previous to the year 1776." The subject of the meeting was described only as /
as "matters of great importance," but the announcement was signed by Alex. Speirs, John Glassford, James Ritchie, and James Dunlop, four of the leading pre-war tobacco traders. The merchants, traders, and manufacturers of Glasgow addressed the King on the peace in March 1783, and in July the Scots received the following encouraging report.

Advices are said to be received from Philadelphia, that resolutions have lately been entered into by Congress; to do away some illiberal prejudices respecting the Scottish nation, which have for some time passed been much diffused throughout the American continent; insomuch that it was thought no commercial communication would ensue between the merchants of America and those of Scotland. In consequence of the above, considerable quantities of tobacco are shortly expected in the western parts of Scotland, from Virginia and Maryland.

In August came news of the first ship to arrive at Greenock with tobacco from Virginia, "being the first from the United States."
CHAPTER VI

SOME VIEWS ON THE WAR


2. On January 9, 1770 the debate on the address in answer to the King's speech centered about petitions occasioned by the refusal to seat Wilkes and a proposal to inquire into discontent prevalent in every part of his Majesty's Dominions. In the debate the opposition linked misgovernment at home with misgovernment abroad. The opposition was defeated 254 to 138. The only Scottish member who voted with the opposition was George Dempster. Another opposition vote was recorded by Georgeramer who sat at the time for Cricklade, Wiltshire, but represented Anstruther Easter burghs from 1778 to 1780.

On January 25, 1770 a motion designed to reduce the decision by which Wilkes was denied a seat was defeated 224 to 180. Scottish members voting with the opposition minority were:

George Dempster (Perth burghs, 1761-68; 1769-90).
James Fife (Banffshire, 1768-1784; Elginshire, 1784-90).
John Hope (a merchant in London, represented Linlithgowshire, 1768 to 1770).
James Murray (Wigtownshire, 1762-68; Kirkcudbright Stewartry, 1768-74).
William Pulteney (Cromartyshire, 1768-1774; Shrewsbury, 1775-1805).
Alexander Wedderburn (Ayr burghs, 1761-1768; English constituencies from 1768. Wedderburn went into an opportunistic opposition shortly after Grenville's dismissal and defended the Americans, denounced Parliament's refusal to seat Wilkes, and supported Parliamentary reform. This role lasted until 1771.

Lathieson, /
Mathieson, *Awakening of Scotland, 62-64*).

George Damer

On February 22, 1775 Wilke's motion for "expunging the Resolution respecting his Expulsion was defeated 239 to 171. Scottish members in the minority were:

James Fife
Arthur Duff (Elginshire, 1774-1779)
John Johnstone (Kirkcaldy burghs, 1774-1780)
Alexander Wedderburn (sitting for Oakhampton, Devonshire)

(George Dempster would probably have voted with the minority but he was newly married and absent in Scotland for the winter)

On October 26, 1775 an amendment to the address of thanks favoring an end to the resort to force and new negotiations for peace with the colonies was defeated 278 to 108. Scots in the minority were:

George Dempster
John Johnstone
William Pulteney (sitting for Shrewsbury)

On April 16, 1777 a motion opposing the King's request for additional funds for the civil list was defeated 281 to 114. The only Scottish member in the minority was Dempster.

On April 6, 1780 Mr. Dunning's motion respecting the influence of the Crown and abuses in the public expenditure was carried against the government by 12 votes, 233 to 215. Scots voting for Dunning's motion were:

George Dempster
Sir Laurence Dundas (Edinburgh city, 1768-1780; Mar. to Oct. 1781)
John Johnstone
Sir Gilbert Elliot, 4th bart. (Roxburghshire, 1777-1784, and English constituencies)
Sir Thomas Dundas (Stirlingshire, 1768-1794)
Newspaper accounts add two more Scottish members to the list. They were:
Sir Henry Watkin Dashwood (Wigtown burghs, 1775-1780, and English constituencies)
James Fife

Cal. Mar., April 11, 1780.

On March 15, 1782 Sir John Hous's motion to withdraw the confidence of Parliament from the King's ministers was defeated 236 to 227. The six Scots voting with the minority were:

Alexander Garden (Aberdeenshire, 1768-1786)
James Fife
Charles Ross (Wick burghs, 1780-1784)
John Shaw Stewart (Renfrewshire, 1780-83; 1786-1796)
Sir Gilbert Elliot
Sir Thomas Dundas

The information on votes and on the constituencies represented, unless otherwise specified, is from the Parliamentary History, and Joseph Foster, Members of Parliament, Scotland (London, 1822).

4. Ibid., 387-388, 399.
5. Ibid., 775; XIX 531-532, 803; Cyril Matheson, The Life of Henry Dundas (London, 1933), 35-36, 41, 46, 47-49.
7. Macartney, Ayr burghs, 1774, until appointed governor of Grenada in 1776.
   Stuart, Ayr burghs, 1776-80, Buteashire, 1796-1802.
   Fraser, Inverness-shire, 1761-82. (In 1757 he had raised a regiment and served as its colonel in America).
Parl. Hist., XVIII 44, 175, 1175; XIX 765-786.
8. Ibid., XVIII, 740.
9. He was criticized in the press for voting against his constituents, /
constituents, but was also defended on the ground that the town council had no right to bind him and that his vote was directed to the necessary end of checking the lavish spending of government. He was also charged with voting out of pique at not being elevated to the peerage. Probably more important was the growing intensity of the struggle with the Henry Dundas faction for control of the Edinburgh elections. Cal. Mer., May 8, 10, 13, 20, 1780. Holden Furber, Henry Dundas, First Viscount of Melville, 163-197.


11. Ibid., XIX, 5-6, 70. Letters in the newspapers criticized him - as they did Laurence Dundas in 1780 - for voting against the wishes of his constituents and supporting those who uniformly opposed the government, right or wrong. Edin. Eve. Cour., Feb. 15, 28, 1777.


13. Richmond, Yorkshire, 1775-80, 1784-6; Orkney and Shetlandshire, 1781-84; Berkshire, 1794-1832. Parl. Hist., XXII, 470. He was a nephew to Sir Laurence Dundas.


18. /


20. Parl. Hist., XX, 1301; XXII, 1435.


27. Ibid., letter of Oct. 26, 1775 to William Strahan; also letter of Nov. 13, 1775 to Strahan.

28. Ibid., letters of April 8, May 10, 1776 to Strahan; June 15, 1776 to John Crawford.

29. Ibid., letters of Oct. 26, 1775 to Strahan; Feb. 8, 1776 to John Home.

30. Ibid., letter of Oct. 27, 1775 to Baron Mure of Caldwell.

31. Ibid., letters of Feb. 8, 1776 to Adam Smith; Nov. 13, 1775 to Strahan.

32. Alexander F. Tytler, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Hon. Henry Home Kames (Edin., 1807), II, 71-83. A reply from Franklin in 1767 which emphasized the necessity of a "consolidating union" was intercepted and never reached Kames, but Franklin sent on a copy of the letter two /
two years later.

... Those who maintained, wrote Kames, that Parliament could not legally tax the colonies since they were not represented in the Parliament were misled by the respectable authority of Locke. It was 'a rash proposition, totally subversive of government' to assert as Locke did that taxes could not be laid without the consent of the people. Kames noted that not a hundredth part of the taxable people in Britain were represented in Parliament and he rejected even the concept of virtual representation as a justification for the thesis of taxation by consent. However, he found the right of taxation in Locke's suggestion that those who shared in the protection afforded by government should contribute to its maintenance. Since the protection of government was an obvious necessity and could be provided only from a public fund, taxes were implied in the very nature of government. It was important to note that legal power to impose taxes without consent did not imply power to impose taxes at pleasure, for this would subject every man's property to the arbitrary will of the sovereign and would make Locke's argument invincible. The arbitrary power to levy taxes at pleasure did not exist where the sovereign's power was limited, and in all governments not despotic there was an effectual check in the general concert of all ranks to vindicate their liberty.


36.


39. In a document which can with very little doubt be attributed to Smith, and endorsed "Smith's Thoughts on the State of the Contest with America, Feby. 1778", a union with the colonies is repeatedly urged. The document is among the Rosslyn MSS in the U. L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The author listed four ways in which the war might end: complete submission of the colonies; complete emancipation; restoration - or near restoration - to the old system; submission of only a part of America. Any one of these conclusions is regarded as totally unsatisfactory, and in the discussions on three of the four possible "endings" the desirability of a union is urged as the best solution. A general impression is left that the government should endeavour in any case to consummate a union with the colonies. Accepting Smith as the author, it may be observed that his conviction of the necessity of a union had been much strengthened in the course of the war over what it was during the composition of the Wealth of Nations, although he noted with some regret that there was in Britain "no considerable party which favoured a constitutional union with American representation." G. H. Guttridge, "Adam Smith on the American Revolution: an Unpublished Memorial", American Historical Review, XXXVIII (1932-1933), 714-420.

40. The letters, written to William Strahan, are printed in part in Dugald Stewart, Works of William Robertson, D.D., to which is prefixed an Account of His Life and Writings (London, 1831), XVIII. To the second letter Robertson added, "It is lucky that my American History was not finished before this event. How many plausible theories that /
that I should have been entitled to form, are contradicted by what has now happened".
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61. Letters of James Boswell, collected and edited by C. B. Tinker, II, No. 182, to Edmund Burke, Edin., Mar. 8, 1778. Fifteen years later Boswell referred to the project in a letter to an apparent stranger, James Abercromby, in America. "By your name, Sir, you must be of Scottish extraction. May I presume to ask how long your family has been settled in America? I have a great wish to see that country; and I once flattered myself that I should be sent thither in a station of some importance". Ibid., No. 317, London, July 28, 1793.
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CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH AND THE WAR.

The sharpest division of opinion on the American War is found in the Scottish church where the internal differences of the Moderates and Evangelicals were extended into a conflict on government policy. The former gave steady support to the government on American affairs; the latter entertained more or less open sympathy for the Americans. The most prominent of the American sympathizers was Dr. John Erskine, the leader of the Evangelical party. Others who shared his sympathies in the General Assembly were the Reverend Mr. Nisbet, the Reverend Dr. Henry, the Reverend Mr. Muirhead of Urr, the Reverend Mr. Porteous of Glasgow, Mr. Andrew Crosbie, and Mr. Henry Erskine.

The Popular clergymen made little effort to hide their sympathy for the colonists and sometimes defended their views in letters to the newspapers. A number of charges, defences, and counter-charges were aired in these letters, and the exchanges, unimportant in themselves, give evidence of a persistent body of opposition among the /
the clergy to the ministerial American policy. William
Smellie and the Reverend Charles Nisbet published an ex-
change of letters in the summer of 1775 in which Smellie
associated the "wild party" with Wilkites as enemies to
government. Nisbet denied that the "Wilkite among the
clergy (I suppose you mean friends to liberty and the con-
stitution)" were only a few fanatics. "They are neither
a few, nor wholly of that party, who wish well to liberty
and the faith of charters." Smellie replied by quoting
from a speech in the General Assembly which condemned the
dangerous spirit of sectaries "at this moment fomenting
rebellion in our colonies "and ever tending to "anarchy
and confusion". He added " 'They are neither few,' you
say, 'nor wholly of that party, who wish well to liberty
and the faith of charters.' Does not this plainly in-
dicate that you and your friends are Wilkites and favourers
of the present rebellion in America?" There is evidence
of treasonable sentiment, he warned, in the current report
of private letters from one of your party intercepted by
the office of the Secretary of State and returned with a
rebuke and a caveat to beware of encouraging rebellious
principles. "If you persist in your opinions, it will be
prudent /
prudent in you to leave Montrose, and to transport yourself to America, where you may bellow in safety sedition and obstinancy into the ears of a deluded people."¹

In another controversy an American political sermon printed in the Caledonian Mercury² was attacked, and the author was libelled as a renegade Scottish minister who had settled in America and become second only to John Witherspoon in advocating what were termed the "Liberties of America".³ Another correspondent wrote to denounce the libel and challenged the denigrating clergymen to "first give a sermon, superior in eloquence to that discourse, by that eminent divine, which is present so universally read and admired."⁴ The Reverend John Erskine entered the controversy with a defence of Witherspoon. Erskine had first to deny a report in the Edinburgh Magazine and Review that a letter from him to Witherspoon and encouraging rebellious principles was intercepted and returned with a rebuke from the Secretary of State. When the Edinburgh Magazine replied by citing Dr. John Erskine, Reverend Mr. Husbet, and Reverend Dr. Henry as leaders of a minority opposition and American party,⁵ Erskine denied the correspondence again, described his efforts, "on both sides of the /
the Atlantic" to prevent rather than excite recourse to arms and defended Witherspoon and the colonial clergymen.

The fact however is, that the Presbyterian Clergy in these Provinces; have been no way instrumental in inflaming the minds of the people, or urging them to acts of violence; and have neither preached nor printed on political subjects; And in Dr. Witherspoon's letters to me, and to his other correspondents in Scotland, he expresses himself with great temper and moderation on the present melancholy state of affairs, and gives instances of his having done all in his power to allay rising animosities and disorders ...

JOHN ERSKINE

In the final passage in this series of exchanges the first participant conceded that correspondence from Witherspoon had been moderately phrased, but insisted that as a member of the Congress he had concurred in votes as violent and inflammatory as any from that side of the Atlantic. He also defended his initial statements concerning the renegade minister whose sermon had appeared in the Caledonian Mercury, and attributed rebel sentiments to the defenders of the sermon.

Incidental comment in reviews of current publications testified to the aggravating and persistent element of American sympathy in the church. In 1776 Erskine re-published his sermon Shall I go to war with my American brethren /
brethren? Reviewed in the *Edinburgh Magazine* in June, the discourse was vigorously condemned. The critic concluded by saying that the review, "gentle as it is," would have been withheld from the public out of regard for the virtue and piety of Dr. Erskine,

if it were not notorious, that, while many of the wild division of the Scottish clergy neglect altogether to offer prayers for our most gracious sovereign, there are others, of whom it is said, that they actually prostitute their pulpits by railings against government, and invoking the Almighty to crown with success the American arms.

In July the same magazine printed part of the pamphlet by Adam Ferguson which had been recently published in London. A long extract, severely critical of Dr. Price, was printed, and in a concluding paragraph the editor declared, "it is with the greater pleasure, that we place before our readers a long extract from this masterly performance, as the fanatics of Scotland have of late been acting as the friends of America, and disseminating sedition and wildness with open effrontery."

There is no direct evidence that the Evangelical ministers prayed publicly for the success of American arms, but they pointedly refrained from praying for the defeat of /
of the Americans and ignored fast days officially proclaimed in view of the American crisis. Reverend Charles Hisbet is reported to have taken a text from Daniel V, 5, 25 on a fast day, enlarging in his sermon on the destruction of the Babylonian empire and declaring that an empire founded in violence and stained with blood could never be secure. On another fast day the members of the Town Council of Montrose are reported to have left their seats in protest during his sermon.\textsuperscript{12} James Boswell, strongly opposed to the war, began to avoid hearing sermons by Dr. Hugh Blair in the autumn of 1776 because of the prayers against the Americans. Boswell found no offence in the services conducted by Reverend [Robert?] Walker, [at New Church?] and took care to avoid services whenever he learned that Mr. Walker was not to preach.\textsuperscript{13} When the general fast proclaimed by the King for December 13, 1776 came near, a correspondent observed a backwardness on the part of some of the Church of Scotland clergy in regard to the occasion, "some of them having just read his Majesty's proclamation on that subject; while others, of more delicate feelings, employed brotheren to officiate for them yesterday; by this means guarding against any danger of losing their kirks /
kirk on the one hand, or offending their consciences on the other." A correspondent who came to the defence admitted that there were administration measures which were disapproved by some of the clergy. They were, he said, "such of the clergy of the Church of Scotland as have not that convenient versatility of judgement (supposing conscience out of the question) as to approve of every measure of Administration, especially a sanguinary measure." 15

The considerable feeling for the Americans is indicated by the fact that in the General Assembly in 1776 an unseemly dispute on a loyal address was narrowly averted. It was customary for an Assembly committee to draft an address in reply to the King's letter, the address to be transmitted by the Lord High Commissioner to the government along with assurances of the loyalty of the ministers of the Church of Scotland. 16 In the autumn of 1775 and the following winter loyal addresses on the crisis in American affairs were voted from most of the burghs and counties of Scotland, but when Cathcart - the Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly - arrived in Edinburgh in May 1776, he found opinion on a loyal address from the General Assembly much divided. His description for the Secretary of State of /
of his efforts to secure unanimous adoption of an address is in sharp contrast to the brief and formal commendations of the Assembly usually submitted. Cathcart found that some members of the Assembly were very zealous for an address, while others wanted either no address at all or at least "no expression in the Address which imported anything contrary to the respective Ideas of Individuals." He was faced with the question of whether to secure a loyal address by a great majority or to avoid one altogether "for fear of Divisions and Protests, threatened by Many, and apprehended by all." The Commissioner arranged private discussions with the principal ministers opposed to the address, and after much "fair Reasoning" in which he assured them of the manifest clemency in his Majesty's measures toward the colonies, he received assurances of support "for any Address not Captious and the Work of Party, if previously communicated." Together with his friends (the Lord Advocate, the Solicitor General, Principal Robertson, and other Moderates) Cathcart formulated an address for the occasion — "No easy task" — and it was arranged that the Commissioner, on his first appearance in the Assembly, should make a speech aimed at uniting the audience /
audience as much as possible, immediately after which the address would be moved and seconded. The Commissioner and the Moderates were successful. Spurred by the uncertainty of the issue and by his eager desire to succeed, Cathcart spoke with what he thought the greatest animation he had ever experienced. Following his speech, the motion for an address was made and passed "by a very loud Agree without a Question." An address was thus voted unanimously, but the atmosphere was obviously tense, and the Assembly was fuller than Cathcart had ever seen it. Many in the audience were no doubt aware of a report circulated before the Assembly met that a considerable number of the clergy favoured an address asking the recall of the troops from America and an end to "so unnatural a war," and had, like Boswell, attended in order to hear the debate on American affairs, only to find that "nothing was done."

The division of opinion on the American war revealed itself in the Synod of Dumfries in 1778. The Caledonian Mercury printed part of a letter from a gentleman in Dumfries which described an attempt in the Provincial Synod to present an address to the King "against the present ruinous and unnatural war in America." The writer declared /
declared that "the measures of Administration, with respect to America, are not more satisfactory in Scotland than elsewhere," and enclosed a copy of the address in evidence. Three points in the address were characteristic of the arguments of the Popular party concerning the dispute with America. The conflict was given the customary description of "the present ruinous and unnatural war in America"; the limited authority of the Crown in terms of the Revolution of 1688 was affirmed; and the fear was expressed that the "sanguinary measures" of the Ministers would fail and the hatreds following in the wake of unsuccessful war would bring disgrace and vengeance upon the people. The address was forthright, and Providence was invoked to keep the King from "the delusions of the bad" and to fortify the King "against the destructive maxims of the unfortunate family supplanted by your illustrious ancestors". The moving spirit behind the address was attributed to the Reverend Mr. Muirhead, Minister of Urr, but the Synod was reported much divided upon the question and faced with a sharp and tedious debate. In consequence, Muirhead agreed to withdraw his motion for the address because the meeting was too thinly attended to debate a question /
question of such importance and "it did not become the friends of liberty to grasp at futile advantages." However, Muirhead insisted that he would bring the motion before the April meeting of the Synod and even before the General Assembly if necessary.21

The Synod of Dumfries considered itself compromised by the letter containing Muirhead's address and authorized a reply to protest its loyalty. The moderator explained that the motion for the address was made in the Committee for Overtures, but that the Committee refused to transmit it to the Synod. By a protest Muirhead brought the motion before a full meeting of the Synod and read the proposed address as part of his speech. As the address was then withdrawn, no further notice of it was taken.22

Muirhead himself finally contributed a letter in which he denied any imputations of disloyalty and attempted to moderate the impression of opposition to the government, but he did not disavow his position. He should not be charged with disloyalty, he wrote, even though it was only illness that prevented him from presenting the address at the April Synod. His action stemmed from the fact that he had "never been very clamorous about vile Americans - unnatural."
unnatural rebellion - unconditional submission, etc., etc. 23

The clearest public statement of the arguments pursued by the Evangelicals is found in the pamphlets written by John Erskine. His first pamphlet on the American conflict - 'Shall I go to war with my American Brethren?' - was published anonymously in London in 1769, and the relatively early apprehension of war indicated by this date as well as the close relationship with the Americans suggested in the title are probably due in part to the extensive correspondence Erskine carried on with Americans. He began to exchange letters with Americans before the middle of the century, and his correspondents, most of whom were ministers are reported to have numbered more than twenty. 24 Questions concerning the state of religion and learning in America were the principal topics of discussion. Books and new publications were much discussed and Erskine was instrumental in distributing many books to American colleges. In some instances the letters referred to the internal government of the colonies, contemporary politics, and the threat of French encroachment. Erskine's deep interest in the colonies before 1763 is obvious, and his interest /
interest in the conflict of interests after 1763 was to be expected. He renewed his American correspondence in 1783.25

In 1776 Erskine republished his pamphlet on the American crisis. In a preface he justified the new edition on grounds that dangers he warned of in 1769 were now greater and more apparent. The Quebec Act and other events gave additional evidence of encouragement to popery; France and Spain were discreetly waiting for the exhaustion of Britain in civil war before acting to satisfy their ambitions. He pleaded for concessions by Britain which would prevent a total loss of the colonies, and he defended his conduct in opposing sanguinary measures.

The first arguments Erskine developed against a coercive policy were humanitarian and general objections to war. He dwelt on the pain and suffering, the rape, murder, sorrow, the human and economic waste which accompanied war. He emphasized the uncertainty of the outcome of any war, that once it began no man could tell its direction or how it would end. These objections, important in regard to any war, are especially serious when the conflict is with countrymen, "connected with us by birth, alliance, or commercial interest, so that we cannot hurt them without injuring /
injuring ourselves."

Added to the ties of humanity and kinship there was much to be said for the colonial constitutional claims. The rights granted in the colonial charters had been accepted as valid by Parliaments and the courts in many decisions, and Hume had considered the charters a greater justification for the colonial view than any claims the British had for their revolution in 1688. Should the colonists submit slavishly to conditions which the British with feeble legal support would not accept? To expect the colonists to accept the taxing powers claimed for Parliament, trusting in the moderate use of that power, was unfair. Restrictions on its use could not be laid on future Parliaments, and it was no solace to argue that as a part of the empire their welfare was as secure as that of any other part. Members whose property was in Britain had interests opposed to those of the colonies and would naturally be tempted to ease their burdens at colonial expense. But even if colonial claims were ill founded, as so many Britons believed, an honest if excessive zeal against what they considered encroachments on their rights should be excused, for despotism has never been resisted
with entire prudence and without some violence in the
name of liberty.

The military problems of a war with the colonies
should not be underestimated, despite the greater wealth
and power of Britain which made victory probable. British
superiority in numbers was to be measured against colonial
endurance, and a British army which might win in a fair and
open field might be destroyed by harassment and enforced
exposure to the elements. A spirit of patriotism and
revenge could raise great deeds from a small number of
men. The capture of Louisberg by New Englanders in 1745
was a mark of their military prowess, and because of the
advantage given Britain at the time, that achievement alone
balanced New England's account with the mother country.
The circumstances of New England's founding, the flight
of Godfearing men to that land, the prudential care which
enabled them to remain and grow, the evident interventions
protecting them from conquest by the French, their con-
tinuing zeal in religion as evidenced in their efforts to
Christianize the Indians - all these indicate a community
approved of God and which Britain should hesitate to strike
down.

There /
There were other dangers to Britain. Tempting propositions of land and offices to British commanders might induce them to use their forces in defence of the colonists. The colonies might ally with Holland, Denmark, or other protestant powers on terms more favorable than Britain allowed. Or, if Britain prevailed by harsh measures, seeds of animosity might be sown which in a generation would ripen into full revolt. "Fire and sword are as prosperous arguments to teach men allegiance, as to instruct them in religion." Terms in the interest of the colonies might secure perpetual allegiance, whereas the alternative was a certain eventual renunciation.

If the colonies were conquered, subjection could be maintained only through a costly standing army which would drain money from Britain and enrich the Americans while there would be chronic colonial discontent, a steady decrease in imports from Britain, and advantage to our enemies in trading losses and subsequent weakening. The absence of armies in America would leave British coasts open to invasion by the designing Bourbons. The occupation army might be seduced and turned against Britain. A military government in any part of the empire was an undesirable precedent.
precedent, for it might spread to other colonies and even to the homeland. And if the Americans did submit, became tame, and lost their spirit of liberty, was that a benefit? Without the power of taxing themselves through their own representatives, and under a complete military government, they might accept a king who rose through the power of the army to govern and control them. An absolute monarch in America, with plentiful bribes to maintain his army and improve its status, might turn on Britain with all the resources of America and reduce this land to similar subservience, possibly aided by those in Britain who prefer an absolute to a limited monarchy. This prospect was not chimerical, since despair drives men into rash action.

"Such, therefore, who value their own freedom, had need to take care how they drive to extremity the free-born and brave spirited North Americans. Nothing under God can so much tend to prevent the establishment of despotism in the British empire, as every part of that empire considering it as at once their interest and duty, to guard against encroachments on the rights of every other part. A large political body is then only healthy and vigorous, when the whole body feels the distresses of every part, and is restless till they are relieved; ... Prudence, therefore, as well as justice, obliges the mother country to support the colonies in the enjoyment of their natural liberty and charter-privileges; seeing, if they are enslaved, the like fate must threaten her also."
The Americans should not be accused as a "froward, murmuring people," for before the Stamp Act there was nowhere a more enthusiastic support for the mother country. They accepted Parliamentary regulation of their trade and manufactures, the Crown assent to colonial laws, and determination by the Crown of cases appealed from their courts. They had questioned only the power of levying taxes for revenue for the support of government in America, and the author of the attempt to exercise this power in recent years was the "wretched confounder of all this harmony."

Erskine ended his list of arguments with two from religion. He condemned as the surest means of inflaming colonial minds the real or reported measures taken to establish an Anglican episcopate in the colonies. On this point his native antipathy to Episcopalian institutions was probably reinforced by the strong feeling on this issue of some of his American correspondents. He then gave reasons for apprehension at the growth of popery in Britain, citing evidence of toleration for Jesuits, popish seminaries, Roman publications, and intended mitigation of the penal laws. Added to this were reports that several frontier forts /
forts in North America had been dismantled, giving opportunity for Canadian papists to harass the colonial heretics. "Gentleness, not to say encouragement to Jesuits, and harshness to colonies, steadily attached to Protestant principles, and to the succession in the illustrious house of Hanover, has an ugly aspect."

In his concluding plea he reverted again to the Whig Revolution. Let us pity, he wrote, our "virtuous fellow-subjects, the worst crime that can be laid to whose charge is this, that they have mistaken, pushed a little too far, and defended in a manner, not the most respectful to their lawful superiors, principles to which we and they are indebted for our civil and religious liberties." 27

Except for Erskine's pamphlets and Thomas Somervilles's Candid Thoughts, the Scottish contribution to pamphlet literature on the war was chiefly in the form of fast day sermons. Many of the sermons were limited to an explanation of the calamity of war in terms of laxity in faith and morals; in some a growing toleration of popery was made the chief reason for a tribulation the nation now suffered; others found hope in the evidence of past instances of divine intervention in times of crisis. 28 But some /
some of the fast sermons were devoted to the political issues, and they replied to Erskine and the Evangelicals.

One of these, by George Campbell, Principal of Marischall College, argued at length against excessive republicanism in the British Isles and in the colonies. The author apologised for adding another publication on a subject which had occupied so many able writers and so engrossed public attention as to leave little new to add, but he hoped the doctrine he presented would be of service independently of the American disputes which had occasioned its production.

"There is a real danger arising from the loose and republican principles now so openly professed, and so assiduously disseminated, thro' the British isles; which, should they still make progress, as they seem to have done for some years past, might after the present controversy is settled and forgotten, involve this country in the most direful calamities. On the other hand ... this quarrel has excited some persons of great learning and penetration, fully capable of doing justice to the subject, to examine more narrowly than had been done before, into the origin, nature, and end of civil government. It may be expected as the consequence, that the wild schemes of our political visionaries, for there are visionaries in politics as well as in religion, will in due time be properly exposed, and at length abandoned by everybody."

In order to meet the spread of republicanism, he continued, it is necessary to understand the proper meaning of the right /
right to resist authority. This right is not a private one, and for Christians the duty is even to resign private claims for the good of others. Resistance is justified only when the cause is so important as to be more insupportable than civil war; when the cause is public, that is, the concern of the whole rather than the part; and when it is clearly understood to be so by the community. When in doubt, the only safe guide is the Christian precept of obedience to civil authority; therein is escape from the certain and immediate evil of civil war waged for the sake of an uncertain eventual good.

In the light of his view of the right of revolution, Campbell examined the American case and insisted that no situation existed which justified resistance to the British government. To prove his contention he examined in detail what he considered "the hinge of the controversy", the right claimed by the British Parliament to tax the colonists. He followed an earlier pamphlet in declaring the Parliamentary power in question was favored by established custom, by the colonial charters, and was clearly implied in the practice of the legislature in other matters. The only colonial argument of substance was the claim that they /
they could not be taxed without their consent, but Campbell insisted there was no important distinction between actual and virtual representation in Britain and therefore the colonists were not discriminated against. He drew on Rousseau to observe that no man in society was completely free or self-governed, that only the savage was perfectly free, and that complete freedom was incompatible with civil society as some liberty must always be sacrificed for protection. In this principle he found justification for Parliamentary taxation. There still remained a need for safeguards against tyranny, and he observed the best protection in the structure of the British constitution which secured against the tyranny of the great and the madness of the multitude. With injunctions to "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," to "meddle not with them that are given to charge," and to "Fear God, honour the King," he urged his hearers to refrain from the excesses of republicanism, to "act as free, yet not using our liberty for a cloak of maliciousness ... but as the servants of God," to refrain from the modern political hypocrisy called patriotism, and to pity the deluded Americans who were the tools of ambitious designing men and were living /
living under governments excessively republican and hence turbulent, licentious and unhappy, "than which no kind of tyranny is a greater enemy to rational and civil liberty."

The stimulus to constitutional considerations given by the American war is further illustrated in a fast day sermon delivered in February 1778 by Alexander Gerard, D.D., like Campbell a member of Aberdeen University. 31 Gerard took issue with the claim that an encroachment on the liberty of the colonists had occasioned the war, for, he insisted, the right to be taxed by Parliament only with consent was a specious claim to liberty. The claim rested on the principle that liberty consists in men being governed only by laws made by themselves or with their consent. This principle had been formulated by illustrious men and was now accepted as an axiom, but since contrary propositions could be deduced from it, it must be false. If the proposition was true, the best form of government might be inconsistent with liberty and the worst form consistent with liberty; a free government formed according to it could not exist beyond the generation which formed it; liberty existed only when every individual in a society had a share in the legislature and continued only so /
so long as all resolutions of the legislature were unanimous. The principle that every person should be governed only by his own consent was, therefore, inconsistent with any possible form of government. There must be restraints in society; and liberty, Gerard proclaimed, "consists only in the power of doing what we ought, and in not being constrained to do what we ought not." A government which secured this condition secured liberty, and the British legislature, primarily because it had the same interest as the body of the people (and only remotely because it was chosen by the people), gave its people the conditions of liberty. Finally, laws imposing taxes were no different from any other laws. Taxes were as necessary as government itself; they were a debt on property rather than a gift of the people, and to refuse them was to subvert government. Taxes were an encroachment upon liberty when they were excessive, unequally levied, or in danger of becoming such. None of these conditions obtained regarding the taxes levied on the colonists. The security against unequal taxes may have been somewhat less than in Britain, and a dutiful application for additional security would have been welcomed by every /
every liberal mind, but the colonial demand to be taxed only by their separate assemblies and not at all by the British Parliament was inconsistent with their being part of the empire. Upon a specious cry of liberty, then, the colonists had risen in rebellion and excited a civil war.

In summary, it may be noted that most of the pro-ministerial clergymen followed basically the same structure of argument. They were devoted to the Whig revolution and the protestant succession, and the right of revolution had therefore to be defended. But the American revolution had to be proved unjustifiable, as without legal basis, and as not meeting the conditions which made civil resistance a right and duty. The issue of taxation raised the question of government by consent, and both these issues had to be met. They refused to recognise tax laws as in any way different from or as raising any other questions than laws in general. The regulation of trade and the imposition of taxes were equally a part of government, and the guarantee against oppression in either case lay in the identity of interest of the legislature and the people. They disposed of the question of government by consent by refusing to concede a literal interpretation /
pretation of the terms. Identity of interest of the legislature and people rather than physical representation in the Parliament provided all subjects with sufficient security of property and person to make the doctrine of the right of revolution inapplicable in the American case. Having thereby defended the Whig revolution and the legal basis for the Protestant succession while denying the legality of the American rebellion, the clergymen were free to apply a variety of Scriptural injunctions concerning the duty of Christians to obey their rulers.32

The Evangelical clergymen, as exemplified in Erskine's pamphlet, also defended the Whig revolution, but found the taxes laid on unrepresented colonists an instance of government without consent; or, hesitant to appear radically American, they urged at least the plausibility of such an interpretation from the American point of view. They found the encroachment of Catholic power a threat both in Britain and the colonies, and joined the colonial ministers in protesting not only the concessions to Catholicism they saw in the Quebec Act but also the relic of popery in the Anglican hierarchy which they believed it was /
was intended to extend to the American continent. An understanding of the American fear of oppression, leniency on the question of taxation, clemency in regard to measures of resistance already taken would effect a reconciliation and avoid the disruption of the empire, portentous consequences for Britain, and unparalleled opportunities for the Catholic powers.

The suspicion with which the Popular party was viewed by government leaders is indicated in exchanges relating to the no popery riots in 1779 and 1780. A bill which freed Catholics of some disabilities in England was passed in 1778, and its extension to Scotland was anticipated when the General Assembly disapproved a proposal to guard against Catholic relief in Scotland. In the months following, a campaign against the bill was organized throughout Scotland and the response from the country was almost unanimous, a few of the Moderate leaders in the church and the leading government appointees in the country excepted. Addresses, declarations, or resolutions on the subject were passed by "seventy-nine ecclesiastical courts, two counties, forty-one burghs, twenty-four towns, eighty-four parishes, fifty-five corporations, and seventy-one private societies."
In February of 1779 riots broke out in Edinburgh and Glasgow, in the course of which some Catholic properties were destroyed or damaged and Protestants favoring repeal of the penal laws were threatened. In face of the popular pressure the government intimated their intention to abandon the bill, and when the General Assembly met in May, Principal Robertson bowed to the weight of anti-relief opinion and approved of a motion opposing extension of the relief bill to Scotland. The no popery agitation shifted its focus to the career of Lord George Gordon for the next two years.

In January 1779 James Adolphus Oughton reported to the Secretary of State that the pulpits, presbyteries, synods, burgess meetings and associations "all speak the same language" in their resolve "to oppose Catholic relief by all legal and constitutional means, Terms too often employed to cloak the worst of Purposes." Even the moderate clergy were forced to join in the alarm which was spread assiduously by "the enthusiastick Preachers, Non-jurors, and Republicans of all Denominations ..." It was necessary to put the fears of the people at rest as soon as possible "least ill-designing People should make an handle /
handle of the present Ferment to raise Disturbances."

A letter from the Lord Justice Clerk, Thomas Miller, expressed similar concern. He thought the act might have been extended to Scotland in 1773 without difficulty, but zealots had since then had time to arouse the people.

"This zeal first appeared in the Provincial Synod of Air and Glasgow in September last; from thence it extended itself to other provincial Synods, and descended to Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions: it then caught the inferior Burrows, and inferior Corporations, with rapid and irresistible force, till at length it reached the Capital itself, where, the least attempt to oppose the torrent would, only have served to expose the opponents to derision and insult. From the Burrows it has now reached the Countys, and although the Gentlemen from principles of Toleration, or deference to Parliament, may disapprove these measures, few or none will be found so hardy as to oppose in Country meetings, what is now adopted with rage by the whole body of the people."

The situation was aggravated by the tendency of the people of Scotland to go to extremes over issues of religion and by their ardent attachment to the principles of the Revolution and the Act of Settlement. They had proved their loyalty in two rebellions raised in favor of a popish pretender, and "in the present more dangerous Rebellion, raised in our American colonies, upon principles more calculated to seduce the minds of the Presbyterians of Scotland, than any other Rebellion," they had remained steadfastly loyal to the King /
King. It was therefore imperative to concede at present the relief law now pending for Scotland in order to retain the affection and confidence of the people. The Lord Advocate concurred in these views. Almost as soon as these injunctions were received and before action could be taken to meet the protest expressed in the flood of petitions against relief, the riots broke out in Edinburgh and spread to Glasgow. Assurance against relief in Scotland was dispatched from the Secretary of State and published in the Scottish press with the desired effect.

In the spirited debate which took place in the General Assembly in 1779, despite the fact that the relief proposal had been withdrawn, at least one speaker expressed the association felt by many between the anti-Popery enthusiasts of Scotland and the political enthusiasts in the colonies. The Reverend Colin Campbell, after inveighing against papists as tyrannical and a threat to liberty, declaimed:

Will any man who is not born with a halter about his neck, choose to be in the reverence of persons who would oppress him? Whatever different sentiments we have about the Americans, and their present behaviour towards government, we all agree in theory, that it is natural for every man to be independent if he can; and why should we run the risk of a dependence upon men /
men whose very principles incline them to persecute and destroy?"37

After relief for Catholics in Scotland was abandoned, the organization of the Eighty Five Societies in Glasgow in support of the Protestant Association and Lord George Gordon maintained a popular anti-Catholic fervor, with a Committee of Correspondence and numerous public declarations and resolutions in favor of the "Protestant interest." Officials were apprehensive of outbursts of fanaticism in which no-papery and republican sentiments might be joined. In October 1779 five companies of the west Fencible Regiment quartered in Edinburgh castle mutinied and, though quickly subdued, alarmed the commander of the forces, J. Adolphus Oughton. Concerned lest a mutinous infection should spread to other Highland regiments, he wrote

"I should think it highly adviseable to withdraw all the Fencible Regiments from this Country, replacing them with an equal Number of English; as I discover too many seeds of Discontent; especially among the lower People. Great Number of the dissenting Ministers, and several of the Established Clergy are avowedly Republicans and Americans; the Popery Bill gave these People an Handle to inflame the Minds of the Populace. Lord George Gordon, with a fellow called Ralph Bowie, received in the west with great Honours and Respect ..."38
When the Gordon riots occurred in London (June 1780), the Crown officials in Scotland were warned of the seditious spirit spreading from London to other parts of the country and were commanded to exercise great care to check the least appearance of any tendency to civil commotion, especially in the west of Scotland where Lord George Gordon had a measure of popularity. The reports returned to the Secretary of State were unanimous in their assurances of tranquility. The Solicitor General learned with dismay of illuminations ordered in Edinburgh on June 19 to celebrate General Clinton's success, but when the celebrations passed without undue disorder, he took satisfaction in the event as proof of the absence of any dangerous support for Gordon. Warnings from the Secretary of State continued, however, and as the date of Gordon's trial - February 5, 1781 - approached, the Secretary wrote of information "from various Quarters," that "a turbulent spirit, strongly tinctured with religious Enthusiasm, will soon show itself at Paisley," and urged steps be immediately taken to prevent any such occurrence. County sheriffs were alerted, with special instructions for investigations in Lanark and Renfrew, and precautions against what seemed a real danger of /
of riots were taken, but no plots were uncovered. Gordon's acquittal was celebrated with illuminations but no riots, and by the end of the year 1781 the officials were confident that Gordon's following had decreased so much he was no longer a danger in Scotland.

The general dissatisfaction which brought changes in the government was reflected in the church courts in 1782. In April the ministers and elders of the Synod of Galloway addressed the King on ending the war and on the plan of economy which had been recommended to Parliament. In the General Assembly a vigorous debate occurred over the desire of the dissenting group to include in the loyal address an approbation of the late changes in the Ministry. The leaders of this group, which reflected reform sentiment as well as dissatisfaction due to the military failures, were the same men who had opposed the government on American policy before the war and in the Assembly in 1776. Mr. Henry Erskine, the Reverend Mr. Porteous of Glasgow, Mr. Andrew Crosbie, and the Reverend Dr. John Erskine were prominent among them, while on the opposite side were the leading Moderates, including the successor to Robertson—the Reverend Professor Hill of St. Andrews—and the Reverend /
Reverend Professor Walker, Dr. Henry Grieve, and Dr. Lamont.

The address first proposed (and finally approved) complimented the King on recent victories and expressed hope for satisfactory consequences in view of the strength of British arms and the wisdom of British councils. Mr. Porteous proposed an additional clause which complimented the King on the changes in the Ministry and expressed hope that the "dark cloud" hanging over the kingdom would be dispelled, and peace speedily restored.

The Moderates argued against the clause that the initial address contained a full and sufficient declaration of loyalty, that the proposed addition implied an undeserved reflection on the late ministers, and that the General Assembly should not meddle in politics lest the church be split among political factions. Supporters of the additional clause referred to the frequent addresses in the past on public events, and particularly to those "for drawing the sword from the scabbard, and whetting it against our American brethren," and cited instances of addresses in regard to individuals such as military commanders. Their chief interest was the ministerial changes, which they declared a great event, "brought about not like common /
common changes, but at the desire of the people in parliament assembled." The new ministry was now busy with plans of reformation "restoring the constitution to its purity at the glorious Revolution." This work was more important than a dozen victories. Finally, "after having presented so many sanguinary addresses, it was necessary to show that the assembly had now adopted a milder and more gentle spirit." The vote was carried against any mention of the ministerial changes by eighty-six to forty-nine. The Popular party entered a dissent which summarized the arguments employed in the debate and insisted their address contained "a constitutional idea, fit to be conveyed by the General Assembly to government, that the voice of the people ought to be attended to in constitutional arrangements," and that "that voice is legally and constitutionally expressed by the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled."
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32. *For succinct paragraphs illustrating this approach to the American rebellion, see the sermon by James Ford, Minister in Lauder, The certain Danger of perverting divine Truth and disregarding the Judgments of Heaven* (Edin., 1778), 50-51.


34. *PRO, SP 54/47, J. A. Oughton to Suffolk, Jan. 1, 1779.*

35. *Ibid., T. Miller to Suffolk, Jan. 5, 1779.*

36. /
36. Ibid., letters between Oughton and Miller and the Secretary of State, Feb. 3, 4, 8, 17, 1779. During the controversy the newspapers were filled with items, resolutions, and letters which detail the course of events and indicate the extent of public interest and excitement in the question of Catholic relief.

37. John Erskine, *A Narrative of the debate in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland May 25, 1779*, occasioned by apprehensions of an intended repeal of the Penal Statutes against Papists (Edin., 1780). Prior to the Assembly meeting a pamphlet was published in Edinburgh which gave a conjectural account of the debates. Basing the account on the names of delegates listed in the press and on what was known of the sentiments of the delegates, the writer imagined some speeches which are of interest when compared with a narrative of the actual debates published by John Erskine in 1780. The Lord Advocate, for example, was imagined to speak as follows, in part:

"I would have the revered Mem__rs of the C__rt to observe, Sir, that there is some reason to think, that not the most favourable impressions are at present entertained of the Presb__n persuasion. A great and leading man in the Am__n Repub__c, Mr. _J____, had his education in that way; and he still rigidly adheres to his principles. In the greatest part of the American continent in arms, the Presb__ns have, almost without exception, espoused the republican and rebellious cause; . . Neither is it a secret anywhere, that many reverend fathers and brethren of this Ch__ch, as well as many of the dissen__rs in England, have, both in the pulpit and elsewhere, been more free in delivering their sentiments, in opposition to the meas__es of Gov____t, in the Management of the Am__n war, than was perhaps necessary or consistent with their proper character."

The reply, attributed to the Reverend Mr. Colin Campbell of Renfrew, suggests that his views on the war were well known, for in the actual debate as noted in the text, above, he did refer, though moderately, to differences of view on the American question.
"We have not a great work about the Presb________ns, an' the A_______, an' Dr. ______; and the Presb_______ns, supposed favourers o' the Americans' cause. I believe some of them favours it, an' some of them no', Sir, just like other folk. But I'm sure of one think, Moderator, an' that is, that it's no sae ill to favour the cause o' the America as the cause o' Popery. A body may favour the cause o' Amer____, an' yet be a very good friend an', well-wisher to government. But I defy him to be a friend to our government an' Popery at the same time. It's impossible, Sir, i' the nature of things, it's impossible, an' a contradiction, a plain contradiction in terms. But there's few Presb_______ns, true ones I mean, that's friends to Popery; therefore there's nothing to hinder them, notwithstanding some o' them ha'e a warm side to the an ______ns, to be very true subjects o' his Majesty's government.

"He finis great fault wi' some o' the brethren for being o'er free in expressing their sentiments about the an______n war. 'Aha's to be free in delivering their sentiments, Sir, if the min____s o' the K_k o' Sc______d are not? It cannot be expected o' placemen, an' postmen, an' expectants, an' siclike. They dare na' speak but as they are directed, Sir. But it's necessary that some body do it, else a' would gang heeless, o'or head. An' fair fa' the ministers o' the K_k o' Sc______d, Sir, for doing what they can to prevent this. But I fear there's but unco few o' them does it, Mo_____r i' these times". Scots Anticipation; or a Summary of a Debate; containing the Substance of some of the Principal Speeches that are to be delivered in the G_______ A______ of the C______ of S______d, relating to Popery (Edin., April, 1778, 86, 46-50.) The pamphlet is attributed tentatively by Halkett and Laing (Anonymous Literature ...) to John Witherspoon. The pamphlet is an imitation of one published in London Nov. 23, 1778, which anticipated Parliamentary speeches and was entitled Anticipation; containing the substance of his H______'s most gracious speech, on the opening of the approaching session; together with a full and authentic account of the debate which will take place in the A_______ of C______s, ... Scots Law., XL (Nov., 1778), 614; XLI (April, 1779), 214. The relatively short span between the two pamphlets and the detailed knowledge required of the members proposed /
proposed for the General Assembly and their sentiments would make the Scots Anticipation a remarkable, though not impossible, performance for Witherspoon, who had resided in America from 1768.
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CHAPTER VIII
THE LIFE OF CAVALLI

There was more difference of opinion on American affairs among the literati of Edinburgh than among the Scottish members of Parliament; the tobacco traders initially opposed a resort to force and, if eventually reconciled to the war, also welcomed its end; a sharp division on the war persisted in the church; but the most extensive evidence of the lack of a uniform support for the war is found in the press. This evidence is, for the most part, anonymous and in only a few instances has it been possible to identify the authors of letters or reviews. The evangelical party in the church may have been the source of some; the men of letters may also have contributed to the public controversy. Whatever its origin, limited early opposition developed strength during the war and prepared public opinion for changes by reducing or destroying public faith in the perfection of existing constitutional arrangements. At least some Hanoverian Whigs doubt were made to realize that the Whig revolution was
was not yet ended.

Somerville pointed to differences of opinion which arose about 1779 when lack of military success produced "a great change in the sentiments of the nation at large", and he observed that the discussion on the war "not only engaged the attention of public bodies of men, but became a principle object of conversation in every company, and often excited angry debates, which impaired the pleasures of social life, and weakened the confidence of friendship". Adam Ferguson at the end of the same year wrote that "in these times even old Women & Children can speak of nothing but politics". Boswell made note earlier of "strange conversation", at Donelson the Bookseller's where in 1775 and 1776 he drank tea and talked of American news. Of one instance in November 1776 he records that he "sat a good while in Donaldson's back shop, and heard much in favour of the Americans". These discussions, including those in which much was heard in favour of the Americans, were not confined to backshops or private circles. The newspapers claimed with some justification impartiality in the presentation of news and essays, and the result of the reflection in the press of differences on American affairs provided /
provided a debate which may be considered far more repre-
resentative of Scottish opinion than the record of the
Scottish members of Parliament. The record of the mem-
bers, in fact, as noted in reports of Parliamentary de-
bates, became only one part of the larger debate presented
in the Scottish press.

The early stages of the conflict between Britain and
America did not provoke much dispute. In the 1760's and
curly seventies interest was confined chiefly to mercantile
elements, so long as the threat of independence was far
off or unperceived. The questions of taxation and repre-
sentation were frequently discussed in letters and essays,
but perhaps localistically rather than indignantly or with
anger. When it became apparent that differences were so
serious as to make recourse to force likely and an American
separation from Britain a possibility, then the British
policy came under closer examination. There were letters,
theses, essays, and resolutions which expounded and supported the
government's case against the Americans and railed at the
false patriotism of the leaders of faction. Less numerous,
but significant in this period of political awakening, were
letters and essays favouring the Americans. These
contained /
contained observations on events and on government policy, disquisitions on liberty, and replies to specific letters by government supporters. The polemical literature of English origin also circulated in Scotland and often afforded an occasion for the expression of Scottish opinion through reviews and notices. In all this there is evident from the beginning of the war the existence of at least a nucleus of opposition to the ministerial American policy.

Most of the literature produced in Britain by the conflict with America was available in Scotland. Some of the literature circulated in pamphlet form, and some English pamphlets had Edinburgh or Glasgow editions. Reviews, essays, and extracts printed in the periodicals made most of it known, especially through the Scots Magazine and Huddiman's weekly Magazine or Edinburgh Amusement which were devoted largely to extracts from British publications. The latter carried long and full discussions on American topics to the extent that the editor sometimes apologized for an issue which seemed to be a magazine on American affairs. The more celebrated essays both for and against the government were also publicised in the regular press where they were advertised for sale, were sometimes commented /
commented upon in letters to the printer, and were occasionally printed in part or in full.

Of special interest for the attention it gave contemporary polemics is the Edinburgh Magazine and Review. This magazine was published between 1773 and 1776 and won an unusual reputation for articles and reviews of interest to readers with literary and scientific as well as political inclinations. Much of its fame was due to the excellent work of its editor, Gilbert Stuart, but Adam Smith, Smellic, probably Hume, and other leading Scotsmen were among its contributors. A prominent section of each issue was given to reviews of recent publications, and the well known British pamphlets on the American question by Johnson, Price, Priestley, and others were given local reviews which often involved, in this journal, more careful attention than they received in the newspapers and other magazines. Among the essays reprinted, for example, was one described in an editor's footnote as "a sensible and spirited paper ... ascribed to Dr. Priestley". The essay argued for the correctness of the American position on taxes, representation, and contribution to the revenue, insisted on the folly of closing the port of Boston, and ended /
ended with a quotation from Dr. Price regarding the national debt and the certainty of financial ruin for Britain in case of war with the colonies.⁵ Arguments of Josiah Tucker were printed which sought to show that no agreement was possible between Britain and the colonies because of the different premises which each side held and would refuse to give over. Tucker's conclusion was that the only possible course for Britain was to give up the colonies and declare herself "to be unconnected with, and independent of them . . ."⁶ Extracts from essays by Price in 1776 decried the war as contrary to the principles of the British constitution, as designed to destroy similar constitutions in America and to replace them by military force, and, consequently, as a gross violation of the constitution. Meanwhile the probability of success in the war was very remote.⁷ The government view was also represented in extracts and reviews.⁸ Selections from one of these, Johnson's The Patriot, which were printed in November 1774 brought in reply one of the more vigorous assertions of the rights and patriotism of the opposition and of the Americans. Johnson ridiculed as an absurdity the prospect of colonists - established and grown rich through the efforts and /
and indulgence of Britain - becoming independent, refusing to contribute to their own defence except at pleasure, and denying their inclusion along with millions of their fellow subjects in the general system of representation. In reply the absurdity was asserted of supposing that colonists surrendered their political independence by crossing the ocean, that they must yield themselves to every caprice of British power and their fortunes to British avarice, that they could be included in a system of representation without a single representative. Johnson's arguments were presented in a series of syllogisms. The reply continued the form of argument, but brought the argument ultimately to rest on the premises, so useful to the colonists, of natural rights. To Johnson's argument that acceptance of protection stipulates obedience and the Americans, having accepted British protection, may therefore be subjected to British government, it was replied that the obedience accepted must be limited for unlimited obedience is slavery, infamy, and debasement, a condition the Americans could not have accepted.

The only question, therefore, is, what degree of limitation ought to be observed in enforcing this obedience from the Americans? Such a degree, surely, as is consistent with the preservation of their natural rights.
rights and their political freedom. The Americans now demand no other limitation. They may admit the sovereignty of Britain; but they are entitled to demand an impartial and constitutional exertion of that sovereignty.

The magazines and journals, however, with some exception for the Edinburgh Magazine and Review, were a reflection primarily of views and argument originating in London, either in Parliament or in the London press. In the newspapers the Scottish response to local and national events and publications is most evident. As the news columns detailed events in the conflict with America, letters followed which condemned, approved, or advised, and Scotsmen who sided against the government were sufficiently numerous - or energetic - to provide a fairly continuous debate in the press. A survey of this debate, in particular of the evidence it gives of Scottish opposition and including reference to such local incidents as were related to the larger controversy, is at least suggestive of the general trend of Scottish opinion regarding the American war.

American news began to reoccupy the papers from the reopening of the conflict in 1774. When the Coercive Acts came under consideration in 1774, the increasing gravity of the /
the situation stimulated discussion of the issues, and when measures were taken to meet the Bostonian defiance with coercion, vigorous challenges to government policy in general as well as to specific measures appeared. There were, in consequence, between 1774 and the time when military forces were fully engaged, frequent out-spoken assertions against the ministerial American policy. The Boston Port Act, for example, was described as no less despotic than the Spanish "Inquest" because it would ruin industrious people for the transgressions of a silly mob.

The trading, busy merchant, the rich citizen . . . is blended with the rabble, punished with the guilty . . . America is alarmed, who wonders at that? . . . Will any people be driven to despair? who can endure to be starved? who will sit in that corner of the world . . . ? No person of spirit, or resolution, would sit tamely under such circumstances; and if he could not conquer, he would die; that is the worst which can befall them.10

A persistent correspondent under the signature 'Philaretes' asserted that whatever the legal correctness of either side in the debate on taxation, war was imminent if the present British policy were continued for the Americans were convinced that their liberties were at stake. The resistance would as a result be fierce and any victory would be pyrrhic; war could only be harmful. Therefore the new Parliament /
Parliament should reconsider American policy and try to bring about a reconciliation. In another letter "Philaretos" emphasized commercial considerations. The colonies were founded, he wrote, for purposes of commerce and that in order to develop the colonies and to secure their commerce restrictions were laid on colonial manufactures and trade. In return Americans were given certain general rights and guarantees, in particular, security in their property. The taxation lately insisted upon by Britain imperiled the security of their property and thereby unbalanced the system, and was unnecessary in any case. Moderation in colonial policy was required if the ministers were not to call down on themselves the execration of their descendants.

Another correspondent referred satirically to the woman in a fable who, after fattening her cow, claimed the right to kill it for her support, adding, "I see no reason, as we have fed and fattened the colonists, why we should not at any time, sacrifice them, either for our convenience or diversion". He continued the satire by noting that in politics the powerful side is always the legal side and those are rebels who are guilty of being the weakest.
weakest. The Americans therefore should be treated with the utmost severity. He suggested that present measures for distressing the Americans were inadequate. Why not sell the colonies to France or Spain for enough to pay off the national debt (since this was incurred on account of the colonies), and if their property is insufficient, sell their persons as well. "If they are to be slaves it little signifies who is their master". If tenderhearted people, he concluded, say our right to occasional taxation of their property is not a right to divest them entirely of their property, "surely, Sir... The reasoning that supports us stripping them of a part supports us in stripping them of the whole; and consequently the sooner we accomplish our ends, and snatch them from the misery of a continued oppression, the sooner we shall manifest our prudence and display our humanity".

Before Britain and the colonies were fully engaged in war some of the opponents of government policy exhibited a boldness which disappeared when fighting began. A writer in February 1775 urged the Americans to resist the government, arguing that "the general revolt of a country, in order to destroy oppressive taxation, can never be construed Rebellion", /
Rebellion", and that "a nation cannot be tied to any other obedience than is consistent with the common good, according to their own judgment". He drew on Roman history for an heroic example of regard for liberty and urged Camden's words, 'That Representation and Taxation are inseparable', he displayed on American banners where they could prove the safe-guards of freedom. Discussion on the power of Kings to give and revoke charters should be dispensed with, for "the liberties of nations by no means arise from the grants of Princes". The spirit of this letter is best shown in quotation.

When things are brought to a certain pass, the boldest counsels are the safest; and if they must perish who lie still and they can but perish who are most active, the choice is easily made; for let the danger be ever so great, there remains a possibility of safety, whilst men have life, hands, arms, and courage to use them; but that people must certainly perish who tamely suffer oppression, either from the injustice or cruelty of Princes, or from these wretches of Ministers who foster their vices. I would recommend to the perusal of these, who have been the occasion of this unnatural contest this . . . most applicable sentence of Machiavel, 'Civil wars and rebellions are diseases, but tyranny is the death of a state'. I own the first two ought to be avoided, if justice could be obtained by gentler means; but when supplications and just remonstrances fail, and when cruel and ill-advised designs continue to be pursued, the colonies must assert their natural rights, if thereby both should perish. This is the last result, and must, when every other prospect of preservation disappears, be put in practice.
practice. Nero's madness could not be cured, nor the mischievous effects of it be suppressed, but by his death.

Americans, now is the push; be not dismayed; liberty begets miracles! Your cause is just...

I sincerely wish, Parliament would naturally consider how to reconcile the colonies to the mother country... all may yet be well, but one rash step endangers our reconciliation forever. Let the troops, ships, etc., be recalled; let that despicable cause of dissension, the tax on the tea, be taken off; let the iniquitous acts complained of be repealed; name the sum you want; leave them to raise it in their own way; and let that commerce, which has for more than a century past, employed our manufacturers, and enriched our nation, flow in its own channel; then peace and harmony will ensue.

ANERIGUS

After fighting began in earnest, letters defending the colonists ceased to appear. Attention turned largely to the war itself and away from the issues of taxation, representation, natural rights, and security in property. Accounts of preparations for war, of commissions, battles, and skirmishes filled the press. Controversial aspects of the war were not entirely laid aside, however, and in January of 1776 the Pantheon debating society in Edinburgh considered the question "Is modern Patriotism of Service to Liberty?" The meeting was "uncommonly crowded", according to the newspaper account, and "judging from the number of speakers, /
speakers, the perspicuity, and eloquence with which they delivered their opinions, the subject is the most important yet considered by the society." Thirteen speakers supported each side and as several others were anxious to rise after the hour for collecting votes, final discussion of the subject was deferred to the next meeting when another "interesting and well supported debate" was anticipated. Meantime, the preparation of loyal addresses in various parts of the country became in several places an occasion for debate on the war.

In Scotland seventy-seven loyal addresses were voted in Scottish burghs and counties in the autumn of 1775 and the following winter. The addresses were not popular in origin. Of forty-seven listed in the Scots Magazine for 1775 only two were drafted by the leading citizens, and two others had "principle inhabitants" added to the usual list of sponsors - the magistrates, town council, and, sometimes, incorporated societies; or freeholders, gentlemen, justices of the peace, and commissioners of supply. The public bodies which sent the addresses represented essentially the same views as the forty-five members they sent to Parliament. There seem to have been no counter petitions /
petitions such as were sent from London, Bristol and elsewhere in England, although merchants in Glasgow threatened such a petition if the corporation insisted on drawing up a loyal address. Glasgow had to be content with an address from the trades and was the only center of any consequence which failed to address the King on the war. There was, however, some opposition to addresses in other centers.

In Edinburgh an address was voted by the town council in October 1775, but only after a period of delay which produced charges of negligence and alliance with the radicalism of London and countercharges of the folly of supporting an unwise and unwarranted war. The first intimation of a dispute in Edinburgh on the question of an address was in a letter which expressed indignation that none had been sent from the city. This "glaring piece of negligence, not to say disrespect" was especially surprising when pretended Whiggish subjects claiming to be the only friends to the constitution were aiding colonists engaged in open rebellion. Could it be that the city of Edinburgh was unwilling to adopt a policy different from the wanton, and insulting line laid down for London by John Wilkes? An immediate /
immediate dutiful and loyal address on American affairs ought to be transmitted "in order to convince the world, that the metropolis of Scotland is not actuated by the same spirit of licentiousness with the metropolis of a neighbouring kingdom . . ."¹⁸ The emphasis in this letter on British radicalism may be related to a report that the Lord-Mayor elect of London, Alderman Sawbridge, had offered to the Provost of Edinburgh assurance of the support of the city of London for any measure required by the Edinburgh town council provided no address were made on American affairs. The report in any case indicates bitter divisions in the town council, for it stated that disputes on the message from London and on the address were so warm "that even resignations have been talked of if certain measures were not adopted".¹⁹

The opposition to a loyal address was evidence that sympathies for the Americans continued, and two outspoken contributions to the debate on an address were among the very few letters openly opposing the war which appeared in the first year and a half after fighting began. One of these berated the "abject inclination that uniformly prevails in Scotland to support the Ministry for the time being". /
being. The contest concerning the rights of America divided the ablest members of government and Parliament of all ranks. It was a difficult question which all wise men must wish could be settled in a better manner than by shedding blood. No one can deny present measures are violent. Whether or not they are just time will tell.

The writer then criticized a recent trades resolution to support a loyal address.

But is it not really provoking, at this awful period of national perplexity, to find a parcel of tradesmen, that is to say, Masons, Wrights, etc. meeting together, and taking upon them to insist, that the City of Edinburgh should send up an address to his Majesty, approving of the war against our colonies; when most certain it is, That these tradesmen cannot tell me distinctly, why this war is carried on . . . I defy any one of them to tell me, in a satisfactory manner, how a distant government's unlimited power of taking a people's money, is consistent with national freedom? That addresses from Scotland can be of no service, because Government already knows full well, that the Scots are at their command: On the contrary, addresses would only serve to degrade us still more in the general estimation, and to exasperate the Americans still more against the Ministry. Let the advice then of the Town-clerk of Edinburgh be remembered, and I trust that our city shall be silent, from prudence, if there is no other motive.

A TRUE FRIEND TO THE KING

The other contribution, like most letters, appeared under a pseudonym, but was later published by its author, John Erskine,
Erskine, as an appendix to his pamphlet sermon *Shall I go to war with my American Brethren?* It was a long and carefully written letter which repeated some points made in the sermon. Erskine argued the dangers, hazards, and costs of war with America, and asked "can we hate men who have taken up arms . . . from a too jealous love of liberty?" He asserted that addresses were meaningless since they made no material contribution, and they often arose from motives and through influence which made them uncertain indicators of actual political sentiment. He expressed doubt of the rightness of the British position. The Stamp Act fiasco proved the fallibility of the administration; perhaps they were wrong in the present instance also. The commercial centers of Scotland might find it to their advantage, when a settlement was effected, if they had not given evidence of unreasonable desire to reduce the colonies and had avoided making the name of a Scotsman as odious to them as Hutchinson or Bernard. Finally, a settlement might come sooner if the Americans believed the difficulties were due chiefly to the rashness or sinister design of a few rather than to the many in the nation. 21

At least two other proposed addresses met some opposition.
opposition. In response to the proposal in Ayrshire an eminently reasonable statement of the anti-administration view on American affairs was printed under the signature "A Commissioner of Supply". Besides the arguments concerning taxation, rights, and tyranny this writer added an analogy between colonial charters and the Act of Union. He declared that if colonial charters could be abrogated at will, the same was true of the Union, and that if the administration should raise the land tax in Scotland to the same rate paid in England, no better arguments could be found against it than those of the Americans. The Commissioner of Supply was in turn described as an emissary of the despicable faction in London, as attempting to cool the loyalty of the northerners, and as imagining he was addressing the 40s freeholders at Middlesex instead of the £400 valuation freeholders in Scotland. When an address approving strong measures against the Americans was read at a meeting of freeholders of the county of Edinburgh in January 1776, it was vigorously opposed by one member, Mr. Dowar of Vogrie. He condemned administration conduct as tyrannical to America and ruinous to Britain, enlarged on the advantages of trade with America, and insisted ruin could
could be averted only by substituting lenient measures for the present coercion. Though alone in this meeting, he was happy to be supported by such names as Rockingham, Chatham, Camden, Burke, and Barre. The address was approved with one dissenting vote and one abstention.  

The refusal of the Faculty of Advocates to support the Edinburgh volunteer regiment in 1778 seems to have been in consequence of divided opinion on the war within the Faculty, although the evidence of this is not extensive. When a public subscription was opened to finance the regiment, various groups were quick to announce their support and contributions, but a letter from the Lord Provost concerning the subscription was very coolly received by the Faculty of Advocates. They refused to grant any funds, complained of being approached as one of the corporations belonging to the community of Edinburgh, and cited a regulation they could not set around which prescribed that funds could only be applied to those purposes for which they had been appropriated. The Provost was assured, however, that they were ready to support the regiment as individuals.  

There is reason to doubt that the reason given for refusing /
refusing to contribute to the regiment was the whole truth. The minutes state that "after a good deal of reasoning on this Subject", it was recommended that the Lord Provost be informed "that they have a Resolution, from which they cannot depart, of applying the Funds of their Society, to those purposes only, for which they are specially appropria\vspace{1em}ted . . ." 25 Their action was consistent with a decision in 1757 when in the course of a meal famine the Society was asked to contribute "after the example of other societies" for the relief of the poor, and the cause was recommended to the members. 26 In 1780, when the Faculty was asked to contribute toward fortifications being raised at Leith, the Faculty resolved "to give (the Plan) all due Encouragement as Individuals; it being their invariable Resolution, Never to apply their Publick Funds to any other Purposes than to those for which they are specially appointed". 27 The same year, however, when an assessment was to be laid on the inhabitants of Edinburgh for reparations to Catholics who sustained damages in the riots of the previous year, the Faculty ruled that they were no more exempt than other inhabitants "and are further of Opinion, that, if they had such an Exemption, this is not a case in which such Privilege /
Privilege ought to be insisted on. 28

There are at least grounds for presumption that an exception could have been made regarding their funds in favour of the Edinburgh regiment had the members desired to do so. In any case their refusal to subscribe was considered in Edinburgh as evidence of opposition to the war. Indignant citizens, who wrote to the newspapers criticizing the advocates for not subscribing as a group, claimed that not only did individuals fail to contribute at the meeting when the matter was discussed, but that the meeting did not even recommend the subscription to the individual members. 29 A similar view was taken by the publisher of the Caledonian Mercury who used the incident to justify the attention given in his newspaper to views against "the unhappy contest with our Colonies". In a note "To the Reader" in the first issue of the paper in 1780 he wrote,

... It has ... been his study, in the insertion of Essays and Letters upon the subject, to pay a proper deference to the several opinions which have prevailed even on this side of the Tweed. While one of the most learned and respectable societies in Scotland refused to subscribe supplies, or testify their approbation, it would ill become the Publisher of a newspaper, however clear in his own opinion, to treat all opposition to the measures of Government as factious and unwise. ... 30
It is possible that Henry Erskine and lay compatriots of the Popular party in the Church were playing a role in the Faculty of Advocates as in the General Assembly in opposition to the government. The reasons for one advocate's opposition to the subscription was made clear in a letter to the Caledonian Mercury.

Sir,

Scribblers attempted to rail against the Faculty of Advocates, because they refused ... to subscribe to the Edinburgh Regiment, and would not prostitute the voice of so learned and respectable a society, to give a sanction to the unconstitutional war carried on against our fellow subjects in America. Advocates, Sir, have the honourable title of Antistites Justitia; and, therefore, it would have been quite out of character to have given their sanction to injustice. I, as a member of that society, felt an honest pride, that whilst an infatuation seemed to have seized almost all the rest of Scotland, wisdom was preserved by its Lawyers.

And now, Sir, we are fully justified by the event. The Ministry ... have given up those claims of taxation to which subjects of the Crown of Britain ... could not submit.

... ... ...

The British, the Irish, and the Americans, are ... members of the same constitution ... The supplies necessary for Government are furnished in Britain by the British Parliament, and in Ireland by the Irish Parliament. Why, then, should not the same principle take place in America, where our fellow-subjects have their own Houses of Representatives?

AN ADVOCATE31

The /
The character of the war was changed fundamentally in 1778 when France entered the conflict. The civil war became an international one. The foe was an ancient enemy about whom there were no reservations due to feeling for fellow subjects or differences on taxation, representation, and natural rights. One consequence was an energetic recruiting drive for soldiers and sailors. Military processions were held in Scottish cities and burghs; towns and societies offered bounties to persons residing within their limits to induce them to volunteer; and the counties joined in resolutions to encourage enlistments and to assist the impress. On the other hand, the spread of the war, as predicted by the opposition, was added to the failure to achieve any decisive success, a condition which had already aroused criticism of the conduct of the war. From 1778 opinion critical of the government mounted. It was associated in interest with the opposition in England and allied itself with the demands for economic and constitutional reform. The development of extensive anti-government opinion in Scotland during the American war and the consequent demand for reform at local and national levels mark a significant change in the Scottish attitude toward national /
national affairs.

Discouragement and criticism are increasingly present in the press from the beginning of 1778. Even earlier the accounts of the fighting which arrived from overseas and were for the most part exaggerated descriptions of successes had begun to include sobering details. In August 1777 the Edinburgh Evening Courant printed from a letter originating in New York the following pessimistic view:

American affairs ... seem now to be ... bad. The rebel Washington plays the game most admirably. Till lately I never thought the Americans had either common sense or common spirit. I am convinced now they have both, in spite of parliamentary assertions. England ... was never in so ticklish a situation. Wise men foresaw the cases; ministers and asses did not. America now can only conquer itself. United, all Europe is not sufficient. Poor old England! as a country I adore it; as a thing suffering itself to be ministered, I despise it ... 33

In January 1778 a correspondent suggested legislation leading to a settlement would be more creditable to Britain than the existing state of affairs and called for the Earl of Chatham to secure an honourable peace. 34 In April 1778 the Pantheon Society debated the question "whether or not the present Ministry should be continued?" and in a crowded house the vote that the ministry should not be dismissed was carried by a more fourteen. 35 By the middle of the year /
year 1778 letters expressing disappointment at the lack of progress were numerous, and some Scots were then urging the dismissal of ministers.

Two letters of interest which attacked the government appeared over the signature "Agrestis". The first of these was headed "For the Caledonian Mercury To the King".

Sire,

when the state is in danger, it is the duty of every honest citizen to shake off the fetters of ceremony, and address your Majesty with the freedom becoming a man, and the firmness becoming a Briton. Not a word of your diminished empire: It is a sleeping lion. But our bleeding, perhaps captive, countrymen, at New York, the ghosts of those, who, with a resolution almost more than human, have died without a wound [word?] in the service of your Majesty and their country, call aloud for the dismissal of those Ministers who have deserted and betrayed them; who forced them to retire before a vanquished foe, and have led them to captivity or death.

But if these distant misfortunes are alarming, what must be your Majesty's feelings, when your attention is called nearer home? The empire of the ocean, upon which your own royalty and the very existence of your kingdom depend, reduced to a balance, and ready to fly from those dastardly and temporising counsellors, who, to preserve themselves in office, have yielded up America!

Let not your Majesty be deceived into a belief, that the complaints of your country are the voice of faction. This address comes from a part of your dominions which the abettors of licentiousness have stigmatized with loyalty. If love for your Majesty's family ... attachment to you as a Sovereign ... and determined purpose to support the constitution ... are /
are loyalty, the appellation is well merited. They know their duty as subjects ... as citizens. The noisy ebullitions of party ... may be disregarded, or ... suppressed; but the deep and secret murmurs of a just discontent, though they move silent and slow, will at last burst into a storm that will shake the empire to the foundations!

The means of preventing this are in your Majesty's hands. Your children and subjects ... call upon you for the dismissal of these ignorant, profligate, and timid counsellors, who have brought disgrace upon your Majesty's reign, and their country to the brink of destruction ... 

AGRESTIS

The second letter from "Agrestis" was addressed to Lord North and the paragraphs castigating his leadership and person were followed by a demand for his dismissal. The attack on North was protested by a writer from Perth who maintained such ill-natured letters should not be published. They made the people disaffected to that nobleman, weakened the hands of government, and encouraged enemies of the country to throw out ill-natured papers against the King and council. He thought many offended readers expected an acknowledgement from the paper. The protest evoked a counter-protest from another Perth correspondent who expressed surprise that his townsman should "ridicule himself so much, by exclaiming against a paper which speaks the minds /
minds of so many of his Majesty's most loyal subjects."
They are very well affected to government and sincerely wished to find the paper answered and their views unjustified. 39

Meantime, new proposals concerning strategy and relations with the colonies, and old proposals revived, entered the discussion. Basic errors in planning were blamed for the lack of military success. America, wrote one contributor, should be left to her "culture, population, and discordant Congress." Concentration on the sea, including New York, and islands off the American coast would secure possessions in the archipelago of the New World and would secure American commerce as well. The American states would eventually return with their commerce to Britain. 40

In September and successive autumn months the discussion turned in numerous letters to the question of granting independence to the Americans, 41 and the Pantheon Society in November considered whether it was in the interest of Great Britain "to treat with America as Independent States." 42

In December of 1778 the Caledonian Mercury printed a long letter containing a carefully written and bitter attack on Sir William Howe. The campaigns and battles which took place under his direction were examined in detail, and for each /
each of a long list of failures the fault was found in
Howe's conduct. The criticism was as severe as it was
particular. The writer concluded,

Such, Sir William is the career you have run.
Delay without prudence, success without advantage, is
the history of your campaign. The loss of America,
the ruin of your country's greatness, an indelible
disgrace upon the honour of its arms, the lives of
many brave men sacrificed to no purpose, a foreign
war . . . which may involve us in bankruptcy and re-
duce our empire to this little island. These, Sir,
form the melancholy catalogue of your achievements . .
you are most miserably deceived if you think you can
ever be happy . . . something in the universal scorn
of the British people . . . will pierce your ear, even
in your most silent retreats . . . scorn, contempt and
indignation will attend you, wherever you appear . . .

LUCIUS43

This letter was reprinted in January with an editor's note
stating that the article had brought an unusually favorable
response and was agreed upon everywhere as a 'capital per-
formance'. It was reprinted because the issue containing
the article had been quickly sold out even though an extra-
ordinary number of copies was printed. The paper was
obliged to the author for having chosen the Caledonian
Mercury as the vehicle through which to make the article
public.44

The attention given in the fall of 1778 to the question
of /
of granting independence to the colonies indicates the seriousness with which the situation had come to be regarded. Through the year 1779 the ever increasing dissatisfaction with the war was reflected in the press chiefly by criticism of members of the ministry or military who could be charged with responsibility for the lack of success. The opposition also was frequently condemned on the charge they encouraged the Americans, by example if not worse, to resort to open rebellion. Some items suggest that affairs were being discussed on a popular level in a manner more fierce than was permissible in the press. Editorial notations which explained the rejection of some essays as due to inadequacies of style, irrelevant or insignificant topics, or too great length, sometimes referred to the political tone, as in the following editor's note.

We received, by post, a few days ago, a letter from Wick signed Amator Probitatis; a favour which we acknowledge, but not with gratitude. It seems to be the production of a brain distempered with sedition and fanaticism ... This composition is a farce of abuse against the assertors of Great Britain's superiority over the Colonies; against the Countess of Sutherland's regiment; and against the author of the History of Edinburgh ... We cannot conclude, without expressing our concern at the dastardly and malicious spirit which, of late, has displayed itself in this country, in a variety of incendiary letters to persons of respectable and public characters.
A correspondent referred similarly to a disturbing popular temper. He had refrained, he wrote, from expressing the forebodings he held from the beginning of the war, but could no longer remain quiet. "When I cannot go into company, either public or private, without hearing the grossest treason uttered against the _______ and the most shocking execrations against the Ministry . . . I cannot help looking into the cause, and enquiring into the authors of this general discontent". At the Pantheon Society meantime, which reflected general interests in its debates on political topics, the assembly voted by a majority of thirty-three that it was not expedient "in the present crisis to withdraw our land forces from America and employ them against the House of Bourbon". They also decided to consider whether the Common Council of London was culpable in refusing assistance to the government "in the present situation of affairs", and whether the lack of success in the war was due most 'to those who formed the plans, or to those who were entrusted with the executions".

In April 1780 a letter on the political situation, longer and more carefully written than most, was printed on the front page of the Caledonian Mercury. Under the signature, /
signature, "TH' GHOST OF WALLACE", and addressed "To the People of Scotland", the writer noted what he considered a rare and lamentable happening, a British minister in the minority. The explanation for this situation he found in the existence of a pernicious opposition, and to them he attributed in detail all the major difficulties of Britain. The opposition were factious; they were to be blamed for the American resolve to force a war and for their resolve to continue the war; they were to blame for the Irish intransigence which led to great concessions. In the desperate situation which had arisen it was time for Scotland to step forward as the asserter of liberty and the defender of Monarchy. Associations must be formed and addresses transcribed throughout the kingdom. Every incorporation, parish, burgh, organization must contribute to show the King the loyalty of Scotland in order that he might take courage.49

The ringing tone of the essay, both in its denunciation of the opposition and in its call on the loyalty of the Scots, brought a quick response. One writer complimented the "Ghost of Wallace" on his essay, but thought the likelihood of a dresses forthcoming was small since the city of Edinburgh /
Edinburgh would hardly set the example. To be sure, ninetenths of the inhabitants would approve the program, "but it is not to be expected, for obvious reasons, that addressing will originate with the Town council of this city".50 Another writer who declared a general disagreement with the "Ghost of Wallace" expressed a view on the loyalty of Scotland to the ministerial policy.

... I would suggest to the people of Scotland, that they have now a fair opportunity to vindicate themselves from the humiliating aspersions for which they have but given too much reason.

It must be acknowledged that Scotland has, to appearance, all along encouraged the ministerial war against our fellow subjects in America; ... a war begun and carried on with the avowed intention of compelling British subjects to be taxed without representation ...

Without saying more upon the subject, as a question of right and wrong, sure I am, that as a question of expediency, all wise men ... must now think, that it would be better for Great Britain no longer to continue this war, of which the effects are so distressing to everybody ...

I do not recollect any public society in Scotland, where manly sentiments of opposition against the American war were expressed, unless in the Faculty of Advocates; a circumstance which does great honour to that learned body, and for which they are much obliged to those amongst them who had spirit enough to speak with freedom. Yet I trust, that although our county meetings and borough corporations were implicit worshippers of the Ministry, the PEOPLE of Scotland in general thought differently.
What I would propose is, that a petition should be drawn up to the House of Commons ... humbly setting forth, 'That some of the petitioners were originally for the American war, and some against it, but that they are now all agreed that a stop should be put to it; ... that we may have peace with our brethren, and be enabled to contend, as we have formerly done, against foreign nations'.

That this petition be lodged at any of the taverns in Edinburgh, and let us see how many will put their names to it. If the number be such as I am persuaded it will, let the Edinburgh Petition be sent up without delay, and let copies of it be transmitted to different places in Scotland, that the real sense of the inhabitants of this country may be collected, and those who persist in this ruinous war may no longer excuse themselves, and disgrace us, by holding out to Parliament that the Scotch are unanimous in supporting them.

LAURENTIANUS

Still another writer, in two letters under the signature, "One of the People of Scotland", concentrated on a careful defence of the opposition. He undertook to refute the "Ghost of Wallace" almost sentence by sentence, and then with equal pains he justified the opposition as men of integrity and conscience and decried the idea that Parliament should merely reflect the views of the Ministry. His concluding paragraph indicates the growing Scottish sympathy with the liberal reform movement more publicly in evidence in England.

... He /
... He talks of supporting his Majesty to the last drop of his blood. This is fit language for a Ghost, who has no blood to lose; but sounds rather like madness in mortals... Spirits so active as our authors ought not to be contented with words.

... if he cannot raise a Scots army... he should instantly repair to court, and after giving his Ghostly advice to the Ministry, he ought to put himself at the head of all the forces he can raise there; and when he has crushed the petitioning counties into unconditional submission, he ought to embark for America, where, after superseding Sir Henry Clinton... if he can find him out, he ought to suppress the rebellion there; and after relieving Gibraltar, and subduing the House of Bourbon on his way home, he ought to get an act of Parliament passed, that... none should be capable of a seat in the House of Commons except such as depend on the Ministry; and the House should have no power to ask any account of the disposal of the monies voted by them, but should be bound to grant all the Ministry's demands, under pain of being crushed as a violent faction. This would convince the public of the nature of his loyalty, and would possibly increase the prerogative a little.

One of the People of Scotland

Thus, in Scotland, as in England, the issues of the American war had become involved in the issues of domestic reform, and the issues of ministerial negligence in American affairs and the rights of opposition at home were, in fact, more and more frequently combined. Loyalty to the King in time of danger is wholly commendable, wrote another correspondent in introducing a series of criticisms, but unquestioning submission is another matter; exalted ideas of /
of the royal prerogative are unaccountably maintained,
since they should have been pulled up by the root at the
Revolution. He continued,

... it has often been my lot to differ from
the rabble, as well as from men in power; and I have
often spoke out that difference of sentiment with
much freedom. I declare it then to be of my opinion,
that the present Administration are by no means deserv-
ing of the confidence, favour, or attachment of the
people. I shall endeavour [in giving an account of
recent ministerial policy] to confine myself to facts;
to enumerate those glorious achievements of the Minis-
try, which, in the annals of Britain, will peculiarly
distinguish the present interesting period.

The Ministry, then, have lost us America, for a
point of honour and a pound of tea. They have lost
us the islands of Grenada and St. Vincent's, and the
dominion over Ireland. They refused to listen to the
terms of accommodation proposed for the Colonies by
Mr. Penn, because they would not treat with Congress,
who rejected their advances with scorn. They entered
into a war with America, without deliberating suffi-
ciently on the justice of the measure, or knowing any
more concerning the strength or inclinations of the
Americans, than I do of that which is transacting in the
Turkish Divan.

The account of damnable negligence was extended to the field
of relations with France, Spain, and Holland. Concerning
domestic affairs, criticism was laid on the huge increase
in the royal revenue and in the national debt, the choice
of officers for the army and navy, the conduct of the army
and the navy, and, finally, "they have broke and dismissed
Lords /
Lords Lieutenants of Counties for voting in Parliament according to their conscience”. 53

The critical letters in the first few months of 1780 are a vigorous assertion of the changed attitude toward the government which had been developing during the war. Before the war and in its early stages any criticism of the ministry was answered with indignation. Such opposition to the war as was expressed in 1774, 1775, and 1776 was described in numerous replies and observations as disreputable faction. In 1780 those who asserted the old attitude of unquestioning loyalty were on the defensive, and it was their letters which occasioned numerous replies demonstrating the fallibility of the ministry and decrying uncritical loyalty. The remaining months of the war confirmed the failure of the ministry and correspondingly strengthened Scottish opposition sentiment.

Despite some successes early in 1780 it was apparent in that year that victory was no longer possible, although news items continued to foster a false optimism. Throughout the war newspapers had printed extracts of letters from soldiers, merchants, and officials in America who gave exaggerated descriptions of British victories and colonial disintegration.
disintegration. These letters and other items in 1780 still glorified every small British success and minimized every setback. Every British unit was made heroic; every rebel unit was described as flying at sight of a bayonet and standing only when possessed of immense superiority in numbers. The colonials were reported as seething with strife and on the verge of disintegration or revolt. The lack of decisive British progress was explained by complaints of the inactivity of Lord Howe and the ministers. As the autumn of 1780 approached the newspapers reluctantly presented the increasingly serious position of Cornwallis and expressed apprehension at the activities of Washington and Rochambeau before New York and as Washington moved south. But in spite of the hesitancy of editors to disavow the over optimistic rumors, letters, and advices from London and abroad, the fact of increasing pessimism among readers and editors is indicated by a growing number of notices accepting the hopelessness of the situation. A correspondent commenting on the stalemate in America and the numerous and powerful enemies stated flatly, "our situation with regard to the conquest of America is, in my opinion, hopeless". An "Advice from London" reveals acceptance /
acceptance of defeat in its attempt to salvage a hope from the situation.

The avidity with which the French assist the Americans may probably terminate in Great Britain's acknowledging their independence, which will naturally renew the old affection of America to her relatives; and, as France will no doubt attempt to keep a possession on the western continent, in a few years Great Britain, as an ally to the States, will be beating the French from those very places where they are now opposing them, though from the opposite cause to that which at present impels them.55

More 'Intelligence from London' informed the Scottish reader of pessimism in the English capital.

... Critical as is the situation in which Lord Cornwallis is involved, and important as is the event that depends on it, you will hear two questions asked about our Jamaica fleet, where there is one proposed relative to our troops in Carolina. This is a strong proof how much the point of American subjection is given up, and how much more important it is to turn our attention to the preservation of our islands.56

A frequent contributor to the Caledonian Mercury attempted to palliate resignation by asserting the inevitability of the eventual loss of America with or without war, and prescribed the abandonment of America in favor of efforts to secure the French West Indian sugar islands.

Sir,

America seems pretty far advanced in her pregnancy of a great revolution. If she can universally throw off those commercial restraints that have been imposed upon her by the avarice of Europe . . . her means of affording /
affording subsistence to mankind, by a proper culture of her soil, seems capable to double the present numbers of the human race.

If Britain, in place of waging war against America, had continued in peace with her for a hundred years, she must nevertheless have lost her sovereignty over America; because, according to the natural course of things, the colonies, in the progress of an hundred years, would have become more populous, and more powerful, than the parent state . . .

The air of finality regarding the American conflict is illustrated by a writer whose chief concern was a Scots Militia. He expressed surprise that the ministry should continue to refuse the militia and that they should not have learned the lessons taught by the Americans and the Irish.

Oppressive measures of the Government drove the Americans to the last resource of a people who preferred the loss of their blood to that of their liberty. The Irish . . . have humbled the Administration, obliged them to relinquish their dictatorial tone, and grant much more than they once thought of. It is abundantly evident, that independence, to either America or Ireland, is not a gracious benefaction of the Crown, but an estimable privilege extorted by their own exertions.

The melancholy train of dismal consequences, resulting from an aversion of the Ministry to gratify respectful subjects . . . in their reasonable desires, ought to . . . deter them and a British Senate from committing such errors in future, and to convince them, that loyal and free subjects will not silently submit /
submit to a refusal of any material right to which they have a proper claim.

CIVIC GLASGOWENSIS

There remained to the end, nevertheless, strong support for the government. The Scottish people had no means of making their influence felt directly, and Dundas was still strengthening his political position. The *Parliamentary History* shows only a few signs of wavering among Scottish members, and opposition views in Edinburgh were still fiercely contested. An unsuccessful attempt in the General Assembly in 1788 to secure an address on the changes in the ministry has been noted. This attempt was shortly followed by an effort to draw up a similar address to be signed by the leading citizens of Edinburgh. Advertisements in the newspapers called a meeting of citizens to prepare an address on "the late Change of Men and Measures, signed by all such as agree with them in their general ideas of a regard for Civil Liberty and the British Constitution". Much controversy resulted, with the usual letters in the newspapers revealing strong differences of opinion. Opponents advertised a fictitious meeting called to oppose the address and listed reasons supposedly drawn up /
up to show why the address on the change of ministers was inappropriate. The author of *Edinburgh Fugitive Pieces*, a contemporary observer and supporter of the old ministry, maintained that this advertisement stopped not only the address from Edinburgh citizens but also a contagion of similar addresses which would have followed from the counties and burghs throughout Scotland.\(^6\) In the Pantheon society the question of whether an address on the late change in the ministry was proper aroused so much interest and participation that three meetings were given to a discussion of it before it was voted in the negative by the substantial majority for that assembly of 123.\(^1\) The address was presented to a public meeting on June 30 and placed on the table at Mary's Chapel for signatures, but no record of its presentation in London has been found.\(^2\)

Scottish constitutional arrangements were the same at the end of the war as before. The number of Scots in opposition in Parliament was only slightly increased and Dundas, in full control of patronage in Scotland, was able to rely on thirty-nine of the forty-five Scottish votes.\(^3\) But a development in Scottish political attitudes and loyalties had taken place. The movement for electoral reform /
form in the decade after the war - the logical channel for the energies of the unrepresented and dissatisfied elements - was evidence of the change, and the break down of uniform support for the ministerial party was a necessary preliminary to the formation of an opposition party slightly more than a decade after the war's end.
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At the end of the war the important place of the tobacco trade in the Scottish economy had been in part replaced by new manufactures. The shift in manufactures from the linens required in the American trade to cotton was under way, the first cotton mill having been erected at Rothesay in 1779 while nineteen more were built in the next eight years. An export trade in cotton was built up with Germany, Italy, France, and Switzerland to replace the trade in tobacco re-exports, and important inventions of the new industrial era facilitated the acceleration of the industrial revolution in Scotland.

The consequences of the war for the tobacco traders, however, were a dramatic illustration for the Scottish merchants of the dangers to which their interests were exposed by their lack of representation in Parliament. When the Stamp Act was repealed, only two of the fifty two merchants in Parliament were Scottish. Neither of these represented Glasgow and both - James Coutts, the banker, ...
M.P. for Edinburgh, and Sir Alexander Grant, M.P. for Inverness burghs - were among the six merchants who voted against repeal. The lead in the campaign for the reform of burgh representation was taken in Edinburgh rather than in Glasgow, in the latter city the merchants being in effective control of the town council, but in 1782 when the Provost of Glasgow received a circular from Wyvill, the Provost’s cautious avoidance of a commitment on the issue of political reform was supplemented with the observation that if the Corporation did express a specific opinion, "they would naturally be led to consider their own situation, and the trading towns on the banks of the Clyde, forming a body of near 100,000 people, represented only by one Member, and that Member elected by four Delegates, of which this City only sends one, who is chosen by the Corporation composed of no more than thirty individuals". A committee from Glasgow participated in the convention met to promote burgh reform in 1784, but the Glasgow merchants sought a more immediate and practical protection for their interests in the formation of the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce in 1783.

A development of wider significance, if difficult to define, /
define, resulted from the fact that the war with its economic and political strains and accompanying discussion occurred in a period when, due to the economic and social changes of the preceding seventy-five years, political changes were near the surface. Control of the existing political system in Scotland was still being gathered in by Henry Dundas, and he continued to strengthen his position until in 1780 the Dundas "interest" in Scotland was almost invulnerable. Locally, however, the predominant dynastic loyalty in Scottish political sympathies, and the disproportionate antipathy to the opposition were shaken by the publicity given to the anomalies in local political arrangements on the one hand, and the protracted failure of the government in the war on the other. The expansion of the Scottish press was due chiefly to the interest created by the conflict with America, but it was also both a cause and a consequence of the widening and critical political interest. A local impetus to county and burgh reform conducted by the middle classes resulted, although its consummation was fifty years away and required support from the masses which came only after the French Revolution.

An opposition element in Scottish political life was evidenced /
evidenced in the opposition to the war which was expressed in the Church, apparently in the Faculty of Advocates and in the debates of the Pantheon Society, in the press, and in connection with addresses on American policy and on ministerial changes. Dundas faced serious opposition from the Whigs in the election of 1784, and the opposition element, though set back by the successes of Dundas, remained in existence and provided leadership to liberal elements in the era of the French Revolution. Under the leadership of men who, like Henry Erskine, had opposed the American war — or their successors, like Sir Henry Moncrief Holland, successor to John Erskine as leader of the Popular party in the church, and Andrew Fletcher, leader in the burgh reform movement in 1784 — the Whig party after 1796 was given a regular organization and creed and contested political control with the Tory party.
CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION


2. C. Wyvill, Political Papers, II, 82-85. Complaints of the political condition of Glasgow had been infrequent, but in 1774 a letter in the Cal. Her., May 7, urging electoral reform contained a paragraph on Glasgow.

"Let me then put in a word for the city of Glasgow. Is it just? Is it fair? Is it reasonable? that a city where trade flourishes to such an extent, and by which an almost incredible amount of wealth is brought into Scotland, should not have a representative in parliament, but have its fourth share of a member along with the petty boroughs of Dumbarton, Renfrew, & Rutherglen? Dumbarton, it is true, has a castle renowned in history...; Renfrew is one of the titles of the heir of the British crown; & Rutherglen marked a nobleman descendant of the house of Hamilton; but whatever were the ideas of more rude & ancient times, we, in this age, have learned a due respect for commerce."

3. The political conquest of Scotland is detailed in H. Furber, Henry Dundas, part II, chs. 1--.

4. Ibid., 200-205.
APPENDIX A

The small number of letters on the War of American Independence written by British participants and preserved has been noted by Eric Hobson, ed., Letters from America, 1773-1780 (Manchester University Press, 1951), Intro., XXII. A few letters by Scottish soldiers are scattered through collections of family papers, but of those observed in connection with this study the series have been too brief or the events described too minor to justify reproduction. In the Laing MSS three letters of Patrick Ferguson describe skirmishes early in the war; a letter by N. Ferguson describes conditions in Pennsylvania in 1776; a letter of J. Butler describes a naval action on Lake Champlain; and two letters by Francis Dundas, printed in the Report on the Laing MSS II, 503, 509-11, describe further skirmishes. Only one of the F. Dundas' letters has been found. (La. II, 456, 480, 500). In the National Library the most interesting war letters are several written from Boston, Halifax and Long Island between 1775 and 1778 by General James Grant of Ballindalloch. The papers of Grant, however, are of most interest for their /
their descriptions of county electioneering in Scotland.

(U33 1224).

The scarcity of letters from America in the Revolutionary period is probably due mainly to lack of preservation, for there is little doubt that correspondence from the many Scots abroad was extensive and was an important source of information about the conflict with the colonies. The evidence for this is in the number of extracts of private letters which were printed in the newspapers. Merchants and others with special interests in America received from their agents, relatives or friends accounts of the course of affairs which supplemented or contradicted the official as well as general news in the Scottish press. When the difficulties with the colonies were greatest and the desire for American news consequently increased, editors made a correspondingly greater use of private letters to fill out their columns.

In the following pages are the private letters printed in the Caledonian Mercury during the critical year of July 1774 to July 1775. All but a few of the most trivial have been included. They contain incidental information, rumors, and some acute observations. Some favour the Americans /
Americans while others are hostile. They came from Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Maryland, Virginia, and Georgia, and were addressed to correspondents in Glasgow, East Lothian, Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Leith. These extracts are probably representative of a considerable flow of letters from the Scottish representation abroad.

The news of blocking up the harbour was received with great astonishment; most of the people of property in the town, look upon themselves as ruined, if some means is not fallen upon to open the port by the fall of the year. They talk of applying to the New Assembly, which meets the next week to pay the money for the tea, and to endeavour to soften down things as much as possible; the other party, who had the rule for seven years past, talk as high as ever, and declare they will not pay a farthing though ruin should be the consequence. Our new governor made his public entrance yesterday; the assembly is to be removed to Salem, and all the Customhouse officers. What turn things will take I cannot as yet say.


The operations of the late act of parliament for blocking up our harbour, begin now to be felt most severely. All trade and business is at a stand. Should the terms of satisfaction expressed in the act not be soon complied with, we, and a number of others, will be obliged to move out of town to Salem or Marblehead.

Our leading men appear to be not yet recovered from the confusion they were thrown into by this new mode of chastisement, for their illegal proceedings. We are in hopes that the daily complaints of a great number of tradesmen now out of employ, will oblige them to alter their measures and submit to the stipulated conditions, although they may think them hard, being the only means left to prevent the impending ruin which threatens this town.

The act for shutting up our harbour has thrown us into a consternation from which we are not yet recovered. It has already commenced; but we do not feel all its effects, though we pretty well foresee them. The owners of the wharfs, and all the people employed by them, will suffer by them. The merchants trading to Britain and Ireland, though the blockade at first would seem chiefly to affect them, will be the least accommodated by it; their goods will be landed at Salem, or Marblehead, at most but twenty miles from Boston; and such a short land carriage, except the goods are bulky and very low priced, cannot be very expensive, admitting the siege to continue for a length of time. It appears from the blockade act, that the framers of it had the most perfect and complete information this place could supply them with; for the act will be very little inconvenience to any of the merchants, except those who have been the cause of all our disturbances, I mean the West India traders. Whenever we were out of humour, these gentlemen were always the first to propose and to sign an agreement against importing goods from Britain; because they were not interested in that trade themselves, and therefore could not sustain any loss by such an agreement; whilst molasses, a taxed commodity, was never accepted against or prohibited by our patriots, because most of them were deeply concerned in that sort of traffic, and the inhabitants could not live without the rum, which is distilled from molasses. Our law-givers have brought themselves into their present distressful situation. The owners of wharfs and the West India merchants, who are great smugglers, will be the greatest sufferers; the first will have no business at their wharfs; and the molasses and sugar of the second are bulky and cheap articles, and, of course, the twenty miles carriage will be proportionately high, which will enable the distillers and the merchants of Salem and Marblehead to undersell the people of the same occupations at Boston considerably. Distillery will be totally ruined at Boston, except what is consumed in the town; all the exportation to the coast of Guinea will be lost to our distillers till the port is opened, as our Guinea merchants will find it more advantageous for them to deal /
deal with the distillers from Salem and Marblehead . . .
The West India traders, whose business is now obstructed, are the keenest for a general non-importation, but that scheme will not go down now; the greatest number of the merchants having signed loyal and submissive addresses, cannot act so inconsistently as to sign an absurd and factious agreement in direct contradiction to their former dutiful addresses. But after all, I have no expectation of seeing our port soon opened. The assembly will meet in a few days; but if they were willing to pay for the tea, and acknowledge their bad behaviour, they dare not do it till they have advised the constituents; and . . . the country towns will not soon agree to pay for the mad excesses of our Boston mobs. On this account our general court will be a long time in submitting; and till they submit, our signing a hundred petitions, as merchants, and barristers, and clergymen, will have no effect towards our relief. We make a dismal figure; business at a stand; no bustle on the wharfs; poor people wondering what is to become of them, and applying to the patriots for subsistence for themselves and their families. Many of us wish to see an end of all these combustions.


. . . . Our affairs have taken such a turn that we have not the smallest prospect of our port being opened this year, the attempt of the mercantile interest to fall upon a scheme to pay for the tea, has been overthrown by the party who have ruled the party for some years past: they declare now that they give up the mercantile interest, and depend upon the yeomanry for the saving of the country, in consequence of this, they have issued a Solemn League and Covenant,
Covenant, to be signed by the people renouncing all commerce or connection with Great Britain. This non-consumption plan will affect every person here in that way of business; and with the shutting up of the port, it has effectively tied up our hands for the present, but it can never answer their purpose, as they can as well do without victuals as clothing, and however we on the spot may suffer, it is a Bugbear with respect to Britain: the other colonies seem to come in to the plan of a congress to meet in the fall. Our chief hopes are from their taking up our cause, and its becoming general. There is no chance left of our taking any step for the relief of the town before this congress. Our views are I believe very different from most of the other colonies; at present nothing less than independency will satisfy us. The new act for regulating the government, will not be submitted to; this will bring on a suspension of law, anarchy and confusion for sometime. They boast of their internal interest, and of the thousands they can bring into the field; but I do not believe much of this kind of opposition; however it is likely some blood will be split before all is settled; we shall be quiet enough in this town, where we have ships now, with five regiments, and more are expected.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Westmoreland county, Virginia, to his friend in Glasgow, dated June 28, Cal. Ker., August 20, 1774.

As the present situation of affairs in this country is alarming, I make no doubt but some account of them would be agreeable to you. The Virginians (and indeed the most of the colonies) look upon the late act of parliament for blocking up the harbour of Boston, and new-modelling their charter, as a thing that may one day or other happen to themselves; they are therefore resolved to stand the friends and espouse the interest of the Bostonians, as far as
as lies in their power; and, for that purpose, they are forming associations not to import any commodities from Great Britain, nor to export any of their own, until such time as the said act is repealed. There is a great clamour here against the ministry at home. In the county of Richmond about ten days ago, I saw an elegant effigy of Lord North, hanging and burnt amidst a vast concourse of people. I was particularly attentive to the countenances of the spectators, and was really pleased to see so very few express any outward signs of approbation on the occasion; there was indeed a few gentlemen who seemed to enjoy an ill-natured satisfaction in it, which they expressed by a loud huzza and plenty of demns. Then Parker, who is the King's Attorney for the county of Westmoreland, mounted on an eminence, and harangued the people, acquainting them of all the efforts Parliament had made to abridge them of their liberties, and many more that would be made, if they were not unanimous and steady in their resolves of breaking off all commercial connections with Great Britain, until the said act of parliament be repealed, and the right they have assumed for taxing America be given up, and American freedom ascertained and settled upon a permanent and constitutional foundation. Yesterday we had a meeting of the freeholders of this county, at our court-house, where there was some of the greatest men in the colony encouraging the common people to a like steady adherence to the aforesaid plan. These late meetings have been only to feel how the pulses of the common people beat; their grand meetings for signing the association will not be till August, and then it will be four or five months more before the commencement of a discontinuance of exportation and importation.

If every merchant in the colony would fall upon the same scheme that four eminent merchants of this county this day resolved upon, I don't know whether there would need to be such a bustle about importing and exporting. Their resolves are, That as the courts of justice are discontinued, they think it prudent and necessary not to sell anything but for ready money, or the ready produce of the country. They have therefore publicly advertised, that no person need to apply to them for anything, without they come furnished with the one or the other of these materials.

Credit /
Credit is a thing so very common here, that there is not one person in a hundred who pays the ready money for the goods he takes up at a store; and, consequently, they will be beginning to feel the ill effects before the day of signing. I forgot to tell you they have put a stop to the courts of justice, in order that none need by under any apprehensions of distress (by the merchants) during their non-importation.

It is true they have always had the good fortune, as yet, to have a repeal of anything that has been against them . . . But you may believe me, if the present act should be continued, their resolutions will soon fail them here. I am convinced, that the disadvantages they must lie under by adopting such a plan, will be so great that had it been imposed upon them, they would think it the greatest evil that every befall them . . .

But it is needless for me to multiply word on a subject which I imagine will soon be without a foundation; I mean by granting a repeal of the late act; and then Parliament may take an everlasting farewell of all their schemes for taxing America for the future, as they find they have no more to do but stand still and see their salvation effected.


We have three sets of people who are equally zealous to promote the non-importation plan. Some there are who really think that life, estate, and everything else, is concerned in the debate, about who shall have the laying on of the paltry three penny tax; this is a frail class. There are other men who trade with Spain, Portugal, etc., in /
in wheat and flour, and never deal in English goods; these are very zealous about non-importation, for then trade will run entirely through their own hands; they will also get a better price for such find goods etc.
as are smuggled in their ships; they are some of the most opulent merchants . . . A third set of people more numerous than both of those put together; they are the men who intend to make fortunes by breaking agreements . . . There is another very respectable class, who are very zealous for non-importation; this consists of people who, for some years past, have imported more goods than they can sell . . . Thus . . . you may guess of our present stock of patriotism . . . Some of the merchants on your side of the water, will doubtless take the alarm; but they must be very green indeed, who can suppose that we shall execute our threats; we have no more thought of drooping trade in earnest, than you have of becoming a Mussulman. We shall rather submit to being taxed a few shillings by the parliament, than to tax ourselves with the ruin of our whole estates, by breaking off trade . . . You will observe by the public prints, that we have all grown very liberal to the poor people in Boston, as a reward for their zeal in the cry of Liberty, though, by the way, they have hitherto proved the most faithless set on the continent . . .; depend upon it, that though the New England people are earnestly beseeching the other provinces to assist them in opposing the hand of tyranny, ninetenths of their own merchants are at this instant ordering goods into every creek and corner and devising every possible method to elude their public engagements. We have not forgot how they treated us last time; but something is necessary just now to save appearances with a sister colony . . . Captain Maciougall has been haranguing the mob once more at Liberty Poll in the Common: He has long been imitating Wilkes, and the likeness increases daily, for they are now equally laughed at and neglected.

America is once more in a flame, and when it will end God only knows. Lord N____ with his train of corrupted s__s, seems determined to drive matters to the last extremity; but it is to be hoped, that the free-born sons of Liberty, on this side of the Atlantick, will not tamely submit to the iron rod of oppression which your corrupt statesmen threaten us with, and convince the world, that the Americans know the value of Liberty, and are only worthy to enjoy her.

We have had some meetings . . to consider what steps are necessary to save us and our posterity from perdition, and to . . support our distressed brethren of Boston, . . . A general congress, consisting of deputies from all the different provinces, is next talked of . . .

. . . the non-importation scheme is again revived; and how far matters may be carried is not known, nor can we foresee this; but you may depend, that it will not take place with the same precipitation it did before, and if it should at all, it will be more extensive and universal over all the colonies.


We are at present very much alarmed here, with regard to the measures your parliament has taken with the colonies. Boston is at present under very arbitrary government . . . It is thought the next thing that will be done, will be to make them deliver up their arms . . but they are a resolute set of people the Bostonians, and are determined not to submit to that but by force. We are very much divided here /
here among ourselves. There is to be a general congress of all the different colonies some time in September, at Philadelphia; but I am much afraid they will not agree there neither. It seems to be the opinion of most people here, that there will be a non-importation and non-exportation agreement entered into here; and if that be the case, goods will be very high, as some of the principal houses of London will not ship any goods out this fall, on account of the disturbances. The Son of Liberty (or, as our freeborn Scots or English here call them the Sons of Violence) think that a non-importation will be the only way they can take to make the parliament withraw their taxations; but I hope they will find themselves mistaken ...


The affairs of this colony suffered a considerable shock by the bankruptcies in Great Britain; from that, and the jealousies entertained concerning the designs of the British Ministry, trade here is of late declined much. The claims of parliament with regard to taxation, and the proceedings with regard to New England, have produced universal discontents. Meetings are held in each colony, and a correspondence carried on between the leading men of the several governments: All seem animated with a firm resolution of opposing to the utmost of their power, claims and exertions of authority, which they consider as tyrannical and illegal.

... Everyone is regarded as an enemy to the liberties of America, who mentions submission to taxes imposed in any form by the British Legislature. At the same time, almost all ranks profess a dutiful attachment and loyalty to his Majesty, and declare their readiness to contribute by their representatives to the expenses of government, and to /
to risk their lives and fortunes in support of his just right to the sovereignty of Britain and his colonies in America.


They talk of non-importation and non-exportation agreements here; but I have the pleasure to inform you, that the people in business and credit, and the judicious and thinking are not of this class, but such as would rejoice to see everything run into confusion. However, the flame is at present so hot, that we dare hardly speak our sentiments. But it will, I hope, soon subside, as our American patriots are for the most part strong only in words. The Philadelphians have taken the lead in proposing some terms of accommodation, modestly enough couched, which I hope will have the desired effect, and bring about a reconciliation.

Extract of some letters from a gentleman on board the squadron off Boston to his friend in Aberdeen. Cal. Mar., Oct. 5, 1774.

There are at present about 2,400 well disciplined troops in and about Boston. One of the regiments commanded by Lord Piercy, and two more are soon expected. The men of /
of war that block up the harbour, are the Preston, Captain, Tartar, Mercury, Lively, and Savage, besides several armed vessels, and some of the transports which brought over the troops. I am sorry to inform you, thinks are not like to take a turn so soon as I could wish. Madness, distraction and rebellion fill the people; and I expect direful will be the consequence. We are daily in expectation of a man or war from England with final instructions to the land and sea commanders. Then the British standard will be hoisted in the camp, and the dismal scene must commence.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman on board the Squadron off Boston, to his friend in Aberdeen, Nantasket Road, Sept. 2. Cal. Mar., Oct. 19, 1774.

New England holds out most obstinately, notwithstanding hundreds are already ruined, and thousands half starved. The clergy are continually in their sermons stirring up the people to rebellion: a remarkable instance of which happened lately in this neighborhood, where the minister, to get his hearers to sign some rebellious papers, advanced with priestly hypocrisy, that the signing them was a material circumstance to their salvation: on which the seduced multitude flew to the pen with an earnestness that sufficiently testified their belief in their worthy pastor. Not a tenth part of the people of this colony are of the Church of England - Anabaptism predominates: though there are vast numbers of Independents, Presbyterians and Quakers. This country is by no means destitute of men of sense and letters. I have heard a ploughman argue on the impropriety and tyranny (as he called it) of the Boston port bill, in a manner that surprised me. The For's behave to us with a civility beyond conception; and the Against's with that sort of jealousy which at once bespeaks their opinion and intention . . . We impatiently wait for the results of the congress which is to be held this day at Philadelphia, as their proceedings must determine our measures.

We learn from Easton that on the 15th ult. a number of the inhabitants of that town assembled together, and erected a tree of Liberty ninety-six feet high, as a monument to be had in everlastig remembrance of an united agreement to maintain Liberty and Property.


In my last I advised you of a vessel being arrived here from London, having tea on board. . . . The people from the country met here; some insisted for hanging Mr. Anthony Stewart, the gentleman who paid the duty of the tea; others were for tarring and feathering him; and a great many were for destroying his house, stores and property; and it was with the greatest difficulty they were appeased with the burning the vessel and tea. Notwithstanding when the question was put to the mob, whether they were for having the vessel burnt or not, a great majority were against burning her; yet the minority threatened so much, that most people thought it best to comply, to prevent worse consequences. From this you may judge what small security people have for their property here. From the proceedings to the northward, I have not now the least hopes but that we must have a civil war in a few months.

Extract /

... The province of Virginia ... is raising one company in every county, which will make a body of six thousand men. They are all independent; and so great is the ambition to get among them, that men who served as commanding officers last war, and have large fortunes, have offered themselves as private men. This province has taken the hint, and has begun to raise men in every county also; and to the northward they have large bodies, capable of quitting themselves with honour in the field. Since the burning of the ship at Annapolis, the common sort seem to think they may now commit any outrage they please; some of them told the merchants yesterday, that if they would not sell them goods, they would soon find a way to help themselves. A certain merchant at Georgetown, 10 miles from this, imported from London ... a large cargo of goods this fall, and thought to sell them higher than common. We understand that a committee is to examine them, and should they find the advance too much, they say he shall and must sell them lower. What think you of this land of liberty, when a man's property is at the mercy of any one that will lead the mob? ...


The state of this country is pretty much the same as when I last wrote you. You will see in the newspapers the resolutions of the Congress. They are such as were expected from men violent in their dispositions, inflamed by sedition, and chosen by a riotous and tumultuous mob. Those resolutions, in the opinion of all sensible and moderate men, never can, or are intended to be put into execution.
execution. They are only thrown out as a bur-bear to in-
timidate the merchants in Britain, and frighten the mini-
stry into a repeal of the late acts, as similar resolu-
tions did a former ministry to repeal the stamp act; but
from the opinion we have of the present administration, we
expect that they will act with that resolution and firm-
ness which becomes the rulers of a great nation. If they
yield, Britain must give up all pretensions to any supra-
macy over her colonies, whom she protected during the last
war, at the expense of so many millions, and at the price
of so much blood. The faction at Boston is now very low.
Believe me, all ranks of people are tired of disorder and
confusion; and as soon as the determination of Great
Britain, to despise their resolves and petitions, is
known, all will be very quiet.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Virginia to his
14, 1775.

Things still go on here in the same manner as when I
wrote you last - everything is in the greatest confusion -
no law in force through the great continent of America.
They say they will acknowledge no other code but that laid
down by Congress - a Scotsman is in danger of his life,
(at least of being tarred and feathered) if he says a word
that does not please them.

They have a set of people chosen for every county,
whom they call committee men; those have the charge of
rummaging all ships, stores, merchants books, etc., when-
ever they please. What glorious work this is! and really
the true spirit of American liberty, to set people to
search merchants books, that cannot perhaps write their
names. I have said enough. I dare say Britain can never
bear such daring insults.

Our Congress have agreed to import no goods from Great Britain and Ireland, until the revenue acts are repealed; by which we cannot send you any orders at present. The disturbances between Great Britain and the colonies will, in all probability, hurt both. Americans will never submit to parliamentary taxation. They are willing to pay all in their power towards supporting government, but it must be agreeable to their charters, and not arbitrarily demanded. More money may be had from the Americans in their own way, than by all their taxations and duty-acts. The quarrel is not properly understood by most people in Scotland and England. They idly conceive, that the Americans want to throw off connection with Great Britain - a gross mistake nothing more distant from their intention. The colonies have their officers in government to support here. They have their assemblies, council and governor, who make laws for them for the regulation of their internal government. We have no representatives at the British senate, nor want any; our charters require none. The violation of our charter rights is the ground of the quarrel. The wanton strides of a despotic Ministry, for encroachments on our privileges, is what Americans mean to oppose, and they will oppose with their blood. Many of them fled here from Episcopal tyranny, and they mean to maintain their just rights.


It may not perhaps be disagreeable to you, to hear some account of the politics of this country. John Hancock, a counsellor under the late administration, a man of property, is the ostensible leader of patriotism. He is
a man of irreproachable honesty and benevolence, but of a weak ambition; and is a generous dupe to another of deeper designs, who is Samuel Adams, a man of cunning and abilities, but of no reputation. He was formerly collector of the town taxes; in which capacity he is alleged to have cheated the town of no less than 2,000 l. Sterling, and is now principle delegate to the Grand American Congress. The next in order is Dr. Young, a man of no property, a stranger in this country till lately. He is a man of a bold seditious temper, and was banished from Albany for atheistical principles. Then follow Drs. Warren and Church; men of acknowledged abilities, possessing no property, and thriving by the dissentions they promote. Josiah Quincy, a firebrand in politics, a tolerable orator, and an inflammatory writer, is sent over an agent to Great Britain. William Phillips is a man of property, but of very little understanding. William Denny, a man of considerable fortune, is become a patriot to screen himself from the resentment of the populace; he is even obnoxious to his own party. Josiah Greenleaf, William Cooper and Sam. Nolandeux, are men of seditious principles, and of little property. The Rev. Mess. Chauncy and Cooper are not the least active of our patriots in stirring up the people to sedition by their inflammatory sermons, exciting them to arms, and every act of desperation in defence of their religion, which they represent to be in the most imminent danger.

Such are our present rulers, and it is amazing to think what influence they have. The Continental Congress, having approved of their conduct, has given them great spirits, which they show in indocent addresses to the Governor, and attacks upon innocent individuals. In particular, they beset the house of a Mr. Scott, a merchant, who had sold us some military stores, which had lain on his hands for many years; and used the poor man with great indignity.

Three Episcopal clergymen, as well as all the counsellors, judges, officers of the customs, etc., have been forced by persecution, to fly here for protection. Colonel Frye, a gentleman at Salem, once obnoxious, who thought he had made his peace with the people, had lately fire set to his house, which consumed it with ten other good dwelling houses, besides several stores, to the amount of 10,000 l. Sterling.

Just now all our trade with Britain is stopt, and nothing of any kind is allowed to be imported from thence. How long this will continue, it is very hard to know, as it entirely depends upon the resolutions of Parliament with regard to American affairs, which we all wait with the utmost expectation.

Two merchants here, for landing goods clandestinely from on board a vessel from England, since the non-importation agreement commenced, have been obliged to make the greatest acknowledgements of their error, in the newspapers, and shut up their stores, and give assurances, that during the continuance of this agreement, they are to carry on no business whatever; and it was with difficulty the violent party was restrained from driving them out of the country; but the moderate men and friends of government interposed to check such a spirit of persecution, although they could not approve of the conduct of these two merchants as they gave their word of honour the vessel and cargo should be sent away without breaking bulk. We hear the London merchants are petitioning in our favours; but I can never let myself think the Parliament will agree to the demands of our Congress; at least, if they do, they may bid an eternal farewell to all superiority here for the future. You no doubt think we are a sad set here, and with some reason; for I believe that posterity will hardly credit that all this trouble and confusion proceeded from Parliament's taking off 9d duty from tea, and leaving 9d behind. Who would not fight, rather than be deprived of the liberty of paying trouble for what they buy? I was in hopes all our differences would have been amicably settled, provided our Congress had been moderate; but as this was not the case, I dread the consequence. As to Massachusetts Bay, I cannot see how Government, after receiving so many insults, can retract, or preserve their dignity, without bringing that province to a sense of their duty, and just subordination to Parliament. I believe they expect to smart for their obstinacy, as they are preparing with the utmost expedition to be in readiness to take the field if they should see occasion for it. Little, it seems, do they/
they know of the dreadful consequence of rebellion, or they would not rush so headlong on it; but they are so much buoyed up with their own importance, that they think Great Britain has it not in her power to conquer them. If it comes to that, soon will they be convinced of the contrary to their sad experience. An affair not very much in favour of their valour happened in that province a few weeks ago. Two soldiers having deserted from a party which was stationed at the town of Marshfield, a sergeant was sent after them on horseback. He was soon overtaken by a captain of militia and two of his men, armed with firelocks, who gave him very abusive language. The sergeant could not bear to be longer insulted, but jumping off his horse, and clapping a pistol to the captain's breast, swore, that if he did not instantly lay down his arms, and make his men do the same, he would shoot him through the body. The poor fellow immediately dropped his musket, as did his companions; and the sergeant carried them to a neighboring town, before a justice of the peace, who bound them over to their good behaviour. While they were there, a mob began to assemble round the door, which the sergeant perceiving, he addressed himself to the captain, and told him he saw what was going forward, that he did not regard his own life, but that he would have the consolation of destroying him first; therefore, if he had a mind to save himself, he must instantly command the mob to disperse. Upon which the paltry fellow, thrusting his head out of the window, desired them to be under no uneasiness on his account, for that the sergeant was a very civil gentleman. Upon this they all went home, and the sergeant returned triumphantly to Marshfield.

In this province I believe there are more friends than enemies to government; our assembly have rejected the proceedings of the Congress, and are drawing up a state of grievances, with a petition to his Majesty, and a memorial and remonstrance to the Lords and Commons. If all the assemblies of the continent had taken this dutiful and peaceable method, harmony might soon have been restored.

A vessel just now arrived from Virginia, brings the following intelligence, that when they left Virginia, the disturbances there were very dismal; but principally at New York, where the rebels and loyalists have gone to loggerheads, and there has been much bloodshed. The Judges at New York, in attempting to recover some debts from different persons, for behalf of their creditors, have been abused and insulted in the very courthouse, and put to the disagreeable necessity of firing amongst, and killing several of the mob, who next day assembled in great numbers, and made prisoners of the Sheriff and Judges; and when the ship left Virginia, they were every moment expecting the account of their being all put to death.


Before this comes to your hand, you will, no doubt, have heard of an engagement between his Majesty's troops and the provincials, near Boston, in which a great number on both sides have been killed, but by far the greatest number on the side of the troops who began the assault; they made an inglorious retreat, and with difficulty got back to Boston. The colonies are now more united than ever. Two days ago the inhabitants of this city, on whom the ministry had great dependence, entered into an association, in which they resolve, in the most solemn manner, never to become slaves; and bind themselves by all the ties of religion, honour, and love to their country, to adopt and carry into execution whatever measures may be recommended by the Continental Congress, that is to meet
at Philadelphia the 10th instant. The New England colonies intend to keep in pay an army of 30,000 men, till they obtain a redress of their grievances, but at the same time are determined to act only on the defensive. All the other colonies are in arms. The Americans will, in general, be soldiers as well disciplined as his Majesty's troops. The Americans seek nothing but the enjoyment of the liberties and privileges they have always been in possession of; and the present convulsions did not originate from them. Believe me, that the united powers of Great Britain and Ireland cannot (humanly speaking) subdue America, if the Americans abide by their present resolutions.


I am sorry to inform you of the disagreeable situation we are in at present, occasioned by the late tyrannic acts of parliament; however, the newspapers will inform you much better of the state of politics, than any private correspondent; but this you may depend on, that whatever may be the opinion of the people on your side the Atlantic, the Americans will defend their rights and liberties, or perish in the attempt.

... And, to speak of the natives, they are as changeable as the weather ... Today, they are stanch friends to the King - tomorrow, the same - the third day comes a frost, a killing frost, nips them in the bud; and then they become patriots for American Liberty.

This is a strange sort of liberty. They term it a civil and religious liberty. "Our civil and religious liberty", say they, "the first is, to tar, and the other, to feather. Do you drink tea, Sir? I say, Do you make use of that detested weed? Perhaps I do, Sir - You do.' A complaint is immediately made to the committee, who issue out their bull as follows:

"Whereas _____ stands accused and convicted of having made use of that detested article tea, that poison to America, in his family, which is contrary to our civil and religious liberties:

Therefore, resolved, and it is the opinion of this Committee, That the said _____ should be tarred and feathered, et. etc." A true extract from the minutes.

Secretary

Thus you see how matters go on here. The mob immediately take the alarm, seize you by the collar, and, in a twinkling, have you stripped. A cann of tar, and a brush, stands by, with which they paint you black. A pillow of feathers is brought, which they shake upon you. And then you make a circumbendibus round the town, amidst the shouts of these civil and religious gentleman, who are pleased to see the genteel appearance you cut.

When I speak of Religious Liberty, I must make mention of an old Dutch preacher we have here, and who is, at this present time, seeking the Lord (in the manner Cromwell was wont) on behalf of Boston. This fellow, I say, has the impudence to stir up the people to sedition, under the article /
article of Religious Liberty. We had an account, last week, of a skirmish which happened between some of the King's troops and the people of Boston, in which the former were worsted... old Hunka thought it his duty to give the people a political discourse, on this topic, last Sunday; Ref to Lord before us, who shall tant against us? wherein he showed what the Lord had done for Boston, etc. This day he has proclaimed a fast to seek the Lord... Now, is it not damn'd hard for the friends of Government to hear this hungry fellow, who has now put his belly full of good things — this adder, for he may be likened to the adder in Aesop, who bit the bosom which cherished and revived it from the perishing cold — snow and bellow treason. Instead of a pulpit, give him a gallows fifty cubits high.


The Americans are grossly misrepresented at home. They have not the remotest design of turning independent. They are ten times better subjects to his Majesty, than the present race of Jacobites that seem to bear the swav in Britain... Providence has united the Americans, andanimated them to such a degree of courage, that it may fitly be called a Political Prodigy. You who are at home have a very faint idea of it... were I to tell you all the circumstances, you would scarcely believe them. Since the skirmish in New England, the sound of war is heard in all the colonies. It seems to be as parallel to the preparations of Scotland, about the year 1638, as any thing ever I read of. It is easy for Providence to give the day now to the Americans, as to the Scots at that period. And the truth is, if American remain firmly united, all the power of Britain is not able to subdue her... They may destroy the sea-ports. But what will they gain by that? Such a victory /
victory would be a defeat. What victory would it be for a madman to cut off his own limbs? . . .
A Letter over a pseudonym of Benjamin Franklin in
the Cal. Mer., Sept. 26, 1768:

queries recommended to the Consideration of those
Gentlemen, who are for vigorous measures with the Americans.

1. Have the Colonists refused to answer any reasonable requisition made to their Assemblies by the mother country?

2. If they have not refused to grant reasonable aids in the way, which they think consistent with Liberty, why must they be stripped of their property without their own consent, and in a way, which they think inconsistent with Liberty?

3. What is it for a people to be enslaved and tributary, if this be not, viz. To be forced to give up their property at the arbitrary pleasure of persons, to whose authority they have not submitted themselves, nor chosen for the purpose of imposing taxes upon them? Wherein consisted the impropriety of King Charles's demanding ship-money by his sole authority, but in its being an exercise of power by the King, which the people had not given the King? Have the people of America, as the people of Britain, by sending Representatives, consented to a power in the British Parliament to tax them?

4. Has not the British Parliament, by repealing the stamp-act, acknowledged that they judged it improper? Is there any difference between the stamp-act, and the act obliging the Americans to pay whatever we please, for articles which they cannot do without, as glass and paper? Is there any difference as to justice between our treatment of the colonists, and the tyranny of the Carthaginians over their conquered Sardinians, when they obliged them to take all their /
their corn from them, and at whatever price they pleased to set upon it?

5. If that be true, which is commonly said, viz. That the mother country gains two millions a year by the colonies, would it not have been wiser to have gone on quietly in the happy way we were in, till our gains by those rising and flourishing countries should amount to three, four or five millions a year, than by these new-fashioned vigorous measures to kill the goose which lays the golden eggs? Would it not have been better policy, instead of taxing our colonists, to have done whatever we could to enrich them, and encourage them to take off our articles of luxury, on which we may put our own price, and thus draw them into paying a voluntary tax; than deluge them in blood, thin their countries, empooverish and distress them, interrupt their commerce, force them on bankruptcy, by which our merchants must be ruined, or tempt them to emigrations, or alliances with our enemies?

6. The late war could not have been carried on without America, nor without Scotland? Have we treated America and Scotland in such a manner as is likely in future wars to encourage their zeal for the common cause? Or is England alone to be the Drawcansir of the world, and to bully not only her enemies, but her friends?

7. Are not the subjects of Britain concerned to check a ministry, who, by this rage of heaping taxes on taxes, are only drawing into their own hands more and more wealth and power, while they are hurting the commercial interest of the empire in general, at the same time that, amidst profound peace, the national debt and burden on the public continue undiminished?

N. M. C. N. P. C. H.
APPENDIX C

Report on the General Assembly, Cathcart, Lord High Commissioner to the General Assembly, to Suffolk, Secretary of State, Edin., May 29, 1776, PRO, SP 54/46:

"The great object I have had in view since the Meeting of this Assembly has been to Engage the Members to make a proper Address on the Subject of the Present Crisis, and to be unanimous in that Measure.

I found, on my Arrival, that Opinions were various in many Respects, Some so very Zealous, and others so desirous of either not addressing at all, or, of admitting of no Expression in the Address which imported any thing contrary to the respective Ideas of Individuals, that the Question was reduced to this, to carry a proper Address by a very great Majority or not to Address, for fear of Divisions and Protests, threatened by Many, and apprehended by All.

I was not satisfied with either Alternative, and Said, that being unable to go abroad, Cathcart was indisposed during the first days of the session, I would Employ Myself in talking with the principal Ministers thought to be most disinclined and could form no Judgement till I had Sounded them.

I accordingly Sent for Them, told them I had never Influenced any Member of Assembly by the communication of any wish of Mine in Ecclesiastick Matters, thinkin it better and Safer to leave the Determination to their own Judgement. But, that there was at present, a Matter of State in which I deeply Interested Myself, upon which I had loudly declared My Wishes both as his Majesty's High Commissioner and as their Sincere Friend, and that I thought I should have been wanting in the Respect due to Them personally if I had not Sent for Them, that I might open Myself to Them with the same cordiality with which I had spoken to others whom I had more frequent Access to See.
I then showed them in a few words the present State of the Publick and the manifest wisdom and clemency of His Majesty's Measures, in order if America is disposed, to accept of the most Gracious opening now in Her Power, to prevent the Effusion of Blood.

After much very fair Reasoning we parted, with this Assurance on their part, that if every one was as fond of unanimity as I was, They would not be backward, and would not only not oppose, but would Support any Address not Caution and the work of Party, if previously communicated.

I then proceeded with My Friends in the Consideration of a proper Address for the Occasion. No easy Task: and it was agreed that I should come to the Assembly on Monday, that by what I should have Occasion to Say, I should Endeavour to Unite the Audience as much as possible, and that the Address would be immediately afterwards Moved and Seconded.

On Monday I found the Assembly fuller than I had ever Seen it and in Expectation from the importance of the Subject and the particular way of thinking of a very few Members, of a great debate.

I must ask your Lordship's Permission to trouble you with a Copy of the words I made use of after having taken my Place and must Intreat your Indulgence that they may be scanned by no other Rule than their Subserviency to the purpose of the Moment, not having given any copy to Clark, least they should not in every thing, be approved of.

As I never had a more eager desire to Succeed, as the Issue was not Certain, and as I did not speak from Notes, I am persuaded I never was, upon any Occasion, so much Animated. The Effect, as I was assured, Answered my wishes, and I received Thanks from all quarters and the Motion for the Address, when made, passed by a very loud agree without a Question.

Yesterday morning I was again in My Place, and the Address upon the Report was read Paragraph by Paragraph, in an Assembly equally full, and was also passed without a Question,
question, by the word 'Agree.'

Allowances I hope your Lordship will make for our Difficulty. Having received it signed by their Moderator and Intrusted to Me to Convey to His Majesty, I have the Honour to transmit and Recommend it to Your Lordship for that purpose.

I must not Conclude without Expressing the Assistance I have Received from My Lord Advocate, Mr Solicitor General, The Moderator, Principal Robertson, Doctor Shaw and Several others.

I have also the Honour to transmit to Your Lordship another Loyal and Dutiful Address to His Majesty from the Assembly on occasion of the Encroachment of His Majesty's Royal Family by the Birth of a Princess; and, there being no Post, I thought Your Lordship would not Dislike to Receive them both by Express.

There being no Business to detain the Assembly beyond Monday, which being the usual day, I then propose to do Myself the Honour to Dissolve Them in His Majesty's Name and I shall not fail to Acquaint Your Lordship of it.

I have the Honour to be, with the Greatest Truth and Respect, etc.

Cathcart

(Enclosure)

"Right reverend, and Right Honorable,

I cannot omit this first Opportunity of expressing to you, the Concern I have felt, in having been so long deprived of the honor of taking my Place amongst you, and at the same Time entreat you to accept my best Acknowledgements for your kind Sympathy, and Indulgence, under that Circumstance.

I did not fail to report to my Sovereign those Dispositions of Affection to his Royal Person, & Zeal for his Government, /
Government, of which, in your Message, on the first Day of your meeting you gave me so ample Assurance; and I have also forwarded to his Majesty, your dutiful Answer to the Letter he was graciously pleased to write to you.

I ought not farther to delay your Proceedings in your Business, and yet, when I behold this Venerable Assembly, when I see their Eyes fixt upon me, standing where I have the Honor to stand, those rise Emotions in my Breast, universally felt, if I read your Countenances right, in those of this Reverend Audience, which are too strong to be suppressed, and I must address some words to you, with that Openness I always use, upon the awful Prospect which the present Situation of Publick Affairs presents a Situation, which every one must see, and sensibly feel, and against which, however in some Lights unpleasing, and alarming, no good Citizen can shut his Eyes.

Far be it from me to go back to the Means by which we have been brought into the Situation, in which it is the Will of Divine Providence, we now stand. The Business of the Moment, is the Situation of the Moment, and to that I mean to speak.

Most of the Colonys, of N. America are in Arms, under the declared Resolution of resisting to the last Extremity, the authority of the King in his Parliament, and the Supremacy of the British Legislature.

They have not confined their Resistance to Defence, but have Hostily attacked and seized his Majestys Fortresses, wrested the Province of Canada from the British Crown, and made a violent, the unsuccessful Attempt to make themselves Masters of its Capital.

On the other Side, the British Nation, justly alarmed by so considerable a Defection, and upon Principles so Dangerous, irritated by aggressions so daring, and necessitated to recover what is lost, to secure and protect what remains, and to support the Acts, and supreme Jurisdiction of her own Legislature, over the whole Empire, has sent forth Fleets and Armies, which if it pleases God, to permit them to arrive at their Destination, will be stronger than any /
any Necessity that can be calculated.

This formidable Muster of British Armies ranged over against British Subjects, and Colonists, in arms against the Laws of their Country, would afford no Prospect but the Reduction of America by Force, were not the Wisdom and Policy of his Majesty accompanied by the milder Qualities of Mercy and Affection. But upon this Occasion his Royal Clemency has suggested to him, to grace with the Olive Branch those Hands which are charged with the Thunder of the war by Sea, and by Land.

Those great Commanders are Brothers, no Hazard of their Disagreement, and their high Reputation for Fidelity, for Valour, for Prudence, and for the tenderest Feelings of Humanity, is equally known and acknowledged in Great Britain and in America, and by the Friends and by the Enemies of the one, and of the other; so that no Stop to Wisdom could suggest has been omitted by his Majesty, whereby the Bonds of Union and of Subordination, necessary to hold together the various Parts of the British Empire may be immediately renewed without Effusion of Blood, unless America, neglecting the Opening, now so graciously afforded to her, should prefer the Decision of the Sword.

The Comfort and Satisfaction I ever receive in this Reflection, gave me Reason to think that if there should be those, in this Reverend Assembly whose Pious Occupations, and whose Distance from Scenes of Business may have rendered it less palpable to them, they would hear it from me with equal Satisfaction, and with equal Comfort, whilst those who are better informed, of whom many surround this Throne, will rejoice in the Knowledge and Conviction they have, of the Truth of what I have said. Happy for this Part of the Kingdom, and this Venerable Assembly in particular, that their long and steady Perseverance in the Support of Government, has gained them the Honor, Estimation, and Confidence in the Eyes of their Sovereign, which they deserve, and which I stand pledged to his Majesty in every Report I have ever made, they will ever continue to deserve.

I think it the great Honour of my Life, that I have been so often in a Situation to do you Justice, and I shall be
be extremely happy in every opportunity this Meeting may furnish me with, of showing my sincere Respect & Desire to serve you".
APPENDIX D

Draft of an address to the king read in the Provincial Synod of Dumfries on the first Tuesday of October, 1777, by the Reverend Mr. Muirhead, minister of Urr, in consequence of an overture made, "That the Synod should testify against the present ruinous and unnatural war in America", Gal. Mer., Feb. 16, 1778:

Most Gracious Sovereign!

We, your most dutiful & affectionate subjects, the Ministers and Elders of the Synod of Dumfries, provincially convoced, concur with ourselves, that we are citizens of a country, whose power is not confined to one individual, whose authority obtains in reasonable gradations; and where every member of the commonwealth is a guardian of its prosperity.

Confiding in the immunities of such a constitution, we beg leave to approach the throne in the genuine spirit of sincerity, and to profess that affection for your Majesty's person, and that zeal for the interests of your family, which, in the day of trial, may distinguish good subjects from mercenary sycophants.

Permit us, however, Sir, to mingle, with the assurances of duty and obedience, those presages of detriment to your Majesty's glory and of calamity to your dominions, which the present ruinous and unnatural war in America suggest to multitude of Britons, who love their country.

Suffer us to express our fear too, that the present sanguinary measures of your Ministers may fall short of the ends proposed; and that they, by sowing hatred in the field of devastation, may occasion your people to retrace disgrace and vengeance.
Amongst the various objects which call the attention of your Majesty's humanity, perhaps the most deplorable is the situation of your American subjects, whose age and sex render them as incapable of guilt towards your Majesty, as of defence against the cruelty of murderous and bloody savages, hired for their destruction. We humbly hope, Sir, that a resource against such unheard of evils will be found in the providence of God, and in the wisdom, as well as clemency, of your Majesty.

We pretend not, Sir, to direct your saecality, nor to influence your counsels; our temporal views are humble, and our church is of no importance. Nevertheless, in the midst of that distraction which civil discord has produced, we think it our duty to implore the Eternal, that your Majesty may be blessed with a double portion of the spirit of that holy religion which commands men to seek peace, and ensue it; and, with humility, to insinuate, that the greatest monarchs, and best benefactors of mankind have been the best friends to pacific measures.

That God may preserve your Majesty from the delusions of the bad, and bless to you all the counsels; that he may direct you to those measures which are for his own glory, and the happiness of your people; that by the wisdom from above, he may fortify you against the destructive maxims of the unfortunate family succeeded by your illustrious ancestors; and that, after a long, and glorious, and happy reign, he may call you from a temporal and transitory crown, to the crown of life is the fervent prayer of,

May it please your Majesty,

Your Majesty's devoted and affectionate subjects
AP PEN DIX E

A report on the support in the west of Scotland for Lord George Gordon, with an account of the origin of the Eighty Five Societies, Robert Sinclair, Sheriff of Lanark to Thomas Miller, Lord Justice Clerk, Glasgow, Feb. 3, 1781, PRO, SP 54/48:

"My Lord,

I have the honour to acquaint your Lordship, that agreeable to your Instructions I came here upon Tuesday last. My arrival alarmed the Printers, who had been told that the Sheriff of Mid-Lothian had prevented some Publications, and imagined I was come here with a purpose of that kind; but as I took care to ascribe it to a Precognition, which actually has employed me for some days past, my real business has never been so much as suspected. The Morning after my arrival, I waited on the Provost with Your Lordship's Letter, who was perfectly sensible of the propriety of the injunction to secrecy, and we agreed in opinion that we should not so much as mention the Letter to his Brethren in the Magistracy. I had the pleasure to learn from him, that at present, he had not the smallest apprehension of any Comotions breaking out in this City, and I am happy to inform your Lordship, that after making the most prudent Inquiries I could think of, I entertain the same opinion. It is indeed true that the Newspapers here, are overloaded with fanatical Resolutions, Declarations, etc., as your Lordship will perceive from the enclosed News Paper, almost a whole impression of which has been sent off to London; but there is no reason to suspect that those Resolutioners mean anything more offensive than Words, and I am now to inform your Lordship that the first idea of those numerous Publications is not Their own, but was a Suggestion, or rather a requisition from the Other side of the Tweed."
Some weeks ago, Paterson, the President of the Eighty Five Societies received a letter from Alderman Bull importing that Lord George Gordon's Counsel had advised, and his Friends wished to have Newspaper Resolutions etc., in regard to Him, and the Protestant Cause of which he had been the Champion, published in Scotland, and disseminated there, and thro' England, without loss of time; and the Letter contained a Specimen of what was wanted, said to be drawn up by Mr. Erskine. Immediately upon receipt of this respectable Epistle, a Meeting of the Eighty Five Societies was held, a Resolution published, & all the Heads & hands of the Subordinate Societies were employed, in procuring it a large band of followers. What could induce Lord George's Counsel, or Friends to advise a measure, in my humble opinion, immediately tending to his destruction, if he shall be condemned, is what I cannot comprehend, nor would I believe my information upon this head, if I had not received it from One upon whose Veracity I can fully rely & who told Me his Author was a Member of the Eighty Five Societies, Who had actually read the Letter from Alderman Bull. This anecdote meanwhile suggests the disagreeable reflection, that of Lord George's Counsel, or any of his Party, shall eventually be so wrongheaded as to prescribe Turults Here, it might endanger the Public Tranquility; tho' I am at a loss to imagine against whom the mischiefs of a Mob could be directed, for in fact we have very few Papists Here, & the One who was the unfortunate Sufferer at the last Insurrection has prudently changed his Religion, & become a Member of the Anteburgher Secession Community. Before concluding (tho' I have already encroached too far on Your Lordship's time, & patience) I wish to give your Lordship some idea of the Institution of the 85 Societies, which made such a figure in the News Papers. In, & about the City of Glasgow, there have long subsisted a numerous lot of Societies, whose only business was to provide for Their poor & aged Members, by certain stated contribution, which produced one general Fund. These Societies for a long time, had no connexion with One another in any respects; but the intended abolition of the penal Laws against the Papists, united 85 of them to this effect, that their eighty five presidents were formed into one Society, to watch over the interests of Religion in general, & in particular to oppose any alteration of Law favourable to the
the Papists; for which purpose each of the subordinate Societies (who upon the whole may consist of betwixt 8 & 9 thousand Persons, mostly of the lower, & none above the middle rank of Life) subscribed a certain sum to be paid out of Their public Funds. Their Subscriptions it seems, have been much larger than what was requisite for the original intention of them, the Victory over the Popish Bill having cost only so many per Cents of the Sums subscribed; but since Alderman Bull's Letter, I am informed a new call of about 7 per Cent, has been made by the Society of the 85 Societies, in order to defray the expence of these Publications which that Letter pointed out, & recommended. I have the honour to be, etc.

Rt. Sinclair

P.S. If Lord George is acquitted, I dare say the Mob will insist on illuminations. If they are guilty of no outrage perhaps it will be as prudent not to interfere in that respect. Is that your Lordship's opinion?
APPENDIX F

Address from the ministers and elders of the Provincial Synod of Galloway, dated at Kirkcudbright, April 24, transmitted to the Earl of Shelburne, and laid before the King, printed in part in the Scots Mag., XIV (May 1782), 276-277:

"We behold with great indignation, the peace of your Majesty's reign disturbed, and the nation involved in a long and expensive war, by so many confederated powers, a war which requires the utmost exertions of the state to support the honour and dignity of your crown, and the sacred and civil liberties of your people; but we confide in the wisdom of your Majesty's councils, under Divine Providence, for disappointing their wicked designs, and terminating the war by an honourable peace.

We view, with particular satisfaction, that disinterested plan of economy which your Majesty has so nobly and seasonably recommended to your parliament, and which, we trust, when followed out to its full extent by the generous and vigorous efforts of your Majesty and your present ministers, will effectually repress a spirit of luxury and corruption, and encourage public virtue by the force of the highest examples.

We rejoice to see your Majesty's parliament employed in restoring our civil constitution to that noble state in which it was established at the glorious Revolution. We pray God may direct their hearts and strengthen their hands, for the completion of that very important work, which will exalt the dignity of your Majesty's crown more than the conquest of many nations".
Address of the freeholders, justices of the peace, and commissioners of supply of the stewartry of Kirkcudbright, printed in part in the Scots Mag., XLIV (May 1782), 277:

"We have with admiration and pleasure received the accounts of those gracious messages, which your Majesty has been pleased to send to both of your Houses of Parliament, recommending public economy and reformation throughout the departments of the state; and we with joy beheld your Majesty making the parliamentary sentiments of your people the rule of your choice of ministers, and honouring those with your royal confidence who appeared to possess the confidence of your people.

"We have seen the most formidable combination of powers formed to distress your Majesty and these realms that hath ever appeared on any occasion, when your Majesty was left alone, without the aid of a single ally, to carry on a desperate, bloody, and expensive war against them; but we rejoice in the prospect of that war being speedily terminated by a safe, honourable, and lasting peace, which we hope the spirit and wisdom of your Majesty's councils will effectuate".
APPENDIX G

In the latter half of the eighteenth century debating societies were a highly popular entertainment in Britain. It is unfortunate that records are not available for the debates of the most important of these societies in Scotland during the American Revolution. The Pantheon Society was founded in 1773, probably transformed from a parliamentary debating club called The Robinhood. Attendance at its debates was not limited to members, and ladies especially were encouraged to attend. The meetings, held sometimes weekly and sometimes twice monthly in the Thistle Lodge and occasionally in Mary's Chapel, were lively social functions at which the debates were the high point of the evening's entertainment. Newspaper notices suggest clergy-men and advocates were frequent participants in the debates, as might be expected, and crowds numbering up to 300 taxed the capacities of the meeting halls. Entertainment and practice in public speaking rather than serious political discussion were the main purposes of the club. When American affairs reached a crisis, serious political questions intruded into the meetings, to the regret of some /
Advertisements and brief reports of meetings which appeared with fair regularity in the Caledonian Mercury (and other Edinburgh papers) show that political topics were more frequently considered as the difficulties with America multiplied. The political subjects offered for debate together with the incidental comment about the meetings as they were reported in the Caledonian Mercury are listed here and presented as a fragmented commentary on Edinburgh interest in national political questions between 1775 and 1783. Details are very limited; the results of some debates were reported, while for others no information is available beyond the question scheduled for discussion.

The first notice of a political topic describes a debate in August, 1775, when the Society discussed the question "whether lenient or coercive measures should be followed with our American colonies?" Many speakers, much oratory, and acute reasoning kept a decision long in doubt, the speakers on each side being nearly equal. At the vote a small majority /

---

1Some background information on the society is given in The Book of the Old Edinburgh Club, I (Edinburgh 1908), 47 ff. No information is given on the debates.
majority was found in favour of coercive measures. The society scheduled for the same month the question "whether is the Constitution of Great Britain in greater danger from the Encroachments of the Crown, or from those of the Subjects?" In January 1776 they considered whether "Is modern Patriotism of service to Liberty?" As described in the newspaper, the meeting was "uncommonly crowded, and, judging from the number of speakers, the earnestness, and eloquence with which they delivered their opinions, the subject is the most important yet considered by the society". Thirteen spoke on each side, most of whom were visitors, and as several others were anxious to rise after the hour for collecting votes, the final discussion of the subject was deferred to the next meeting when another "interesting and well supported debate" was anticipated.

The next meeting was not reported, and another political topic does not appear until April 1778. At that time the question debated was, "Whether or not the present Ministry should be continued?" The house was crowded and

---

3 Ibid., Jan. 27, 1776.
the speakers politic and erudite. Following the debate a vote was carried by 14 that the ministry should not be dismissed. The account of the meeting concludes with a startling item, complimentary to the importance of the society if true. Certain reports had insinuated that bribes were distributed by friends of the Administration among some Pantheon members in order to prevent an unfavorable decision which might have considerable influence among his Majesty's subjects in North Britain. This, it is declared, "we may imagine is a vague report . . ."4

The report of bribery at the Pantheon brought an indignant letter to the printer which described the report as malicious. However, the correspondent thought that despite the vote recorded the greater number of speakers had favored the dismissal of the ministry, and he enlarged on the factious motivation for such views.5

In June 1778 the Society discussed the question, "Have the present gentleman in the minority contributed to the cause of liberty?" In November they raised the question, /

4Cal. S.T.C., April 4, 1778.
5Ibid., April 11, 1778.
question, "Is it for the interest of Great Britain to treat with America as Independent States?"  

Pessimism dominated the political questions considered in 1779. In August the question was, "Is it expedient in the present crisis to withdraw our land forces from America, and employ them against the House of Bourbon?" After an animated debate in which a majority of the speakers were against withdrawing the forces, the assembly voted by a majority of 33 that it was not expedient. It was decided at this meeting to consider soon the question, "Are the Common Council of London culpable in refusing to assist the Government in the present situation of affairs?" In October the Society was scheduled to ask, "Has our want of success in the Present war been most owing to those who formed the plans, or to those who were entrusted with the execution?" The interest in volunteer forces in lieu of a Scottish militia was reflected in a debate, December 23, 1779, on the subject. /

---

7 Ibid., August 14, 1779.
8 Ibid., Sept. 18, 1779.
subject, "Is it consistent with the respect we owe Government to take up Arms at the present period?" A great majority voted that it was consistent. 9

The Pantheon was quick to give consideration to the county reform movement in England. Debated in April 1780, the question was phrased as follows, "Does the present conduct of Opposition, in procuring county associations tend to the real advantage of the British Empire?" The result of the voting was a narrow majority of four in the affirmative.10 In May the Society asked, "Whether Members of Parliament were bound to follow the instructions of their constituents?" This question was determined in the negative by a considerable majority.11 In November they scheduled the question, "Whether Great Britain is verging more towards an Absolute Monarchy, or a Republic?"12

In May 1781 the Society inquired "Whether has the Discovery of North America been of more advantage or prejudice to /

---

10Ibid., April 12, 1780.
11Ibid., May 27, 1780.
12Ibid., Nov. 6, 1780.
to the real interest of Great Britain?"\textsuperscript{15} A month later they returned to a question debated first in 1779: "Would it be for the interest of Great Britain, at the present crisis, to withdraw her forces from America, and employ them against the French and Spanish West India Islands?"\textsuperscript{14} In November, at a time when advices of the sad position of Cornwallis were becoming more frequent and foreboding and numerous letters on the American disaster urged that the Americans be left to themselves in order to allow concentration on the French and Spaniards, the Society debated the question, "Whether has Great Britain, America, France, Spain, or Holland, the greatest cause to repent of the present war?"\textsuperscript{15}

In January 1782 the assembly voted in the negative on the question, "Ought the present Ministry to be dismissed his Majesty's Councils?"\textsuperscript{16} In the same month at the request of a very respectable honorary member the society also /

\textsuperscript{13}Cal. Mar., May 5, 1781.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., June 20, 1781.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., Nov. 21, 1781.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., Jan. 12, 1782.
also asked, "Should the American war be immediately terminated?" After a full debate of over three hours the question was decided by a majority in the affirmative. 17

In June, after some discussion on the propriety of the question, the Society considered whether, "Is it proper to address his Majesty upon the late change of the Ministry?" The question aroused so much interest and participation that three meetings were given to its discussion before it was finally voted in the negative by a majority of 123. 18

Two meetings were given to the question, "Ought the rejection of the Scots Militia Bill to be considered as an unfavourable event to this country?" The vote was in the affirmative. 19 American questions were then taken up again. "Should Britain prosecute the war with America, or sue for Peace through the medium of France?" The decision was against peace through the channel mentioned. 20 They next debated, "Whether ought Lord Shelburne's or Mr. Fox's plan /

17 Cal. Mor., Jan. 17, 1782.
18 Ibid., June 26, July 6, 10, 17, 1782.
19 Ibid., July 20, 31, 1782.
20 Ibid., July 31, Aug. 7, 1782.
plan of Accommodation with America to be preferred?" The latter was favored by a considerable majority. Three questions arising out of local political agitation were accented by Pantheon debates. The question, "Ought the splitting of votes in elections to be allowed?" was determined in the negative with only two votes given to the affirmative. After repeated requests they scheduled the question, "Would it be for the interest of the Incorporations of this city, that the practice of shortening their lots, in the election of Deacons, should be abolished?" Anticipating changes in local affairs as well as in political affairs, the Society asked, "Would it be for the advantage of Scotland, that Trials by Jury should be adopted in civil causes?" In December the last reported debate of the period on American affairs was held. The question was, "Would it be for the interest of Britain at this crisis to conclude a Peace with the Contending Powers, /


Powers, including the Independence of America?" 25

In April 1783, when the notices of a renewal of Scottish emigration were once more appearing in the press, the return to peace time problems was reflected in a debate on the question, "Would it be sound policy in the State to prevent Emigrations to America?" 26

*   *   *


26 Ibid., April 26, 1783.
A list of titles of discourses on political and economic subjects extracted from:


25 Jan., 1765. Mr. Millar: "Some observations on the origin of the English Parliament and the changes which have happened in different periods".

9 Mar., 1765. Mr. R. Foulis: "What is Faction distinguished from Patriotism".

8 Nov., 1765. Mr. R. Foulis: "Discourse concerning the animosity between England and Scotland".

17 Jan., 1766. Mr. Millar: "The origin of the Feudal Law with regard to Property in Europe".

28 Mar., 1766. Dr. Stevenson: "Whether the Separation of the Colonies from G. Britain might not insure her Constitution and real happiness for a longer date".

1 May, 1767. Dr. Reid: "Whether Paper Credit is beneficial or hurtful to a Trading Nation".

11 Nov., 1768. Mr. Anderson: "What is the Conduct proper to be observed with regard to the Colony of N. England".

28 April, 1769. Mr. A. Foulis: "In order to an equal representation of Property and People ought not the powers to be taken from decayed Burghs and given to those which have increased".

5 Jan., 1770. Mr. Millar: "The Condition of Servants in different ages and Countries".

9 March, 1770. General discussion in absence of the speaker, Mr. Cumin, on: "What are the chief defects and Inconveniences attending the British form of Government and how may they be remedied".
16 Mar., 1770. Dr. Williamson: "What is the Principal Cause of the opposition to the present Administration".

'(There is a gap in the record from 1771 to 1776).

5 Mar., 1779. Mr. Graham: "The Probable Consequences with respect to Britain from the Independence of America".

2 April, 1779. Mr. McDermitt: "Has the opposition of the Minority in Parliament to the Measures of Government promoted the interest of Great Britain?"
APPENDIX H

A letter opposing a loyal address on the war from the shire of Ayr, Cal. Mar., Oct. 9, 1775:

For the Caledonian Mercury

To the Noblemen and Gentlemen, Freeholders, Justices of Peace, and Commissioners of Supply of the Shire of Ayr.

My Lords and Gentlemen,

By an advertisement in the newspapers, you are summoned to meet at Ayr, on Wednesday the 11th of October, to consider of an address to his Majesty, on the present situation of public affairs. I can have no doubt, that the unhappy civil war between Great Britain and some of her provinces in America will be the subject of your deliberations; and though the freeholders in one county in Scotland have announced their intentions in terms of asperity, I hope better things of a shire which may justly be ranked amongst the most respectable in the island.

It would be improper to detain you long upon this occasion with arguments upon the important question concerning the right of the British Parliament to impose taxes upon our brethren in America, as so much has already been written upon the subject. But admitting there were such a right, you are now to consider the expediency of attempting to enforce it at the risk of losing altogether those provinces, which, by fair and undisputed commerce, yield Great Britain an immense annual revenue, while, at the same time, the supplies to be obtained by taxation have ever been furnished by free gift, with the utmost liberality, and are offered still to be furnished in the same manner. To say that the Americans are not sincere in their offers, is to urge the base suspicion of ungenerous minds. If we cannot trust their words, while they express their voluntary declarations, are we to trust them, when they express a compelled submission? Is it not better to put confidence in our/
our fellow-subjects, animated with the same spirit, which has often been our boast; a spirit to defend, at all hazards, against the encroachments of power, what they believe to be their rights? Is not this better than, with a vindictive rage, to spread devastation over their country, and reduce them by force of arms, to abject servility, the state of those who submit to what they believe to be tyranny? I would fain flatter myself, that such will be your sentiments; and that, upon the ground of expediency alone, whatever may be the right of taxation, you will have the wisdom and the Spirit to implore his Majesty to listen to the offers of reconciliation.

But if you are not satisfied with this simple state of the case, and think it is incumbent upon you to support the present measures of administration, as far as an address from you can support them, let me humbly entreat, that you will not proceed rashly, but seriously consider, that if these measures are unjust, your approbation of them will, in some degree, load you with the blood of your fellow-subjects, which shall henceforth be shed in unnatural battles. Do not condemn the Americans without a candid attention to their claims.

I trust that none of you will testify your approbation of the present war, till you have carefully perused the charters of all the different Provinces, and until you are clear in your own minds, that notwithstanding what is contained in those charters, upon the faith of which our brethren settled in America, the British Parliament may assume the power of establishing their taxation. Many of you have sat upon Juries, and have not grudged long and painful attention, where the life of only one man was at stake; and will you, without due examination, give your voice, where the lives of thousands are at stake?

If the charter of a Province in America may be altered by the British Legislature, I desire to know what security the people of Scotland have for their charter - the articles of Union? And supposing Administration should think fit to exact, all over Scotland, the same proportion of land tax that is paid in any of the counties in England, I should wish to know, if better arguments could be opposed to /
to it, than those of the Americans? and most certain it is, that, twenty years ago, the Americans as little dreaded the present attempt to wrest from them their long allowed privilege of taxing themselves, as you dread an infringement of the article of Union respecting the moderate quota of your land-tax.

While I thus, my Lords and Gentlemen, with the utmost deference, venture to suggest a few hints, let me, at the same time, assure you, that there is not one of your number more warmly attached to the true constitutional Monarchy of this island, than I am. I write with sincere diffidence, anxious for the honour of a country, which hath been distinguished on memorable occasions. Let us either leave to those, who are actually of our most Gracious Sovereign's Council, the full weight of public affairs, as they shall answer at their peril; or, if we are to volunteer with our advice, let us not follow a thoughtless herd who have gone before us, but sacredly ponder what we are about. And surely, you cannot be displeased with me, for wishing, that if we are doubtful, we should rather lean to the side of mildness and concord.

My Lords and Gentlemen,
Your most obedient
humble servant.

A COMMISSIONER OF SUPPLY
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

This bibliography is merely supplementary to the foot-notes. No attempt is made to list all of the widely scattered materials in which contributions to the study, however small, were found. Sources which only provided items, some of the general background studies, and the composite foot-notes on such topics as aspects of the tobacco trade, the Highland emigration, or the political organization of Scotland are not duplicated. Adequate bibliographies are cited in place of a long list of secondary works. The list of materials is confined to bibliographical aids, a selection of basic secondary works, the periodical press, and the various types of unpublished sources.

In addition to the guides for the records depositories, the following are the main bibliographical aids:


Useful bibliographies listing secondary sources and some primary materials are included in the following:


The standard histories of Scotland have chapters, necessarily limited, on Scotland in the period of the American Revolution. More detailed works are available for some aspects of the subject. Of special interest for the Scottish tobacco trade are:


Knox, John. *A View of the British Empire, more especially Scotland.* London, 1785 (3rd ed.)

Basic works for the history of burgh and county reform from 1782 are:


Fletcher,
Fletcher, Archibald. A Memoir concerning the Origin and progress of the Reform... of the Royal Burghs of Scotland. Edin., 1819.


For the agitation before 1783 there are a few fleeting pamphlets and broadsides, but the main reliance is upon the newspapers and periodicals.

The press has been an important source for almost every aspect of the study. Newspapers and periodicals examined are:

The Caledonian Magazine and Review, I-III (1763).

The Caledonian Mercury, 1763-1783.

The Dumfries Weekly Magazine, I, 1773.

The Edinburgh Advertiser, 1764-1783.

The Edinburgh Evening Courant, 1763-1783.

The Edinburgh Magazine and Review, 1773-1776.

The Glasgow Journal, 1763-1774.

The Glasgow Mercury, 1778-1783.

Ruddiman's Weekly Mercury, 1777-1781.

The Scots Magazine, 1763-1783.

The Weekly Magazine, or Edinburgh Amusement, 1768-1783.

The periodical press is a major source on the patronage debate /
debate and on the questions of the peerage elections and
the Scottish militia. Pamphlets on these topics are
readily located in the catalogues in the Signet and New
College libraries. The fast-day sermons are mainly in
the New College library pamphlet collection.

Manuscript materials include customs records, business
 correspondence, and family and personal papers.

Customs records in the Register House, Edinburgh:

Accounts of Customs of all Goods Imported into and Exported

Controller-Generals Cash Accounts. Annual volumes,
1707-1817.

1786; Ayr, 8 vols., Sept. 1742-Oct. 1786; Dum-
fries, 5 vols., Sept. 1742-Oct. 1786; Greenock,
41 vols., Sept. 1742-Oct. 1785; Leith, 59 vols.,
Sept. 1742-Oct. 1785; Port Glasgow, 39 vols.,

Official correspondence relating to customs in the Custom
House, Greenock (of some value, though chiefly concerned
with problems of securing the revenue):

Letter-Books, Collector at Port Glasgow to the Scottish
Board of Customs Commissioners. Vols. 1-15,
July 1749-1784.

Letter-Books, Scottish Board of Customs Commissioners to
the Collectors at Greenock and Port Glasgow.
Vols. 1-9, 1723-1803.

In the Custom House Library, London:

Minutes of the Scottish Board of Customs Commissioners.
Vols. 1-19, 1723-1783.

Other manuscript material of special interest for the
Glasgow /
Glasgow trade:


The Value of all Goods, Wares, and Merchandize imported into and exported from Scotland compared with the Excess of each Country, commencing anno 1755 to 1787, Melvill Papers. (National Library of Scotland. The document is a reproduction of annual summary pages in a detailed customs record of values of imports and exports for Scotland, 1755-1787. Ledgers of Imports and Exports, Scotland, 1755-1827. PRO Customs 14/1A and ff.).

The most useful materials in the Public Record Office are four volumes of State Papers for Scotland, Series II (SP 54/45-48) which contain papers for the years 1756 to 1781. There is additional material on emigration in T1/500; 47/12. Of interest but with little of value for the subject of this study are Church Books, Domestic Entry Books, Criminal Entry Books, and Warrant Books for the relevant years. The Home Office correspondence which contributed much to Moikle, Scotland and the French Revolution begins in 1782.

Letters of Scottish personages in the Br. Mus. Add. MSS contain few references to American affairs. Many of the letters testify to the influence of Henry Dundas in securing appointments, but the greater part of his papers are later than the period of the American war. The bibliography /
bibliography in H. Furber, Henry Dundas, contains the most complete list of Dundas papers. A Dundas letter on emigration is in the Br. Misc. Add. MSS. 34, 41*, f. 35*. A few other of his letters in the State Papers for Scotland are cited in the foot-notes.

Large quantities of family and estate papers in the National Library of Scotland have been examined. They afford numerous illustrations of county election procedures, and contain some references to the American war, but most of the latter are casual. Some letters from Scots serving in America describe military action (see appendix A). In the Edinburgh University library the Laine and Non-Laine manuscripts contain additional family papers with casual and indirect comment on the war and political questions scattered thinly through them, together with some letters from participants in the war. A series of letters of Adam Ferguson in which American affairs are a frequent subject of comment is the most relevant of the papers of literary figures represented in both the University and National libraries.