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ABSTRACT

In this thesis I point to the continued existence in the Scottish Borders of a small number of traditional, great landowning families who exert an enormous amount of power and influence at the level of everyday life. I attempt to show how the basis of this power has changed over time.

What started out as essentially military power became, with the Agricultural Revolution, economic power. At the same time, an increasingly political basis to this power was being developed and this was sustained, more or less, until the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974. After reorganisation, politics as a channel of influence became blocked and for a while it seemed as if the days when the lairds ran rural society were over, ending not so much with a bang as with a whimper.

In the Borders this was not the case, for many lairds had already been busy investigating new ways to make their presence felt. This was achieved by enterprising lairds like the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe being prepared to open their stately/ancestral homes to the public; laying the foundations for the birth of a Scottish 'heritage industry' as they did so.

The basis of power was thus transferred from the level of politics to that of ideology and it is with this transformation that I am essentially concerned.
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The BORDER MARCHES of ENGLAND & SCOTLAND in the Sixteenth Century

Border events of the sixteenth century show fairly clearly where the limits of the six Marches ran, but there are some portions for which the evidence is conflicting or incomplete. For example, the line between the English East and Middle Marches cannot be established with complete certainty; contemporary authorities do not agree exactly, and I have drawn the boundary along what seems the most likely line. Similarly, local opinions differed about the boundary between the English West and Middle Marches, particularly where it touched the Anglo-Scottish frontier. I have used the Cumberland-Scottish line, which both evidence and common sense seem to favour, rather than an arbitrary line touching the border at Kirkby Martin.

Source: MacDonald Fraser (1971).
Map 2

### Landlordism in Scotland: The Top 100 Landowners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Buccleuch</td>
<td>Buccleuch Estates</td>
<td>277,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wills Family</td>
<td>Wills Estates</td>
<td>263,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Seafield</td>
<td>Seafield Estates</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess of Sutherland</td>
<td>Sutherland Estates</td>
<td>158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Atholl</td>
<td>Atholl Estates</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. A. C. Farquharson</td>
<td>Invercauld Estates</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Westminster</td>
<td>Westminster Estates</td>
<td>113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Aluminium Ltd.</td>
<td>British Aluminium Estates</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Stair</td>
<td>Stair Estates</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir D. Cameron</td>
<td>Lochiel Estates</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Roxburgh</td>
<td>Roxburgh Estates</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. H. Vestey</td>
<td>Vestey Estates</td>
<td>93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Uist Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Uist Estates</td>
<td>92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Cowdray</td>
<td>Cowdray Estates</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberton Properties Ltd.</td>
<td>Big House Estates</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benmore Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Benmore Estates</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Lovat</td>
<td>Lovat Estates</td>
<td>76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison family (distillers)</td>
<td>Islay Estates</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Argyll</td>
<td>Argyll Estates</td>
<td>74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stornoway Trust</td>
<td>Stornoway Estates</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Ancaster</td>
<td>Drummond Castle</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Berry</td>
<td>Arnamara Estate</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Hereward Wake</td>
<td>Amhuinsudeal</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Estates Ltd. (Ross family)</td>
<td>Balnagowan</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. T. G. Moncrieff</td>
<td>Strathmore Estates</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir H. P. MacKenzie</td>
<td>Gairloch Estates</td>
<td>58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Alec Douglas Home</td>
<td>Douglas Home Estates</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair family Trust</td>
<td>Ulster Estates</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galston Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Galston Lodge</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fothingham family</td>
<td>Fothingham Estates</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlay &amp; Jones (Investors) Ltd.</td>
<td>Mar Lodge</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Fleming</td>
<td>Blackmount</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Granville</td>
<td>N. Uist Estates</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir E. W. Gladstone</td>
<td>Fasque</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Portland</td>
<td>Langwell</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig. Colvin</td>
<td>Camuseric</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Forestry Ltd.</td>
<td>E.F.G. Estates</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Dalhousie</td>
<td>Dalhousie Estates</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Thorneycroft</td>
<td>Eiskin</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Wemyss</td>
<td>Wemyss Estates</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir I. Colquhoun</td>
<td>Luss Estates</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir O. Crosswaite-Eyre</td>
<td>Knoydart</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir W. P. Ramsden</td>
<td>Ardkerikie</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barvas Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Barvas Estates</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord MacDonald</td>
<td>Sleat Estates</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jura Ltd. (Astor)</td>
<td>Jura Estates</td>
<td>41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Elliot (Langholm)</td>
<td>Dunfelling Estates</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J. B. W. Tyer</td>
<td>Gordon Bush</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Burton</td>
<td>Dochart Estates</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Cawdor</td>
<td>Cawdor Estates</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Gordon</td>
<td>Lude and Arrisdale</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. G. Balan</td>
<td>Forsinard</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. Buchanan-Jardine &amp; others</td>
<td>Castlemilk Estates</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. MacPherson</td>
<td>Attadale</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardnamurchan Estate Ltd.</td>
<td>Ardnamurchan</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queen</td>
<td>Balmore Estates</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. F. T. Folanke</td>
<td>Malness</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. MacLeod of MacLeod</td>
<td>Dunvegan</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S. M. Threipland</td>
<td>Toltingall, Waas, Dale</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. B. L. Munro-Ferguson</td>
<td>Novar Estates</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. S. A. F., M. M. Roger</td>
<td>Dunolden</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Airlie</td>
<td>Airle Estates</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss E. J. M. Douglas</td>
<td>Kilillian</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Robinson</td>
<td>Monagal</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Guthrie</td>
<td>Conagen</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble family</td>
<td>Ardinglass</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. &amp; P. Wilson</td>
<td>Garregie &amp; Loch Rosque</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Star Ins. Co. Ltd.</td>
<td>Eagle Star Estates</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochluchart Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Kinlochlichurt</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. &amp; H. Blythe</td>
<td>Dunbeath</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The late Lord Glentana</td>
<td>Grentana</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs E. E. Bonnington Wood</td>
<td>Salachy</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carloway Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Carloway</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Sandison</td>
<td>Glemromie</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lady Mary Boscawen</td>
<td>Douge</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of R. Midwood</td>
<td>Syre</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Roseberry</td>
<td>Dalmeny Estates</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Butie</td>
<td>Bute Estates</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Balfour</td>
<td>Balbirnie &amp; Scourne</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj. I. M. Scobie</td>
<td>Rhidderoch</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyvie Settlement Trust</td>
<td>Fyvie</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aks A. G. Forbes</td>
<td>Auchentoul Estates</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchentoul Estates Co.</td>
<td>Auchentoul</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Alan Wigan</td>
<td>Borrobol</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattray Discretionary Trust</td>
<td>Haddo-Rattray</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady McColquodale</td>
<td>Gruinard</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Leverhulme</td>
<td>Badanloch</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. J. R. N. Lowes</td>
<td>Glenfalloch</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Williams</td>
<td>Strathspey</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Carlton Greg</td>
<td>Lochcarron</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Barker &amp; Mrs Kershaw</td>
<td>Soval</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewarts Estates Aberdeen Ltd.</td>
<td>Slains Castle</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Linlithgow</td>
<td>Linlithgow Estate</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs M. Garton</td>
<td>Loch Mekland</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pare Crofters Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Pare Crofters Estate</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. A. Ramsay</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Beecher</td>
<td>Arnsaig</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs A. R. Nelson</td>
<td>Ardluissa</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTRODUCTION

'Rites of Passage'

In this thesis I point to the existence in the Scottish Borders of a small number of families who have, from the thirteenth century onwards, owned vast amounts of land. Throughout history these same families have exerted enormous amounts of power and influence, not only in the everyday life of the Borders, but in the wider realm of Scottish civil society and in the interstices of the British State. I attempt to show that the basis of these families' power has always been vested in, and derived from, the land they own and that this power has, over time, been remoulded; its shape altered and its form changed.

This is not an easy task for two reasons. Firstly, very limited information is available concerning both modern and historical patterns of landownership in Scotland. Apart from a census taken in 1874, no Government agency has attempted to provide any information as to how Scotland's land is held. What information does exist is largely the work of two intrepid individuals, Roger Millman (1970) and John MacEwan (1977). This is the subject of Chapter One.

Secondly, while information about the nature, extent, and pattern of landownership in Scotland is scarce, many words have been written about the role of Scotland's landed aristocracy in Scottish history. Some of these, such as James Fergusson's Lowland Lairds (1949), have been in praise of the great families, others have taken the form of virulent diatribes against them. Of these latter types Tom Johnston's Our Scots Noble Families of 1911 is perhaps the most well-known. The competing versions of the role of Scotland's landed aristocracy in Scottish history are the subject of Chapter Two.
There is, however, a preliminary task to be attended to before these problems can be dealt with in detail. Before a discussion of the pattern of landownership in the Scottish Borders and the role of these landed families in Scottish history can be undertaken, the myth, rhetoric and propaganda surrounding the Borders, the lairds and the land have to be exploded, dispelled and cleared away.

The first stage in this tidying-up process concerns the construction of 'the Borders' as a mythical place. This is a characteristic which encompasses the whole range of literature on 'the Borders', from Scottish Borders Tourist Board pamphlets to local history projects, from romantic historical accounts to coffee-table picture books. The quality and content of this literature varies greatly, but coffee-table picture book and free pamphlet, local history project and romantic historical account alike, all share one fundamental feature. This is that they all operate within a wider construction of romance which has its origin in the work of Sir Walter Scott. All take Scott's conception of a wild, romantic, untamed, but essentially spurious, Border past and play it back upon themselves. As a result it becomes increasingly difficult to separate myth from reality, fact from fiction, romance from history. A good example of this process at work is provided by George MacDonald Fraser's The Steel Bonnets (1971), which is, as its subtitle reveals, A Study of the Anglo-Scottish Border Reivers.

George MacDonald Fraser's book starts from a Scott-inspired conception of the Borders and the past, takes fragments of historical detail and historical half-truths and frames them in terms of his romantic construction of the Borders and the past. This process is facilitated by MacDonald Fraser's seductive use of language. He is the author of the Flashman novels and capitalises on his literary training to hold the reader's attention. The result is a well-written piece of popular historical fiction which it is easier to fall into the trap of believing than to cast aside as romantic, make-believe.
Why is The Steel Bonnets so persuasive? There are two reasons. Firstly, one is enchanted by MacDonald Fraser's use of language. Secondly, it fits in with an already existing popular vision of the Borders' past. I made the classic mistake of treating The Steel Bonnets too much as history and too little as romance. Having fallen headlong into the trap myself, I can at least warn others of the pitfalls by showing how MacDonald Fraser's account operates.

In the Introduction to The Steel Bonnets MacDonald Fraser warns us that, "the story of the reivers is not one that can conveniently be told in strict chronological order" (1971, p.9). What he in fact does is to distort time and space so that the sixteenth-century 'Borderland' appears as a separate, mythic entity. Temporally and spatially it takes on a character of its own and 'the Borders' and 'the Border' become indistinguishable:

In that time, the Border as a separate entity came into being; divided and yet united by a strange chemistry far above international politics. Half-English, half-Scottish, the Border was to remain a thing in itself; there as nowhere else, however much they might war and hate and destroy in centuries to come, Englishmen and Scotsmen understood each other (1971, p.21).

A mythic place is thus located somewhere in an equally mythic past, "the old Border is buried a long time ago, and there is hardly a trace now to mark where the steel bonnets passed by. They would have had no quarrel with that" (1971, p.381).

Romantic popular fiction as it is, MacDonald Fraser's account does, however, have a veneer of historical credibility, in that he hangs his romantic construct on items of historical fact and detail. In this respect his use of the term 'the Borders' to refer to the wide area spanning both Scotland and England called 'the Marches' is correct (see Map 1). So is his point that 'the Marches' was divided, for administrative purposes, into six Marches - three on the Scottish side and three on the English side - each under the charge of a Warden; a governing officer appointed by their respective governments. It was the duty of the Warden to
defend the frontier against invasions from the opposite realm, and in times of peace, to co-operate with their opposite numbers across the Border in the attempt to put down crime and impose law and order.

Where I went wrong was in failing, on first reading, to be rigorous enough in my attempt to separate basic historical fact from popular historical fiction. I was bewitched by MacDonald Fraser's account of each of the Marches, especially his account of the Scottish Middle March, which covered the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk; the two counties I am especially interested in. I took it at face-value because it was both compatible with and, in addition, reinforced ideas I already had about the romantic Border past. It was also, quite simply, riveting stuff. It was, after all, in the Scottish Middle March, according to MacDonald Fraser, that the most raiding took place. It was inhabited by "as choice a collection of ruffians as ever was seen in one section; here were the Kerrs, both of Cessford and Ferniehurst, and the Scotts." Best of all, however, was the fact that "no Wardens carried such a burden as those of the Middle Marches; it was, as one of them said, 'an unchristened country'" (1971, p.38).

So seduced was I by The Steel Bonnets that it was a long time before I could take a step back and see it for what it was; useful as background, entertaining and well-written, but not hard data out of which a thesis could be constructed.

The second stage of clearing away the myth, rhetoric and propaganda which surrounds the Borders, the lairds and the land, concerns the great families themselves. My original intention was to write a section on the great families. There was, after all, a whole wealth of easily accessible data, which made it a very different exercise from writing the chapter on landownership in the Borders. One only had to open a stately-home guidebook to find a succinct little history of the family in question, a reproduction of its family tree, crests and mottos. Then there were the much longer 'official' histories of the families, such as
William Fraser's The Scotts of Buccleuch (1878), Keith Scott's Scott 1118-1923 (1923), J.R. Oliver's The Scotts of Buccleuch (1887), not to mention the countless references to the great families in various coffee-table books and local history projects. There was also, of course, the wealth of genealogical data contained in Debrett's Peerage, Burke's Peerage and The Scots Peerage. This, I mistakenly thought, was going to be the easiest chapter of all.

It was only when I began to write the chapter, having spent many hours collecting the data, that the problem stared me in the face. For while I was not stuck for information, just how much of it could I, in fact, believe? I could very easily produce a lengthy section giving a biography of successive Kers and Scotts. In the case of the Kers, from Andrew Ker of Cessford who died in 1481, right through to Sir Guy David Innes Ker who is the present Duke of Roxburghe, and in the case of the Scotts from Richard Le Scott of Rankilburn and Murthockston (1265-1320), right up to the present Duke of Buccleuch, Walter Francis John Montagu-Douglas-Scott, who was born in 1923. But if I did this all I would in fact be doing would be regurgitating accounts and biographies of these families, written by themselves or by people employed to do it for them. Having spent many hours collecting the 'data' for a chapter on the great families it was hard to admit to myself that such an exercise would not be productive.

While a regurgitated biography of the great families would have been of limited value, the hours I had spent collecting and collating the 'information' were not, I was relieved to find, totally wasted. From reading the 'histories' of the great families I learned several important things about the way they legitimate themselves in terms of their power, position, privilege and property. A striking example of the way this is achieved is provided by a Manpower Services Commission (1986) publication, 'The Scotts of Buccleuch', which I found in the Local Collection at the Borders Regional Library H.Q. at St. Mary's Mill, Selkirk.
This publication points out that there are two accounts of the origin of the name Buccleuch, one an etymological account, the other a popular local myth. According to the first account:

In a wild mountainous region like Rankilburn, cleughs or ravines are abound. Cleuch, the Anglo-Saxon CLOUGH means a fissure or opening in a height, glen or valley, narrowed by steep and close acclivities on either side. Buck is prefixed from the connection of the cleugh with the chase, so common in Ettrick Forest and on the lands adjoining.

Other names of similar import and similarly derived were given to other lands in the same district, such as Volfcleuch, Harecleuch, Baorhope, Harewood to name a few (1986, p.1).

The other more vernacular account concerns the 'myth of the buck'. According to this myth, from the twelfth century various Scotts had been Rangers of ancient Ettrick Forest which was a favourite hunting ground of the kings of Scotland. Newark Castle, two miles north of where Bowhill, the Scott family's Border home, now lies, was used as a hunting box. One day, in a deep 'cleuch', in the heart of the forest in the time of King Kenneth, a crazed buck turned on the King's hounds. A massacre seemed imminent. However, a forest Ranger by the name of Scott came to the rescue. He seized the cornered buck by its antlers and threw it over his shoulder. In honour of his bravery he became known as Scott of Buccleuch (Buck-Cleugh) and received some of the lands which the family still holds to this day. It is this latter account of how the lands of the Scotts of Buccleuch were given to them by the King as a reward for gallant bravery, not the strictly etymological one, which appears in the guidebook to Bowhill.

Another myth which features in both this most interesting local history project and in the section on 'The Scotts of Buccleuch' in the Bowhill guidebook, is the story of 'Bold Buccleuch', alias Walter 1st Lord Scott of Buccleuch. Bold Buccleuch earned his name initially as a result of his exploits in the Border raids. The high point in his colourful career, however, was his rescue of Kinmount Willie in 1596 from the English stronghold of Carlisle Castle with only eighty horsemen. This rescue roused the wrath and indignation of Queen Elizabeth of England and was the cause of
much bitterness in her relationship with King James VI of Scotland. Two years later the English Queen came face to face with Bold Buccleuch and asked him why he had embarked upon such a desperate mission. Bold Buccleuch answered her with the immortal line, "what is it that a man dare not do?" (Bowhill Guidebook, 1981, p.22). The Queen was so impressed by the bravery and audacity of the man before her that she turned to the bystanders and said, "with ten thousand such men our brothers in Scotland might shake the firmest throne in Europe" (1981, p.22). In 1606 Bold Buccleuch was created 1st Lord Scott of Buccleuch. Thus once again an act of heroic bravery, sealed with royal approval is used to justify and legitimate the acquisition of power, position, influence, privilege and property.

There are many other examples of the great families legitimating themselves via myth which I could have used by way of illustration. These two, however, make the point as well as any. My time spent in the local history room at St. Mary's Mill had not been wasted after all.

Having dispelled some of the myths surrounding the Borders and the great Border landowning families it is possible to proceed a stage further in the attempt to show that, from the thirteenth century onwards a handful of families in the Scottish Borders have owned vast amounts of land and that this has been the basis for the power, in all its changing forms, which they have exercised in the everyday life of the Borders, in Scottish civil society and in the British State.

After clearing away the myths two problems remain. One, as I have already argued, concerns the lack of information regarding both the historical and the contemporary pattern of landownership in Scotland, and is the subject of Chapter One. The other concerns the existence of a number of competing interpretations of the role of Scotland's landed families in Scottish history. On the one side of the debate there is Tom Johnston's tirade of 1911, and on the
other there is James Fergusson's highly partisan apology on behalf of the lowland laird. This debate is the subject of Chapter Two.

Before dealing with either the problem of who owns the Borders, or the role of the great families in Scottish history it is essential to realise that the latter problem, that of evaluating and assessing the role of the landed families in Scottish history, is bound up with a much more fundamental problem, a problem which in many ways is both the Alpha and the Omega of this thesis. This key problem concerns the way history in Scotland has been written, and the very nature of Scottish history itself.

When I arrived in Edinburgh in the autumn of 1985 I was totally oblivious to the fact that in order to produce a thesis on lairds and landownership in the Scottish Borders I would have to know something about Scottish historiography. I knew that I would have to study 'the historical background' because, after all, this was a new area of study and a different country. But had anyone told me that a large part of my thesis would be concerned with something as esoteric as historiography I would have laughed in their face.

Ahead of me lay three fundamental lessons which had to be mastered if anything was going to be achieved. These lessons were to prove a powerful medicine in preventing me spending four years whistling in the dark. But the medicine did not come cheap and being English was not enough to make me eligible for an exemption certificate. I did my share of whistling in the dark.

The subject of these lessons was Scottish historiography. The first lesson of the trilogy was that Scottish history has many perspectives. The second, related, lesson was that in Scottish history, unlike in English history, it is not usual for perspective to be enforced by time. The third, and most important lesson revolves around Ash's point that while Scottish history as an academic discipline 'died' in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, there is a sense in Scotland in which history
is not yet over. Being English, and as such, the product of a culture in which, as Neal Ascherson argues, "there is still an assumption that 'our' (in quotes) history can only have one focal point, one perspective" (1988, p.153), and in which the past, although venerated and idealised, stands firmly behind the present, as something which is essentially over, I was not prepared for the chaotic plethora of unfinished histories I was to encounter north of the Border. These early lessons in the education and initiation of an English person are worth describing in a little more detail for they were my rites of passage.

The rites of passage were not devoid of pain. After chasing up many blind alleys, I learned the hard way that there was in fact no such thing as 'Scottish History'. Instead of one history with one focal point and one perspective, it slowly became instilled in my head that during the Scottish Enlightenment, in the Edinburgh of the 1820s, two sets of ideas about Scotland were formulated which between them have shaped Scottish history and Scottish historical consciousness ever since. These were the Scottish Whig interpretation of history and the Scottish Tory interpretation of history. Both were essentially pro-union, but the Scottish Tory interpretation of history was deeply tinged with nationalism, in that it celebrated the existence of a separate and thriving Scottish civil society within the Union.

My education continued as I learned that the twentieth century has witnessed the birth of rival ideologies, most importantly those of socialism and nationalism, which have both drawn from, challenged, and to a large extent, replaced, the dominant ideologies of the nineteenth century. Just as the Whig and Tory myths "degenerated among coarser souls into mere nostalgia, into a sentimental wallowing in the lost causes of 1707 and 1745" (Fry, 1987, p.3), their twentieth-century cousins have both regarded themselves as "requiters of the lost causes, always assuming that a socialist or nationalist meaning can be read back into them" (1987, p.4), I had taken my first steps in the right direction.
Lesson one had been that Scottish history had many focal points and many perspectives. The moral of lesson two was that, not only is Scottish history characterised by a multiplicity of perspectives, but that these perspectives are not ordered or enforced by time. As Neal Ascherson argues:

It isn’t an insult to the enormous pioneering work of historians here in the last forty years to suggest that the public perception of time remains chaotic. Time is not generally used to enforce perspective, and instead there is a scrapbook of highly coloured, often bloody scenes or tableaux whose relation to one another is obscure (1988, p.154).

Central to lesson number two is the figure of Sir Walter Scott. As to why Scott is so important, Nairn makes an enlightening remark:

To a surprising extent we are still living in the Scotland of Sir Walter Scott. He said nothing about 'modern' Scotland. But he did show us what to do with our past. And in the context of nineteenth and early twentieth century social development in Europe, this was a most important thing to do (1975, p.14).

What did Scott tell the Scots to do with their past, and why was it so important? Marinell Ash in her book, The Strange Death of Scottish History (1980), suggests a few answers. The key to Ash’s critique and to the importance of Scott himself is contained in the following paragraph:

The Romantic revolution in historical writing was born of Sir Walter Scott and Scotland. The man and the place combined a blend of past and present, uncertainties and assumptions, physical realities and philosophical ideals.... Scott’s historical legacy was both personally unique and yet representative of the changing experience of his country, compounded as it was of the tensions and contradictions of a traditional Scotland merging into a great world empire (1980, p.13).

Ash argues that Scott created a picture of the past in his novels and poems which was highly romantic and fictitious, inspired largely by his childhood spent on his grandfather’s country farm at Sandyknowe near Smailholm in Roxburghshire, and his early exposure to the oral historical tradition of the Borders. Nineteenth-century historians took Scott’s highly romanticised vision of the past and attempted to recreate similar pictures of
the past through the recovery and study of historical documents and records. Scott did not just condone this activity; he actively encouraged it. By 1870 most of Scott's historical crusaders, the would-be founding fathers of Scottish history, were dead. They left a legacy but no heirs to inherit it.

This leads on to the third, and most important, lesson. It is also, I would argue, the most optimistic. The third lesson is about the Scottish past having an open and unfinished quality. Here, once again, Ash's critique is perceptive.

Ash points to a connection between the death of Scottish history as an academic discipline and a corresponding change in the middle of the nineteenth century from a distinctively Scottish society to one with a British or even imperial outlook. Scottish history had no place in this imperial/British future and was simply tossed aside. As Ash argues:

The Scots were a practical and utilitarian people - or at least thought they were, despite their propensity for tearing one another apart over matters of principle. The spirit of Scott's historical revolution was deeply utilitarian and initially his revolution fulfilled a national need. But when his conception of history was no longer useful to the Scots they abandoned it, speaking as usual in terms of liberation and freedom. The Reformation was freedom, the Union was freedom, the Disruption was freedom and the death of Scottish history was freedom. Perhaps. What was more certain is that by the 1870s Scottish history was no longer a national preoccupation except when it touched national pride (1980, p.150).

Scott's revolution, Ash argues, was thus destroyed by the elements of the living historical tradition of Scotland from which it sprang and of which he was the embodiment.

I said that the third lesson was not only the most important, but also the most optimistic. But why, one may ask, should the death of Scottish history be the cause for so much rejoicing? For the answer it is necessary to go back to lesson number two.
When I described the second lesson of my initiation process I referred to Ascherson's point about Scottish history resembling a scrapbook, colourful but untidy, and without the helping hand of time to order and arrange it. This is most unlike the situation in England, where history is neatly packaged and presented, resembling a stamp collectors' album rather than a scrapbook, and where "time is linear to a perfectly oppressive degree" (Ascherson, 1988, p.153).

Scott attempted to turn the scrapbook into a stamp album, but failed. In the latter half of the twentieth century, some enterprising landowners in the Scottish Borders (the Border lairds I will be looking at in subsequent chapters) have once again attempted to turn the scrapbook into a stamp album. Playing on Scott's legacy of a spurious, fictitious and romantic Border past, they have been opening their stately/ancestral homes to the public. In connection with this they have produced coloured guidebooks complete with family trees and histories of the families and have opened gift shops where one can buy souvenir pens, pencils, postcards and pictures of how life in such places 'used to be', how it 'really was'. They have, in fact, as Robert Hewison points out in his scathing critique of the 'heritage industry' (1987), been selling history. To what extent these lairds have been successful in organising and arranging the transformation, and corresponding deterioration, of history into heritage, with all its commercial, political and ideological implications, is one of the central concerns of this thesis.

My argument is that, ultimately, these lairds have not succeeded. While they have been able to commercialise the Scottish past, they have not been able to capture and conscript it. They have not been able to do to the Scottish past what the 'Druids' have done to the English past (Ascherson, 1988, p.146). The Scottish past remains alive, open and unfinished; not captured, tamed and neutered. It is colourful, chaotic, confused and dislocated, but, as Ascherson argues, "there is a source of energy in this dislocation" (1988, p.154), and it is this energy of an unfinished past which is its
life force. At the very least it could provide a way out of the impasse which Britain has been in since 1979. This is the catechism and the creed with which I approach this thesis.
In the Introduction I stated that my aim in this thesis is to point to the existence in the Scottish Borders of a small number of families who, from the thirteenth century to the twentieth century, have owned vast amounts of land. These same families have, throughout history, exerted enormous amounts of power and influence in the everyday life of the Borders, in the wider realm of Scottish civil society and in the interstices of the British State. I made it clear that it is my intention to show that the basis of these families’ power has always been vested in, and derived from, the land they own and that this power has, over time, been remoulded, its shape altered and its form changed.

I went on to describe the two major problems that confronted me. The first problem I mentioned was that there is very little information about both modern and historical patterns of landownership in Scotland. The second was that while there is a relative abundance of literature on Scotland’s landed families these accounts are often radically different in their aims, intentions, evaluations and assessments.

The problems posed by the existence of radically-different interpretations of the role of the great families in Scottish history is the subject of Chapter Two. Meanwhile in this chapter I attempt to deal with the first problem. I attempt to describe, on the basis of the limited information available, the pattern and structure of landownership in the Scottish Borders.
1.2 The Paucity of Information

In the Introduction I pointed to the astonishing paucity of information regarding both the historical and the contemporary pattern of landownership in Scotland. This is surprising in the context of Timperley's remark that "power and landownership have been synonymous in Scotland from time immemorial" (1980, p. 137). This lack of information is not, it would appear, peculiar to Scotland but is the norm for Britain as a whole. Writing, essentially about England, Newby argues:

Considering the intrinsic importance of land, not least to agriculture, it is surprising how little information is available about it. What it is used for, who owns it, how much it is worth - these and other related questions are surrounded by mystery and confusion and hence controversy (1979, p. 27).

Newby points out that this reminds us that:

... the 'land question', as it was known in nineteenth century politics, remains a live political issue, but it also reflects the fact that even in a predominantly urban and industrial society like ours land remains a source of wealth, prestige and not a little power (1979, p. 27).

It is, therefore, no accident that in both Scotland and England we are kept in a state of ignorance as to how land is owned:

Land in other words, not only possesses a use-value: it is capital. Thus any attempt to control the allocation of land must first involve control over the market for land. And this, in a predominantly market economy, would be to strike at some of the most fundamental rights concerning the use of property (1979, p. 29).

Apart from a census taken in 1874, no Government agency has attempted to provide any information as to how Scotland's land is held. What information does exist regarding both the historical and the contemporary patterns is the work of individuals. Timperley (1980), for example, has attempted to reconstruct the pattern of landholding in Scotland for the year 1770, while Roger Millman (1970) and John MacEwen (1977) have, between them, provided what information exists for the twentieth century. It is
to Timperley's account of the pattern in 1770 that we must first of all turn.

1.3 The Pattern of Landholding in the Scottish Borders in 1770

Using a variety of sources, including the valuation rolls (which were compiled for each county in order that every proprietor might pay a just share of any land tax demanded by Parliament), estate plans, lists of freeholder, the minutes of the commissioners of supply, lists of heritors signing documents pertaining to parish affairs and the Old Statistical Account (1793), Timperley attempts to reconstruct the pattern of landholding in Scotland in 1770:

Such a picture of the Scottish landholding pattern must be the result of an amalgamation of many and various sources, carefully and painstakingly pieced together, as detailed sources, comparable to those used in English studies are not available (1980, p.139).

On the basis of this carefully amalgamated evidence Timperley found the pattern of landholding in the Borders in 1770 to appear as can be seen in Tables 2 and 3.

Notes

(1) Timperley takes the Borders Region to be Dumfries, Selkirk, Roxburgh and East Lothian. Her argument for including East Lothian is that "it has a pattern of landholding similar to that of the main Borders Region, although differences become apparent when changes over time are discussed" (1980, p.145). She does not include Peebles and Berwick in the Borders Region but in the Eastern Region. As both Peebles and Berwick are both part of the current Borders Region and have, throughout history, always been regarded as Border counties, I have taken her table for the Eastern Region and included it along with her table for the Borders Region.
### TABLE 2
The Pattern of Landholding in the Eastern Region, 1770

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage of Valued Rent Controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peebles</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincardine</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 3
The Pattern of Landholding in the Borders Region, 1770

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage of Valued Rent Controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxburgh</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timperley distinguishes between three categories of landowners who enjoyed heritable tenure. These are (1) the great landlords; (2) the lairds; (3) the bonnet lairds. The great landlords, or nobles, were the closest to the King in the feudal pyramid and most acknowledged him as their immediate feudal lord. They were distinguished by their aristocratic rank. Buccleuch and Roxburghe come into this category. The lairds were a much more numerous and diverse class with a wide range of incomes, and varying degrees of social prestige and political power. In general, however, she argues, "they can be defined as having unearned income from rents, mortgages, government office or a profession." Finally, the bonnet lairds were roughly equivalent to the English owner occupier and were "mainly limited to areas where Church or Crown had feued land in small parcels" (1980, p.140).

These divisions are frequently used by historians. They are more useful, Timperley argues, in understanding the differing social status and political functions of the various groups than the economic and financial side of landownership. In this respect, "a more meaningful and fundamental division into landlord and owner-occupier can be discerned" (1980, pp.140-141).

What emerges from Timperley's work, therefore, as the map of landholding patterns illustrates, is that in 1770, "unlike her neighbour England, Scotland's landholding shows a specific pattern" (1980, p.143).

In the Borders, the great landlords, it can be seen, had a much greater share of the total wealth than they did in the central belt and in the Highlands, with the exception of Sutherland. The traditional Border counties of Roxburgh, Selkirk and Dumfries, she argues, emerge, with the Highlands, as "a distinct area affected by distance from the centres of population, rugged topography and poor soils and climate" (1980, p.142). In the past, when these counties were "the buffer zone against English attacks" (1980,
Counties in which the Great Landlords controlled the largest single share of valued rent

Regional divisions

County boundaries

p.142), the "extensive areas of marginal land in proximity to the English Border had made it expeditious to set up large estates" (1980, p.144).

This then is what the pattern of landholding looked like in the Scottish Borders in 1770. Timperley's work focused on this year for several reasons. Firstly, because of the fragmented nature of the evidence it would not have been possible to study the pattern of landholding for the whole of Scotland at ten or twenty year intervals. Secondly, because "1770 stands out as being of great significance. Many historians have argued that it is about this date that the take-off into self-sustained growth occurred in the agrarian sector." Thirdly, because of the availability of the "wide range of contemporary documents and books relating to the land after this date, reflecting the activity and interest evoked by the changes occurring." Her study thus reflects "the traditional society of the early eighteenth century, while at the same time holding the elements vital to the substantive economic changes which took place in Scottish agriculture in the latter decades of the century" (1980, p.139).

It also provides a useful background to the pattern of landholding in the Scottish Borders in the following two centuries.

1.4 The Nineteenth Century: The Government Census of 1874

In 1874 a Government census took place in order to establish how many acres Scottish landowners owned and the Gross Annual Value of their estates. The results appeared in a Government publication of the same year, Lands & Heritages. In view of the acute shortage of information, on both the historical and contemporary patterns of landownership in Scotland, compounded by the absence of an official land register, the 1874 census is an important starting point. The data contained in this census provided the basis for Tom Johnston's polemical attack on the Scottish aristocracy which appeared in 1911.
A vast amount of information is contained in the Government Census of 1874, much of it not strictly relevant to the Scottish Borders. In order to avoid being overwhelmed by data not specifically relevant to the pattern of landholding in the Borders, I have approached the 1874 Census in a simple way. I do not attempt a detailed account of the landholding pattern in Scotland in 1874 based on the Census of that year because such an undertaking would be beyond the scope of this thesis. What I do instead is extract from the 1874 Census information specifically pertaining to the Border counties of Roxburgh, Selkirk, Peebles and Berwick, and use this data to show that Timperley's findings regarding the predominance of very large estates in the Scottish Borders in 1770 hold true 104 years later.

The pattern of landholding in the Scottish Borders in the year 1874, based on the Lands and Heritage publication of Government Census (1874) thus looks as follows:

**Roxburgh**

In the year 1874 the county of Roxburgh contained two very big estates, belonging to the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe. The figures are as follows:

- Duke of Buccleuch: 104,487 acres
- Duke of Roxburghe: 50,459 acres.

**Selkirk**

In the year 1874 the county of Selkirk was dominated by one very large estate, belonging to the Duke of Buccleuch:

- Duke of Buccleuch: 60,400 acres.
Peebles

In 1874 the county of Peebles was also dominated by one large estate, belonging to the Earl of Wemyss & March:

Earl of Wemyss & March 41,200 acres.

Berwick

In 1874 the pattern of landholding in the county of Berwick was characterised by the existence of several fairly large estates but no very big estate. The figures for the county of Berwick are as follows:

Lord Lauderdale 24,700 acres
Lord Campbell 20,200 acres
Marquis of Tweeddale 18,100 acres
Earl of Haddington 14,300 acres
Earl of Home 10,300 acres
Duke of Roxburghe 6,096 acres.

1.5 The 20th Century: Millman & MacEwen

There is no official record of the contemporary pattern of landownership in Scotland. The only indication as to the number of landowners in Scotland this century, and the size of their estates, has come from the work of two individuals, Roger Millman (1970) and John MacEwen (1977).

In 1970 Roger Millman of Aberdeen University carried out a survey of estate boundaries in Scotland. The estate boundaries were marked on one inch Ordnance Survey sheets and the name of the estate was written within the boundary. The maps were not drawn to scale and acreages of estates were not attempted. A separate index card was completed for each estate, stating the name of the owner.
John MacEwen used Millman's survey to calculate the number of estates of 1,000 acres or more in each Scottish county and to provide lists of names of landowners and estates of 5,000 acres or more. The results appear in his *Who Owns Scotland?* which was first published by E.U.S.P.B. in 1977.

In the Introduction to *Who Owns Scotland?* MacEwen asks himself whether spending 25-30 years compiling a land register of all Scottish landowners and their estate acreage down to 1,000 acres has been a 'gowk's errand'. The answer to this has to be 'no' even though the tables, which are now rather out of date as land transactions occur all the time, contain many inaccuracies. MacEwen himself admits "the point must be stressed that the acreages produced are not as exact as they should and would be with mapping by the Ordnance Survey Department" (1970, p.7).

In the absence of an official land register MacEwen's work provides a valuable source of information as to how land in Scotland is held. In addition, Robin Fraser Callander argues that:

All the available evidence also suggests that there has been very little overall change since Millman and McEwen's 1970 dateline and that their work remains a fair representation of the present estate structure and its distribution within Scotland (1987, p.129).

MacEwen's work, while being important, is full of errors. I discovered this when reading Tom Johnston's *Our Scots Noble Families*, his polemic of 1911 in which he makes use of the data contained in the 1874 Census to convict "some 33 of our Scots Noble Families' of taking in the year 1874 land rents (mostly from stolen territory) amounting to over £2,602,000" (1911, p.139).

MacEwen uses the 1874 Census in order to compare and contrast the pattern of landholding in Scotland in 1970 with what it was in 1874. I noticed that, at times, MacEwen and Johnston differed in their interpretations of the 1874 Census. At one point MacEwen says that according to the Government Census of 1874 the Duke of
Roxburghe owned 10,500 acres in the County of Roxburgh (1977, p. 83). Johnston, also using the 1874 Census said that the Duke of Roxburghe owned 104,487 acres (1911, p. 86). Worried by such an enormous discrepancy I went to the 1874 Census and found that Johnston's figure was in fact the correct one.

When looking at MacEwen's findings regarding the pattern of landownership in the counties of Roxburgh, Selkirk, Peebles and Berwick for the year 1970 what I did, therefore, was compare and contrast his interpretation of the 1874 Census data with Johnston's version and then compare both of these with the 1874 Census itself. This way it should be possible to make a slightly more accurate assessment of the pattern of landholding in the Scottish Borders in 1970 and to see how far and in what ways it is different from the pattern in 1874.

1.6 MacEwen's findings regarding the pattern of landownership in the counties of Roxburgh, Selkirk, Peebles and Berwick

(a) Landownership in the County of Roxburgh

In the County of Roxburgh MacEwen lists nine estates down to 5,000 acres. Of these six belong to members of the Scottish aristocracy - the Duke of Buccleuch, the Duke of Roxburghe, the Marquis of Lothian, the Earl of Haddington, Baronet Usher, and Baroness Elliot of Harwood. One of the owners is the Tilhill Forestry Group. Andrew Douglas, owner of the Saughtree Estate, is a farmer. I have not been able to trace John H. Douglas of Glendeary.

The most notable characteristic of the pattern of landownership in Roxburgh is, as MacEwen points out, the fact that in both 1874 and 1970 it had more than one very large estate. In both cases these were the estates held by the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe (1977, pp. 83-84).

MacEwen's account of the pattern of landownership in Roxburgh is
# ROXBURGH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area</th>
<th>425,564 areas</th>
<th>Inland water</th>
<th>2,440 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Estates down to 5,000 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Buccleuch</td>
<td>Buccleuch Ests.</td>
<td>60,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Roxburghe</td>
<td>Roxburgh Ests.</td>
<td>55,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Lothian</td>
<td>Lothian Ests.</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Douglas</td>
<td>Glendearg</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillhill Forestry Group</td>
<td>Tillhill Forestry Group</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Douglas</td>
<td>Saughtree</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Haddington</td>
<td>Mellerstain</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Usher Barontcy Tr.</td>
<td>Courthole</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Elliot</td>
<td>Harwood</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Totals of Estates down to 5,000 acres

9 Estates — 175,900 acres

---

*Source: MacEwen (1977), p.84.*
disturbingly inaccurate. I was alerted to this when I compared MacEwen's interpretation of the 1874 Census with Johnston's. In 1874 MacEwen argues, the size of the Duke of Buccleuch's holding in the County of Roxburgh was 10,500 acres. Johnston, in Our Scots Noble Families gives the figure 104,487 acres (1911, p.43). Worried by a discrepancy of around 94,000 acres I checked the 1874 Census for myself and found that Johnston's figure was the accurate one. Thus the Duke of Buccleuch's holding in Roxburgh had in fact been reduced by over 44,000 acres between 1874 and 1970. Meanwhile the Duke of Roxburghe's holding had increased by about 5,000 acres, from 54,459 acres in 1874 to 55,000 acres in 1970. This contradicts MacEwen's argument that "Buccleuch's 10,500 acre holding of 1874 has exploded to 60,100 acres, leaving Roxburgh's own Duke to come second with 55,500 acres" (1977, p.83); which is quite simply wrong.

(b) Landownership in the County of Selkirk

In the County of Selkirk in 1970 there were only three owners of estates down to 5,000 acres. These were the Duke of Buccleuch, the Earl of Wemyss & March and a private Forestry Group.

In 1874 the Duke of Buccleuch held 60,400 acres in Selkirkshire. This time Johnston and MacEwen's figures are the same, Johnston giving the exact figure of 60,428 acres (1911, p.44). MacEwen rounding it down to the nearest hundred. By 1970, MacEwen found that the Duke of Buccleuch's holdings had declined to 30,000 acres (1977, p.74).

In 1874, MacEwen argues, there was no record of the Earl of Wemyss & March holding any land in the county of Selkirk. In 1970 MacEwen found that he held 21,000 acres. MacEwen suggests that it is possible to infer that some sort of transaction occurred between the Duke and the Earl (1977, p.74).

In 1874 both the House of Traquair and Lord Napier held land in the county of Selkirk. By 1970 there was no trace of either
## SELKIRK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area</th>
<th>171,209 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland water</td>
<td>1,797 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estates down to 5,000 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Buccleuch</td>
<td>Buccleuch Ests.</td>
<td>29,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Wemyss &amp; March</td>
<td>Wemyss Ests.</td>
<td>20,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Forestry Group</td>
<td>Private Forestry</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals of Estates down to 5,000 acres

- 3 Estates — 57,000 acres

Table 5  
Meanwhile the Philiphaugh estate which used to be owned by Sir J. Murray of Philliphaugh & Melgund totalled 1,857 acres. MacEwen had "considerable difficulty" in locating this estate on Millman's one inch maps (1977, p.74). Eventually, he found that in 1970 the estate totalled 7,000 acres and was owned by the wealthy industrialist Sir W. Strang-Steel. He does not, however, include this in his tables. He concludes that there must, in the County of Selkirk, be many other fragmented estates which he has not been able to piece together.

(c) Landownership in the County of Peebles

The pattern of landownership in the County of Peebles is somewhat different in that there were, in 1970, nine estates down to 5,000 acres but no really big estate. In 1874, MacEwen argues, there was one very big estate (41,200 acres), belonging to the Earl of Wemyss & March (1977, p.73). Here again we see a major difference between MacEwen's figures and those of Tom Johnston, for Johnston gave the size of the Earl of Wemyss & March's holdings in Peebles in 1874 as 10,140 acres (1911, p.119). This time it is Johnston who is wrong. According to the 1874 Census the Earl of Wemyss & March held 41,247 acres in Peebles at this date.

In 1970 the Wemyss & March Estate was still the biggest in the county but had been reduced to 16,000 acres. the House of Traquair also experienced a reduction in its landholdings from 10,800 acres in 1874 to 6,000 acres in 1970.

While the holdings of Traquair and the Wemyss & March Estates have declined in size, those of the Roseberry Estates have increased. In 1874 there was no mention of the Roseberry Estates; by 1970 they claimed 12,000 acres.

MacEwen's account of landownership in the county of Peebles is somewhat puzzling. In the narrative he talks about the holdings of the Wemyss & March Estates in Peebles, being reduced to 16,000
## PEEBLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area</th>
<th>222,240 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland water</td>
<td>1,048 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estates down to 5,000 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countess of Dysart</td>
<td>Stobo</td>
<td>16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Roseberry</td>
<td>Roseberry Ests.</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. T. S. Morton-Robertson</td>
<td>Portmore</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. A. M. Sprot</td>
<td>Haystoun</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Reid</td>
<td>Glencatho</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. D. Maxwell-Stewart</td>
<td>Traquair</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Mrs E. Marshall</td>
<td>Baddinsgall</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messrs. Dykes</td>
<td>S. Slipperfield</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col. D. G. C. Sutherland</td>
<td>N. Slipperfield</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals of Estates down to 5,000 acres

9 Estates — 71,300 acres

Source: MacEwen (1977), p.73.
acres but, as can be seen in the tables, he does not mention the Vemyss & March Estates at all. The only estate of 16,000 acres in the County of Peebles to feature in the tables is the Stobo Estate which is owned by the Countess of Dysart. It is not immediately obvious that he is talking about a collateral branch of the same family (1977, p.73).

(d) Landownership in the County of Berwick

The pattern of landownership in the County of Berwick has more similarities with the pattern in Peebles than in Selkirk and Roxburgh. MacEwen lists twelve estates down to 5,000 acres, ranging from 12,900 acres to 5,000 acres. There are no really big estates.

Once again MacEwen found considerable differences between the pattern of landownership in this county between 1874 and 1970. Once again, also, there are differences between Johnston and MacEwen's versions of the extent of holdings in 1874. Where there are no discrepancies, either because MacEwen's interpretation of the 1874 Census is correct, or because Johnston was not concerned with these particular owners, I just give the straight figures for 1874 and 1970. This is the case regarding the holdings of Lord Campbell, the Earl of Haddington and the Marquis of Tweeddale.

The Duke of Roxburghe, with 12,900 acres was, in 1970, the biggest landowner in Berwickshire. MacEwen argues that this figure is significantly lower, although he does not say how much lower, than in 1874 (1977, p.76). Johnston, however, gives the figure of 6,096 acres for the 1874 dating which represents an increase of over 100% (1911, p.86). This is, in fact, the correct figure.

In 1874 the Lauder Estate comprised 24,700 acres and belonged to Lord Lauderdale. In 1970 MacEwen found that this figure had been reduced considerably. Once again there is a discrepancy between the narrative and the tables. In the narrative he says that the
## BERWICK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area</th>
<th>292,535 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland water</td>
<td>1,359 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estates down to 5,000 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Estates</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Roxburghe</td>
<td>Roxburgh Ests.</td>
<td>12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank J. Usher</td>
<td>Dunglas</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie Castle Estates</td>
<td>Billie Castle</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Haddington</td>
<td>Tyninghamhe (Mellerstain) Est.</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess of Lauderdale</td>
<td>Lauder Ests.</td>
<td>8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. F. Fisher</td>
<td>Brockholes</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Calder</td>
<td>Billie Mains</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. McDougal</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>5,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Alec Douglas Home</td>
<td>The Hirsle</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladykirk Estates Ltd.</td>
<td>Ladykirk</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John McEwen</td>
<td>Marchmont</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Sutherland</td>
<td>Mertoun House</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals of Estates down to 5,000 acres

12 Estates — 89,700 acres

Lauder Estates in Berwickshire had been reduced to 18,100 acres. In the tables he gives the total as 8,100 (1977, p.76).

In 1874 the Marchmont Estates belonged to Lord Campbell and comprised 20,200 acres. By 1970 the Marchmont Estates had been reduced to 5,000 acres and were owned by Sir John McEwen.

In 1874 the Earl of Haddington held 14,300 acres in Berwickshire. By 1970 his holding had been reduced to 9,200 acres.

The Douglas Homes of the Hirsel held 10,300 acres in Berwickshire in 1874. Johnston treats the holdings of the Earl of Home and the Countess of Home separately, attributing 2,597 acres to the Earl and 7,804 acres to the Countess (1911, p.113). The combined figure is roughly equivalent to that given by MacEwen (1977, p.76). By 1970, however, the Homes' holdings had been reduced to 5,500 acres, just over half the 1874 figure.

The Marquis of Tweeddale held 18,100 acres in Berwickshire in 1874. In 1970, according to MacEwen, these had gone (1977, p.76).

MacEwen points out that he was unable to trace "what has become of much of the land lost to the above estates perhaps because of large blank spaces in the copies of maps put at my disposal" (1977, p.76).

1.7 Conclusion

The picture that emerges on the basis of MacEwen's findings is of a very complex and intricate pattern of landownership in the counties of Roxburgh, Selkirk, Peebles and Berwick. Land, it seems, is frequently changing hands within and between families. Because of the absence of an official land register the nature and extent of these transactions remain shrouded in secrecy.

In terms of landownership, two of the Border counties, the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk remain, as far as we know,
dominated by the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe. With 29,600 acres in 1970 the Duke of Buccleuch is the biggest landowner in the County of Selkirk. The Duke of Roxburghe holds no land here. Buccleuch is also, with his 60,100 acres, the biggest landowner in the County of Roxburgh, holding 5,100 acres more than the Duke of Roxburghe in 1970. In addition to being the biggest landowners in the Borders, the Duke of Buccleuch with 277,000 acres is, according to MacEwen, the biggest landowner in Scotland. He is also rumoured to be the biggest private landowner in Europe. The Duke of Roxburghe with 96,000 acres is the eleventh biggest landowner in Scotland (see Table 1).

These then, as far as we know, are 'the facts' about landownership in the Scottish Borders. It is now time to turn our attention to how 'the facts' have been interpreted and to look more closely at the subtle, highly complex, and often tenuous relationship which exists between patrimony and power.
CHAPTER TWO

Leaders or Land Thieves?
The Cases For and Against the Great Families

2.1 Johnston Vs Fergusson: The cases, charges, convictions and condemnations

While information about the extent and patterns of landownership in Scotland is scarce, many words have been written about Scotland's landed aristocracy. Some of these have been in praise of the great families; others have taken the form of virulent diatribes against them.

In 1911 Tom Johnston's Our Scots Noble Families was published, and, as John MacEwen argues, "its effect on all thinking, forward-looking people was immediate and terrific" (1977, p.13).

Johnston's book is a polemic in which he convicts "some 33 of our Scots 'Noble Families' of taking in the year 1874 land rents (mostly from stolen territory) amounting to over £2,602,000." He also attempts to give "some indication of the additional plunder they secured by foisting themselves into sineuses and by abstracting from the public funds huge remunerations for more or less imaginary services" (1911, p.139). It is Johnston's intention to:

Show the people that our Old Nobility is not so noble, that its lands are stolen-lands - stolen either by force or fraud; show people that the title deeds are rapine, murder, massacre, cheating or Court harlotry; dissolve the halo of divinity that surrounds the hereditary title; let the people clearly understand that our present House of Lords is composed largely of descendants of successful pirates and rogues; do these things and you shatter the Romance that keeps the nation spellbound while privilege picks its pockets (1911, p.x).
For:

So long as a dozen families own one-half of Scotland, so long will countless families own none of it, and be under continual necessity of cringing and begging

'A brother of the earth to give them leave to toil!' (1911, p.ix).

Johnston's writing makes stirring polemic but, as with all polemic, the danger comes when its status is elevated to something more. Our Scots Noble Families does not escape this fate for in the 'Preface' written by Ramsay MacDonald, it is described as a "valuable contribution" to "the scientific side of socialism" (1911, p.vi). Most worrying of all, perhaps, is the way it is venerated as a valuable contribution to understanding the history of the people of Scotland. To this end MacDonald argues that instead of being one of countless:

... stories of useless pageantry, chronicles of the birth and death of kings, annals of Court intrigue and international war... [it presents us with] the real facts and narratives of moment, the loss of our ancient freedom, the rape of our common lands and the shameless and dastardly methods by which a few selected stocks snatched the patrimony of the people (1911, p.vii).

In 1949 a book entitled Lowland Lairds attempted to redress the balance, pointing out that not all Scottish lairds were bad and that rather than being imaginary, the services to the State provided by the landed families, particularly the landed families of lowland Scotland, had been immense. The author, James Fergusson, himself the descendant of a landed lowland family, the Fergussons of Kilkeran, openly admitted that he writes as a partisan:

I write as a partisan - and why not? The bad lairds have had plenty of publicity, if not more than they deserved: the good not so much. They should be remembered not as picturesque antiquities, but for what they did. They cared for the land, and for their dependents, with as much thought as does the modern State and often with more discrimination. To them too, Scotland owes all its finest woodlands, a quantity of noble architecture, and collections great and small, of pictures, books, and furniture which have made the Scottish country
house a living and harmonious example of our culture at its best (1949, p.23).

Little did Fergusson realise at the time of writing Lowland Lairds that quarter of a century later the tables were to be turned slightly. For today the commercial viability of the country mansion makes, as will be seen in Chapters Six and Seven, a significant contribution to helping the landowner avoid what Newby has called, his "long predicted oblivion" (1979, pp.58-59).

In addition to admitting that he writes as a partisan, with a particular bias in favour of the 'Improver' lairds, such as his grandfather and great-grandfather, Fergusson makes no grand claims about offering a true or definitive history of the landed families. Anecdotal and amusing in style, Fergusson's book directly and indirectly highlights many of the weaknesses of Johnston's arguments.

Fergusson starts off by pointing out that "there is an increasing tendency to speak and write of the history of the Scottish people, as though their comparatively modern integration had existed much earlier than extant records would suggest" (1949, p.13). As a remedy he suggests that:

It would be no more misleading, and might even be a useful counter-balance, to write the story of our country as that of the landed families of Lowland Scotland. For their influence on Scotland's growth and development has been steadier and more enduring than that of kings and regents, and far more direct than that of popular movements (1949, p.13).

For while being less flamboyant than the highland clans which feature so much in popular history and fiction, the histories of the great families of lowland Scotland form a mirror of the changing political fortunes of Scotland.

To anyone who has ever, no matter how superficially, looked at the history of Scotland's great families, it soon becomes apparent that "all the landed families of whatever rank or extent, blend and join together in a complicated tangle of relationships which
unite them all" (Fergusson, 1949, p.14). In explaining why this is so, Fergusson manages to undermine Johnston's "few selected stocks" (1911, p. vii) argument. Fergusson's own argument is that:

Class distinctions were never strong in Scotland. Earls' families intermarried with knights', the small laird wedded the daughter of the great, and the great laird might choose his bride from the daughter of a prosperous burgess - while that burgess himself might be the son or grandson of some cadet of a noble house (1949, p.14).

The landed families of Scotland were, therefore, bound to each other by kinship and, Fergusson argues, they were bound to the classes that were landless, not by kinship this time, but by the land itself. For:

Between the laird and his tenant and even his servant there remained a kinship of feeling, a realisation of common interest, a sense of loyalty to the soil on which and from which both of them lived, which in comparison scarcely existed between English squires and English yeomen, and never came to birth between the French seigneur and his serfs (1949, p.15).

Three factors, Fergusson argues, made up this 'kinship of feeling' which, writing in 1949, he argued, was far from dead. The 'kinship of feeling' arose partly from "the feudal relationship which bound the Laird's Jock to the Laird as it bound Harden to Buccleuch and Buccleuch to the king." It also derived "partly from a common simplicity of life and manners" and, thirdly, "perhaps partly from a community of race, since the Norman strain was assimilated in the Scottish nobility instead of overlaying society with an alien aristocracy, as happened in England" (1949, p.15).

This last point about Norman assimilation is much more plausible than Johnston's bigotted denunciation of the Scottish aristocracy on the grounds that seventy five percent of Scottish 'noble' families are "descendants of foreign freebooters, who forcibly took possession of our land after the Norman conquest in 1066" (1911, p.ix), and his irrational hatred of Robert the Bruce on the
grounds that he was a Norman. He claims:

The Bruce, a Norman convinced our forefathers that his fight against the English was for Scottish freedom; and, lo, when the invading hosts were driven back, the Bruce handed our common fields to his fellow Normans (1911, p.viii).

The harmonious relationship which is thus supposed to have existed between the laird and his men flourished, Fergusson argues, "as long as Scotland remained a predominantly agricultural country." It was maintained after the Reformation by the Scottish educational system which, until well on into the nineteenth century "sent the sons of the laird, farmer, smith and fisherman to sit side by side on the same school bench" (1949, p.15).

While Johnston was guilty of romanticism of the Left, Fergusson is equally guilty of romanticism of the Right. Yet the charges of which Fergusson stands accused are not as severe as those levelled at Johnston. Fergusson's saving grace in this respect is the fact that he is not blind to the fact that there were some bad lairds. He takes the Dukes of Buccleuch and the Earls of Cassillis as examples of "little tyrants in their own districts, waging small wars of their own and lording it over neighbouring families equally old but less dynamic" (1949, pp.16-17).

The value of Fergusson's account, however, does not rest entirely on the fact that it is more sensitive and subtle than Johnston's tirade. It is important, also, because he describes in considerable detail the areas in which the landed families of lowland Scotland have been particularly influential. He points to six such areas.

The first of these is the role of the landed families in establishing the Church of Scotland. It was, in particular, the smaller lairds from the west country:

... who built up the young Church of Scotland, swung over the mass of the rural population to the cause of the National Covenant, and headed that stubborn and aggressive resistance to the royal authority throughout the 'Killing Times' which is at once the glory and the shame of Scotland (1949, p.18).
Secondly, a century later, the landed families of lowland Scotland, especially those of East Lothian, made a great contribution to Scottish agriculture, transforming it "from a clumsy medieval craft into a modern science" (1949, p.18). He points to Grant of Monymusk, Maxwell of Arkland, Cockburn of Ormiston, Dempster of Dunniston, Barclay of Urie, Fullarton of Fullarton, Orr of Barrowfield, Lord Kames and Lord Gardenstone as examples of lowland lairds involved in agricultural reforms and collectively known as the 'Improvers'.

Thirdly, Fergusson points out, the 'Improvers' work did not stop at farming but extended to many other features of the Scottish landscape, including the building of roads, bridges, piers, schools and churches. In order to do this the 'Improver' lairds needed "not only energy and foresight but the courage to risk experiments which might bring success, or in not a few cases, disaster" (1949, p.19).

This same adventurous spirit, Fergusson argues, found expression in other areas where the landed families of lowland Scotland made a major contribution. This brings us to the fourth area in which the landed lowland families were particularly influential, this time in establishing "the European reputation of Scotland as a nursery of warriors" (1949, p.19), thereby transforming fictitious characters, such as Sir Walter Scott’s Dugald Dalgetty and Ludovic Lesley, into flesh and blood.

The 'adventurous spirit' of the landed families of lowland Scotland was not just confined to soldiering and agricultural improvement. In some it inspired a sense of wanderlust. Thus apart from the Improvers and the soldiers:

Besides these, there were the merchants who established themselves in the seaports of France, Scandinavia, the Baltic, and the low countries, and the students who found their way to Paris, Padua, Leyden or Cologne. Many of these wanderers were cadets of landed families in Lowland Scotland (1949, p.19).
Finally, Fergusson points out that many sons of the landed lowland families went into politics:

... it was from established Lowland families that there came such men as George Baillie of Jerviswood, Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, Sir James Oswald of Dunnillivier, Sir William Pulteney (who was born a Johnstone of Westerhall but changed his name), Alexander Wedderburn, who became Lord Chancellor of England, George Dempster of Dunnichen, and above all Henry Dundas. [Additionally], they brought to politics the same eager energy which their brothers gave to law, business, farming, philosophy or antiquarian researches, according to their bent (1949, p. 20).

Of the six areas Fergusson lists in which lowland lairds have been particularly influential it is this last one, the field of politics and the role of the lairds in the formal political process, which interests me most. This is the subject matter of Chapters Four and Five. I focus on the role of the lairds in the formal political process for two reasons. Firstly, because the other five areas have, to a large extent, been staked out as the terrain of historians. Secondly, and more importantly, because my interest in this thesis is primarily in the power of these great families; where it comes from and how it has changed over time. There is no better vehicle through which to study the nature of power than through the activity of politics. They are parts of the same equation.

2.2 The Stay of Execution

Before exploring the politics/power equation further it is necessary to look more closely at where Johnston's account finishes and Fergusson's account takes off. In this respect the one can be read as following on from the other, and despite their very different positions vis-a-vis the great families, there is a similarity in that both are concerned with the lairds' long-term demise. Johnston, in his attempt to expose the vices and misdemeanours of Scotland's 'Noble Families' hoped to condemn them to future historical impotency. This would be achieved by sentencing landowners, as a class, to death. He saw the new
political force of socialism as their executioner. It would surely not be long until the sentence would be carried out?

Scotland's 'Noble Families' were, however, still on Death Row in 1949 when Fergusson's Lowland Lairds was published. In this book, Fergusson accounts for the stay of execution and by doing so provides a useful account of the way the role of the lowland laird has changed in this century, up to 1949. In this way it helps to set the scene for my own study of lairds and landownership in the Scottish Borders. Fergusson's account is, therefore, worth outlining in some detail.

Fergusson explains how the lowland laird had his golden age, which he dates from the Union of Parliaments (1707) to World War One. Throughout these centuries the lairds lived securely on their hereditary estates, rearing large families to carry on the traditions of public duty and service. It seemed as if this was the way things would continue. The outbreak of World War One in 1914 firmly announced that this would not be the case.

The carnage of World War One was not confined to the battlefield. For World War One, Fergusson argues:

... wounded this rural society severely. Many estates were broken up, or changed hands, and some of the new owners acquired their lands without the traditions which in past times had not failed to pass with them even to distant heirs or purchasers (1949, pp.23-24).

The result was that those lairds who survived had to cope with smaller estate staffs, and steadily rising costs, not merely of improvements but of maintenance. Thus:

The Laird's Jock often found, as he grew up, that employment was not available for him, as it had been for his father, in the woods, the gardens, or the joiner's shop, and went off to Glasgow or Canada; and his sister did the same, instead of going, as her mother had done, into service at the 'big house' (1949, p.24).
Between World War One and World War Two, Fergusson argues, the whole economy of landownership changed. The introduction of income tax and then of death duties had a devastating effect; for they cut off the private income and then ate into the revenue that maintained the estate.

World War Two brought further increases in income tax and a rise in the wages of agricultural workers and foresters. This necessitated proportionate increases in the wages of all estate workers. There was also a substantial increase in the employers' share of workers' insurance. Fergusson says that the lament of John Galt's impoverished laird of Auld-bigings in 1825 took on a new significance:

> What with the Government at the one end with their taxes, and the laborous folk at the other with their wages, the incomes of our 'stated gentry is just like a candle lighted at both ends' (John Galt, 'The Last of the Lairds', 1825; Fergusson, 1949, p. 25).

The role of the laird had then, by 1949, changed considerably. Fergusson had the foresight to see that it would have to continue to do so if the stay of execution was to be extended and landowners as a class were to survive:

> Landowners as a class are widely regarded as an anachronism, and, although, they still have a not unimportant part to play in rural society, are being tacitly encouraged to disappear. But the laird who is not a merely inactive landowner is not dying out, though he is changing (1949, p. 25).

One is reminded here of Newby's point about the Country Landowners Association in England and Wales. He argues that there may be a historical irony in the descendants of nineteenth-century country gentlemen mobilising themselves in a manner which at times resembles that of a trade union, but that it is this very adaptability which has enabled the landowner to survive. Newby's argument can be extended to Scotland, because here similar functions are performed by the Scottish Landowners Federation.
At the time of writing, Fergusson pointed out that there were two classes of laird, 'the old and the new'. The class of lairds he describes as the 'new' lairds are either former tenant farmers who have bought their farms, or incomers "with money from the city" (1949, p.25) who have bought land to farm, maybe "answering some dimly felt call in his blood from a long-dead ancestor who left the country for the town a century or two ago" (1949, p.26).

As for the 'old' lairds, Fergusson regarded them as having "some definite future" if they "reduced their properties to the size of a large farm which they can, and do run themselves, or to a forestry unit," or if they were among the few "who have turned their estates into private companies" (1949, p.26).

Fergusson's Lowland Lairds is then a sentimental and partisan tribute to the landowning families of lowland Scotland by one of their number. There is a whole chapter dedicated to his father, grandfather and great-grandfather, the lairds of Kilkeran, better known as the Kilkeran Improvers. But for all its obvious bias, and Fergusson openly admits his partisanship, Fergusson's Lowland Lairds is in fact a perceptive account of the changing role of the laird. It is free from the restrictions, oversimplifications and inaccuracies of both the work of Tom Johnston and of many contemporary Marxist accounts. For this reason it cannot be dismissed as mere sentimental drivel or irrelevant rhetoric.

One of the major strengths of Fergusson's work is that while he is acutely aware of the economic side of landownership he does not conceive of the role played by landowners throughout history in purely economic terms. For example, he points out that:

The lairds, in addition to their work in agriculture and afforestation, once exercised a number of functions which belong nowadays to the State, local authorities or incorporated bodies. These functions included, at one time or another, the administration of local justice through the baron courts, the drawing up of voters' rolls through the Michaelmas Head Courts, the development of rural industries, the building of churches, schools, and occasionally whole villages (1949, p.26).
This makes for a rural landscape which is in many ways "the monument to the old lairds' discharge of their public duties, the responsibility for which has now passed to other hands" (1949, pp.26-27).

Fergusson’s account, despite its obvious partisanship offers, therefore, a considerable degree of insight and perceptiveness. Not only does he describe how the role of the laird has changed over time. He also explains why, much to Johnston's regret, the lairds were given an indefinite stay of execution. In addition he provided some suggestions as to how the stay of execution could be extended still further. To this end he argues that:

... the spirit that once vitalised that responsibility must not perish: it must be directed into other channels, into conscientious service of the land itself, and into the innumerable committees, from those of a County Council downwards, through which local government is carried on. It is in this sphere that the traditions of the old lairds must be kept alive and renewed (1949, pp.26-27).

Fergusson's predictions were fulfilled. As Chapter Four illustrates, from the time he was writing until the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974 the energies of the Border lairds were directed into the formal channels of County Councils and their various committees.

The year 1974 saw major changes. The County Councils which had been established in 1889 were done away with and the proposals outlined in the Wheatley Commission were implemented. A two-tier system of local government was introduced - the two tiers being the Regions/Islands and the Districts. With reorganisation, the direct formal involvement of landowners in Scottish local government, in the sense of being members of councils and committees, was drastically reduced. Surely the long wait on Death Row was now over?

The reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974 and the corresponding removal of the great Border landowning families from
these channels of influence was a change that Fergusson, writing in 1949, could not have foreseen. He would probably not have been surprised, however, to learn that the sentence has still not been carried out and that 'the spirit' of the 'old' lairds he praises so highly, is as lively as ever. For by the time of reorganisation, many lowland lairds, seeing the hangman approach, had been driven to secure for themselves other channels through which 'the spirit' could be kept alive. In the Borders this was achieved by enterprising lairds like the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe being prepared to open their stately/ancestral homes to the public and to convert the history with which Johnston had tried to convict them into a commodity whereby they could save themselves.
There are, therefore, radically-different versions of the roles played by the great families in Scottish history. These range from the 'official' histories of the families, such as William Fraser's *The Scotts of Buccleuch* (1878), and the brief histories of the families that can be found in the guidebooks to their stately homes, (both essentially attempts to legitimate the great families, their power, position and privilege), to Johnston's tirade and Fergusson's attempt to redress the balance. All must be taken with a very big pinch of salt and understood in light of the context in which they were written and what they set out to achieve or expose. There is one thing, however, which is common to all of these accounts and which is backed up by other, more general histories of Scotland, local histories and archive material. This is that these noble families have, throughout history, certainly wielded a tremendous amount of power and influence.

I do not intend to get bogged-down in a debate about power, for such an exercise would be futile and self-defeating. As Stephen Lukes points out, power is a concept which must be treated with extreme caution:

Indeed, I would maintain that power is one of those concepts which is ineradicably value-dependent. By this mean I mean that both its very definition and any given use of it, once defined are inextricably tied to a given set of (probably unacknowledged) value-assumptions which predetermined the range of its empirical application.... Moreover, the concept of power is in consequence, what has been called an
'essentially contested concept' - one of those concepts which inevitably involve endless disputes about their proper uses on the part of their users'. Indeed, to engage in such dispute is itself to engage in politics (1974, p.26).

While we must tread carefully we cannot run away. Instead we must stand our ground and take the conceptual beast by its horns. Having tamed the beast, it can then be put to the task of arriving at a sociological understanding of the fates and fortunes of the great Border landowning families as they wax and wane over time.

Lukes's analysis of power provides a useful starting point, for he provides "a conceptual analysis of power" and argues for "a view of power (that is, a way of identifying it) which is radical in both the theoretical and political senses (and I take these senses in this context to be intimately related)" (1974, p.9).

Lukes considers, firstly, a view of power which has its origins in Weber's sociology and was popularised by Robert Dahl and his fellow pluralists. It became particularly influential among American political scientists in the 1960s. Lukes calls this view of power - which focuses on the behaviour of individuals and groups; the process of decision making; on key social/economic/political issues; on objective (overt) conflict and on subjective interests as revealed by participation in the political process - the 'one-dimensional' view of power. He also makes the point that it reflects a political philosophy which, extremely crudely could be called 'liberal'. He criticises it for being superficial and restrictive, and as leading to an unjustified celebration of American pluralism, which it portrayed as meeting the requirements of democracy.

The liberal/one-dimensional view of power was criticised by P. Bachrach and M.S. Baratz in 1962. In their paper they argue that power has two faces. The first is that identified by the pluralists. The second face is more heavily disguised, for it concerns issues and points of conflict which are organised, or
find expression outwith the political process. This hinges on what Schattschneider calls the 'mobilisation of bias' (1960, p. 71).

Lukes agrees with Bachrach and Baratz's criticisms of the pluralist view but argues that while their argument goes one step further it does not go far enough. He calls their view of power the 'two-dimensional view'.

The two-dimensional view of power which, Lukes argues, is essentially a reformist view, remains inadequate on three counts. Firstly, it is still too committed to the study of actual, observable, behaviour. It pays too little attention to the way behaviour is often socially structured and culturally patterned. It fails to take heed of Marx's maxim that:

Men make their own history but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past (K. Marx & F. Engels, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, cited in Lukes, 1974, p. 22).

Secondly, the reformist view is too preoccupied with observable conflict. It ignores the fact that not only does A exercise power over B by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but, more importantly, he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining what he wants. Thus:

The trouble seems to be that both Bachrach and Baratz and the pluralists suppose that because power, as they conceptualise it, only shows up in cases of actual conflict, it follows that actual conflict is necessary to power. But this is to ignore the crucial point that the most effective and insidious use of power is to prevent such conflict from arising in the first place (Lukes, 1974, p. 23).

Finally, there is a tendency to believe that if the observer cannot find any grievances then there must be a 'genuine' consensus of values. Thus if men have no grievances then they cannot have any interests that could be harmed by the use or misuse of power. This, Lukes argues, is unsatisfactory, because a grievance can be anything from a politically-articulated demand to
a vague feeling of deprivation. He goes on to make the point that:

... is it not the supreme and most insidious exercise of power to prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by sharpening their perceptions, cognition and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial (1974, p.24).

Lukes thus argues for a view of power which is not liberal or reformist, but what he describes as 'radical'. Such a view takes issue with the emphasis on actual, observable behaviour, prevalent in the liberal and reformist views. It is concerned instead with the many ways in which potential issues are kept out of politics. It stresses awareness of the potential for latent conflict between the interests of those exercising power and the real interests of those they exclude, who may not even be conscious of their interests.

Lukes thus offers us a way of conceptualising power. He does not, however, tell us much about the actual sources of power and their relationship to time and space. The work of Michael Mann is useful here because it overcomes some of these limitations. Influenced by Weber's sociology of domination, Mann draws our attention to what he calls 'the four sources of social power'. By doing so he takes the treatment of power one step further. Mann argues that:

A general account of societies, their structure, and their history can best be given in terms of the interrelations of what I will call the four sources of social power ideological, economic, military and political (I.E.M.P.) relationships (1986, p.2).

Before giving detailed descriptions of these four sources of social power, Mann raises the question of what these sources are in more general terms. He points to the different way power is conceptualised in much orthodox Marxian and Weberian theory. In Marxian theory they are generally, he argues, referred to as 'levels' of a 'social formation' while in neo-Weberian theory the term 'dimensions of society' is most frequently employed. Despite the differences in terminology "both presuppose an abstract,
almost geometric view of a unitary society. The levels or dimensions are elements of a larger whole, which is indeed composed of them." In both versions "society becomes a large box or circle of an n- dimensional space, subdivided into smaller boxes, sectors, levels, vectors or dimensions" (1986, p.12).

The Marxian and Weberian schemes differ in detail. Marxists see the social totality as 'ultimately' determined by economic production, whereas Weberians develop a multifactor theory in which the social totality is determined by the interplay of dimensions. Mann outlines the mathematical meaning of the word 'dimension', that is, something which is analogous and independent, being related in the same way to some underlying structural property and inhabiting the same overall space; in this case a society.

While the Marxian and Weberian schemes differ in detail, they share, Mann points out, "a symmetrical vision of society as a single, unitary whole" (1986, p.12). Within each level/dimension the impression of symmetry is reinforced in the combination of three characteristics. These are first, Mann argues:

... institutions, organizations, stable subsystems of interaction visible in most societies as 'churches', 'modes of production', 'markets', 'armies', 'states' and so forth. But they are also functions. Sometimes these are, secondly functional ends pursued by humans. For example, Marxists justify economic primacy on the grounds that humans must first pursue economic subsistence; Weberians justify the importance of ideological power in terms of the human need to find meaning in the world. More often they are viewed, thirdly as functional means. Marxists view political and ideological levels as necessary means to abstract surplus labour from the direct producers; Weberians argue that they are all means of power. But organizations, function as ends, and function as means are homologous. They are analogous and inhabit the same space. Each level or dimension has the same internal content. It is organization, function as end, and function as mean, wrapped up in a single package (1986, p.12).

My own scheme is something of a hybrid in that I use the mathematical metaphors characteristic of the Weberian scheme - dimensions, matrices and parameters - and combine this with an
adaptation of the Marxian tendency to attribute ultimate primacy to one of the levels/dimensions. Where my scheme differs from the Marxian scheme is in my argument that the ultimate primacy of one dimension over the others is something that changes over and within time. More will be said about the importance of time later on in this chapter. The next step is to outline and explain these four sources of social power according to Mann.

3.2 Mann's Four Sources of Social Power

(a) Ideological Power

Ideological power, according to Mann has three sources deriving from three interrelated arguments in the sociological tradition. Firstly, because we require concepts and categories of meaning imposed upon sense perception in order to understand and act upon the world of everyday life, those who monopolise a claim to meaning control a tremendously important source of social power. Secondly, Mann argues, in order for sustained social cooperation to be possible, it is absolutely vital that there should be norms; "shared understandings of how people act morally in their relations with each other" (1986, p. 22). Durkheim, Mann argues, demonstrated that religious movements are often the bearers of these norms:

An ideological movement that increases the mutual trust and collective morale of a group may enhance their collective powers and be rewarded with more zealous adherence. To monopolise norms is thus a route to power (1986, p. 22).

The third source of ideological power Mann points to are aesthetic and ritual practices, practices which are not reducible to rational science. He quotes Bloch on the power of religious myth. "You cannot argue with a song" and argues that "a distinctive power is conveyed through song, dance, visual art forms, and rituals" (1986, p. 23).

Mann points out that sometimes the terms 'ideology' and 'ideological power' are used to describe knowledge which is false
Mann argues that he implies neither:

Knowledge purveyed by an ideological power movement necessarily 'surpasses experience' (as Parsons puts it). It cannot be totally tested by experience, and therein lies its distinctive power to persuade and dominate (1986, p.23).

Mann is quick to point out that although such knowledge cannot be tested by experience this does not mean to say that it is necessarily false:

People are not manipulated fools. And though ideologies do contain legitimations of private interests and material domination, they are unlikely to attain a hold over people if they are merely this. Powerful ideologies are at least highly plausible in the conditions of the time, and they are genuinely adhered to (1986, p.23).

Mann argues that the functions of ideological power give rise to two distinct organizational contours. The first form is more autonomous and what Mann describes as "sociospatially transcendent" (1986, p.23). This configuration:

... transcends the existing institutions of ideological, economic, military and political power and generates a 'sacred' form of authority (in Durkheim's sense), set apart from and above more secular authority structures. It develops a powerful autonomous role when emergent properties of social life create the possibility of co-operation or exploitation that transcend the organizational reach of secular authorities (1986, p.23).

He points out that ideological organizations may be highly dependent on "diffused power techniques" which are reinforced by the extension of "universal infrastructures" (1986, p.23) such as coinage, markets and literacy.

The second form of organizational contour that ideological power gives rise to is, Mann argues, "ideology as immanent morale." This configuration intensifies "the cohesion, the confidence, and, therefore, the power of an already established social group" (1986, p.24). Immanent ideology reinforces and strengthens whatever is already there and, therefore, is less dramatically
autonomous in its impact than the transcendent type. The main examples of the immanent type of ideology are the ideologies of class and nation.

(b) Economic Power

According to Mann, "economic power derives from the satisfaction of subsistence needs through the social organization of the extraction, transformation, distribution, and consumption of the objects of nature." He points out that "a grouping formed around these tasks is called a class - which in this work, therefore, is purely an economic concept" (1986, p.24).

A class which is able to monopolise control over the relations of production, distribution, exchange and consumption obtains a large amount of "general collective and distributive power in societies," but such classes, Mann argues, "are not 'the motor of history' as Marx, for one believed" (1986, p.24).

Mann points out that Marxists stress control over labour as the source of economic power and therefore concentrate on 'modes of production'. Neo-Weberians, on the other hand, stress the organization of economic exchange. Mann argues that "we cannot elevate one above the other on a priori theoretical grounds; historical evidence must decide the issue" (1986, p.24).

Economic organisation, Mann argues, "comprises circuits of production, distribution, exchange, and consumption." These circuits are extensive but also involve "the intensive practical, every-day labor - what Marx called the praxis of the mass of the population." These "circuits of praxis" thus combine extensive and intensive, diffused and authoritative power. Classes are groups which are defined in relation to these circuits of praxis and:

The degree to which they are 'extensive', 'symmetrical', and 'political' across the whole circuit of praxis of a mode of production will determine the organizing power of class and struggle. And this will turn on the tightness of linkage
between intensive local production and extensive circuits of exchange (1986, p.25).

(c) Military Power

Military power, which Mann argues has been neglected in late twentieth-century social theory (although he does not say why):

... derives from the necessity of organized physical defense and its usefulness for aggression. It has both intensive and extensive aspects, for it concerns questions of life and death, as well as the organization of defense and offense in large geographical and social spaces. Those who monopolise it, as military elites, can obtain collective and distributive power (1986, p.26).

Military power, Mann argues, has two main organizational forms. Firstly, it is essentially what he calls "concentrated coercive" in that it mobilizes violence which is "the most concentrated, if bluntest, instrument of human power." The most obvious example of the concentration of force is a wartime situation, but Mann points out, "it may endure beyond the battlefield and the campaign" (1986, p.26). Slavery is a classic example of coerced labour outside of the battlefield.

Military power also assumes a more extensive, negative, terroristic form. Throughout history, Mann argues, locals living in the shadow of a great military force have had to comply, externally, at least, with its dictates. This was the fate of the Merse farmers of the old Scottish Eastern March who supplied the town of Berwick, on the English side of the Border, with food. However, Mann does not mention, that in such cases the power relationship was double edged for, as John Carey, the officer at the Berwick garrison, whom I have already quoted, pointed out, if the Merse farmers refused to sell to Berwick, "we need no other siege" (MacDonald Fraser, 1971, p.35). Mann does point out that just because locals may have appeared to obey the dictates of a nearby military presence this does not mean to say that they internalised them. Thus, "everyday behaviour could be otherwise unconstrained" (1986, p.26).
Military power, Mann argues, is therefore:

... sociospatially dual: a concentrated core in which positive, coerced controls can be exercised, surrounded by an extensive penumbra in which terrorized populations will not normally step beyond certain niceties of compliance but whose behaviour cannot be positively controlled (1986, p. 26).

(d) Political Power

Political power, Mann argues, "derives from the usefulness of centralized, institutionalized regulation of many aspects of social relations." He stresses that he is not defining it in purely 'functional' terms, that is, in terms of judicial regulation backed by coercion for any power organization, be it ideological, economic or military, can possess these functions, as can states. He restricts its definition to "regulations and coercions centrally administered and territorially bounded - that is, to state power" (1986, p. 26).

Political power, Mann argues, is different from the other power sources in two respects:

As here defined, political power heightens boundaries, whereas the other power sources may transcend them. Second, military, economic, and ideological power can be involved in any social relationship, wherever located. Any A or group of As can exercise these forms of power against any B or group of Bs. By contrast, political relations concern one particular area, the 'center' (1986, p. 27).

The key to political power, and what marks it out as different, is for Mann the fact that it is "located at the center and exercised outwards." It is "necessarily centralized and territorial" which makes for the fact that "those who control the state, the state elite, can obtain both collective and distributive power and trap others within their distinctive 'organization chart'" (1986, p.27).

Political organization, Mann argues, is "sociospatially dual" (1986, p.27) but not in the same way that military power is sociospatially dual. The difference hinges on the distinction
between domestic and international organization. Domestically, he argues, the state is "territorially centralized and territorially-bounded." When there are the possibilities for "enhanced cooperation and exploitation of a centralized form over a confined territorial area" (1986, p.27), states are thus able to attain a greater degree of autonomous power. In order to maintain this power the state depends to a considerable degree upon techniques of authoritative power.

The world, Mann points out, has never yet been dominated by a single state which has meant that states' territorial boundaries give rise to an area of regulated interstate relations. Thus, he argues, "geo-political diplomacy is a second form of political power organization" (1986, p.27).

3.3 The Limitations of Mann's Model

Taken together, Mann says of his four power sources:

They give collective organization and unity to the infinite variety of social existence. They provide such significant patterning as there is in large-scale social structure (which may or may not be very great) because they are capable of generating collective action. They are 'the generalized means' through which human beings make their own history (1986, p.28).

This is interesting stuff. Conceiving of power as a model made up of four different, but related, sources which give rise to, and find expression in different organisational configurations is more subtle and would appear to be of far more use than conceiving of power as two faces. It does indeed represent a major advance, but Mann's model is not without its limitations.

Mann's model, I would argue, is ultimately restricting because he attributes too much importance to the model per se. Mann takes issue with Weber's railway metaphor, that ideas are like 'switchmen' determining down which of several tracks social development would proceed. He argues instead that the metaphor should be amended, for "the sources of social power are
'tracklaying vehicles' - for the tracks do not exist before the direction is chosen" (1986, p.28). Thus, for Mann, power is the primary force, which works upon, structures and shapes, chooses the direction, in which the tracks for social development will be laid.

While respecting many of the subtleties of Mann's argument, especially his breakdown of power into four sources, I am unhappy with the way power is raised to the status of a force over and above society. Consequently, I turn Mann's conceptualisation slightly on its head and argue that if the four sources of social power are 'tracklaying vehicles' then they are tracklaying vehicles programmed by society over time. In fact I would rather not employ the railway metaphor at all because it distorts and detracts from the real issues under consideration.

The major weakness of Mann's conceptualisation of power, it seems to me, lies in the fact that he conceives of power as a model, something which in the end remains rather fixed and rigid in its relationship to time and space. I argue that it is more fruitful to conceive of power as a matrix, a set of changing dimensions, and parameters within time and space. While all four dimensions are always present within the matrix, there is the tendency, at different points in history, for one dimension to be predominant while the others lie dormant.

3.4 The Matrix in Scotland

In Scotland the matrix initially drew its shape from the system of feudal landownership which was gradually introduced and took hold during the eleventh century and lasted until the end of the sixteenth century. Under the feudal system of landholding it was military power that predominated. As Robin Fraser Callander argues:

Throughout the first five centuries of feudalism in Scotland, from the late eleventh century to the end of the sixteenth century, land was the most powerful currency in Scotland. Feudalism was employed by Scottish kings as a well-tried
system of law and order for strengthening their central authority and involved the promotion of power, based on the possession of land.

The Crown assumed ownership of all the land in the realm and then granted out authority over different parts of that land to others in exchange for financial and military obligations to the Crown. These owners could then grant out portions of their lands to others under similar conditions (1987, p.16).

During the seventeenth century there was a marked decline in the number of landowners and a re-concentration of landownership into fewer and fewer hands. This pattern was to continue throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. With these developments the power matrix was thus being remoulded. Economic power was becoming increasingly predominant over military power. To quote Robin Fraser Callander:

The beginning of this decline in the number of landowners reflected a shift during the seventeenth century in the balance between the main factors determining the power behind landownership. The change can be characterised as a rise in the economic over the military significance of land. Traditionally, bonds of kinship and the authority of feudal lordship had been the dominant influences in the values of land. During the seventeenth century kinship was still strong between landowners, but it was declining in importance and, at the same time, the role of feudal superiorities was also decreasing. Instead, the economic potential of land through rents and teinds was assuming a new priority in landownership (1987, p.33).

While lairds throughout the lowlands of Scotland, "beating their swords into plough-shares, turned Scottish agriculture from a clumsy medieval craft into a modern science" (Fergusson, 1949, p.18), military power in Scotland was becoming rationalised and bureaucratised. The Napoleonic Wars led to the establishing of a permanent lieutenancy and a militia which itself underwent a process of rationalisation. Force thus became divided between the army at the national level and the police at the local level.

From the middle of the eighteenth century onwards the lairds' ability to achieve domination through having a monopoly of economic interests was in turn weakened. The growth of industrial, commercial and manufacturing capital during the Industrial
Revolution shattered the lairds' monopoly of economic interest, but at the same time, by creating the need for society to be rationally administered, helped to secure a political basis for their power. Thus the political dimension was consolidated and sustained until the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974 made it more or less redundant. By this time, however, a different dimension had come to the fore. This dimension, which currently dominates the matrix, is the ideological dimension. It finds its most complete contemporary expression in the 'heritage industry' to which it helped give birth. This metamorphosis of political power into ideological power is a complicated process and is the subject of Chapters Seven and Eight. This chapter, meanwhile, is concerned with the dimension of political power, which from the time of the Industrial Revolution and up until 1974, was the dominant one.

3.5 'Power' in Scotland

Part of the inspiration for this thesis came from John MacEwen's Who Owns Scotland? Indeed, without this book it would not have been conceived of, let alone written. But important and valuable as it is, some of the arguments of Who Owns Scotland? (especially those put forward by John McGrath in his "encouraging and solid foreword" ("Acknowledgements", MacEwen, 1977)), to say nothing of the premises upon which the book is based, cannot be accepted wholeheartedly and without criticism.

I have already outlined the limitations of Tom Johnston's arguments as presented in Our Scots Noble Families. Johnston, it would seem, had an axe to grind and was determined to do so at any cost, even if it meant not only leaving out evidence to the contrary, but actually distorting it. In addition, he relied heavily upon simplistic rhetoric in order to make his points. The result was a contrived and bigotted piece of polemic.

Over half a century later, John McGrath in the 'Foreword' to Who Owns Scotland? falls into the same traps. A playwright by trade,
McGrath is a master of the grand opening. The audience listens dumbfounded as he tells us that:

We live in the age of the multi-national corporation. In twenty years time, we are told, 200 major corporations will dominate the economy of the entire capitalist world. National Governments, national frontiers are becoming meaningless as these giants leap over them in pursuit of profit and expansion.

The constitution of the ruling classes is changing from one of the domination of owners and industrialists, to the domination of non-owning managers operating in many countries, controlling many industries. Why, when this is going on, should we pay attention to the throw-back to feudal times that lingers on in the land-ownership patterns of Scotland?

For many small - and middle-class farmers, the actual ownership of the land is becoming increasingly meaningless. As they find themselves at the mercy of the monopolies that control their input needs, and control the prices of their output, they find themselves working more and more as servants of the market, managing the land on behalf of stronger economic forces which are outside their control. The biggest profit from land in many parts is not for those who reap and sow, but for property speculators, who buy and sell land, often without even walking on it - sometimes without even entering the country. Why, in the circumstances, bother about the 'wilderness' of Scotland, and how many acres of it the latest generation of an ancient family has managed to cling to? (MacEwen, 1977, p.1).

Before the reader has time to properly digest these staggering, sweeping statements, the ardent playwright is forcing his explanation upon us:

There seems to me to be two main reasons - doubtless there are many more. The first is that examining the land-ownership structure tells us a lot about Scotland. It points to a history which is significantly different from that of neighbouring nations, and it establishes that the consequences of that history are with us today, and should affect our thinking about Scotland and its particular problems.

Scotland, to put it crudely, did not have its own bourgeois revolution - it inherited the fruits of the English one by the Act of Union. But this Act and the subsequent growth of Scottish capital was carefully 'managed' by the Scottish aristocracy. The aristocrats had accumulated their wealth not because they were skillful merchants, but because they owned vast acres of land. Through ownership of mineral rights and/or careful investment of their capital, and/or very convenient marriages, plus wily use of their strong political position,
they remained in the forefront of the new capitalist class. This allowed them to retain their vast estates, and the quasi-feudal relationships that went with them, even to this day (MacEwen, 1977, pp.1-2).

McGrath almost gets away with it. On first, and even second readings, his arguments seem plausible. It is not until one starts to analyse what he is saying, to dissect the various strands of his arguments, that their underlying weaknesses and inaccuracies are revealed. When McGrath's rampant socialist rhetoric is looked at in this way, several points emerge which cannot be accepted.

The first of these is bound up with a general confusion in this area over the meaning of the word 'feudal'. As Robin Fraser Callander argues:

Scotland's system of landownership is different from that in the rest of Britain because it is defined by Scots Law. The Scottish system is also unique in the modern world because the method by which land is owned is still legally classified as feudal. Feudal landownership became established in Scotland during the eleventh century and has survived remarkably unaltered for nine centuries (1987, p.9).

Legally speaking, this is true. The mistake is to confuse the meaning of the word 'feudal' in the legal sense with what historians (especially Marxist historians) mean by feudal; that is, pre-capitalist. Consequently there is a tendency among writers such as McGrath to equate the way property is held legally, with a specific pattern of social relationships. For example, he talks about the "quasi-feudal relationships" of the Scottish laird who is "an archaic 'seigneur' at home" and a "go-getting capitalist in London" (1987, p.2). This is a generalisation which most certainly does not apply to either the current Duke of Buccleuch or the current Duke of Roxburghe. Admittedly, the Scottish 'heritage industry' was in its infancy when McGrath was writing his 'Foreword' to MacEwen's book, but the Bowhill Estates have been run as a registered company since 1923 and the Roxburghes have run a stud farm as a registered company since 1951. This is hardly the way "archaic 'seigneurs'" operate!
My other major criticism of McGrath is his explanation of how landownership in Scotland today can be explained by the fact that Scotland did not have its own bourgeois revolution but inherited the fruits of the English one by the Act of Union, and how the subsequent growth of Scottish capitalism was stage-managed by the Scottish aristocracy.

Other writers have argued that in Scotland capitalism was not an altogether alien imposition. John Foster, for example, argues that Scotland was a weak link on the periphery of European feudalism and produced at a very early stage— that is, when merchant and manufacturing capital was still dominant— its own very early capitalist social relations. These, however, were too premature and feeble to survive without an increasingly close alliance with capitalist forces in England. It was this inability of Scottish capitalism to maintain the institutions it inherited which led to the Union of 1707. Those in favour of union were mainly the bigger landowners, and west coast merchants. They managed, by the Act of Union, to establish:

... a non-colonial political relationship—quite distinct from that between England and Ireland or the America colonies [and] separate Scottish legal and educational systems, a form of religious settlement not unlike that suppressed in England in 1660, and springing from this, quite different poor law and social control practices (Foster, 1975, p. 146).

As Smout has said, "most Scots would, quite rightly, have laughed at the idea that the Scottish nation came to an end in 1707.... it was the end of an auld song, perhaps, but it was not yet the end of an auld people" (1972, pp. 158-9).

Foster's argument about the growth of Scottish capitalism is a good deal more refined than McGrath's crude, materialist one. It does not, however, help us to understand 'power' in Scotland for it is still overly simplistic and economistic. This is true of many other sociologists, political scientists, economists and economic historians writing on Scotland. Thus, while works such as Johnston's Our Scots Noble Families (1911), The Red Paper On
Scotland (1975), edited by Gordon Brown, Scottish Capitalism (1980), edited by Tony Dickson, and Who Owns Scotland? (1977), are useful in so far as they draw attention to Scotland and raise questions about class, nationality and power in Britain, they do not provide very satisfactory answers.

What is needed, I argue, is a way of looking at 'power' in Scotland which is much more subtle. The work of Antonio Gramsci is important in this respect, for it throws light, not just on the way power, political or otherwise, operates in Scotland, but provides a useful tool for helping to understand Scotland and why it is, in certain fundamental respects, different from the rest of Britain.

The next step is to look at the key Gramscian concepts of the State, civil society, and hegemony.

3.4 Gramsci: the State, Civil Society & Hegemony

(a) Civil Society & the State

For Gramsci, capitalist society is composed of three sets of social relations: the relations of production, 'that is, the basic relations between capital and labour; the coercive relations which characterise the state and all other social relations which make up civil society. The distinction between civil society and state is crucial. The institutions of the state are those institutions which possess a monopoly of coercion. The institutions of civil society on the other hand include those of government, political parties, trade unions, churches, the mass media, the law, education and cultural and voluntary institutions. Gramsci compared civil society to a powerful system of "fortresses and earthworks" (Simon, 1985, p.74) standing behind the state. It is the sphere of class struggles and of popular democratic struggles. As such it is the sphere where hegemony is exercised. The concept of hegemony requires some explanation.
The original Greek meaning of 'hegemony' is the predominance of one nation over another. The term hegemony, as Simon points out, was used by Lenin in a rather different sense when he argued that the Russian working class should form and lead an alliance with the peasantry to overthrow the Tsarist autocracy. By doing so, the working class, then a tiny minority of the population, would be able to win the support of the great majority of people. Thus, for Lenin, hegemony was essentially a strategy for revolution.

Central then to the term hegemony, as used by both Lenin and Gramsci, Simon argues, is the notion of building up a system of alliances. Gramsci, however, adds an important new dimension here with his concept of national-popular. For Lenin hegemony was essentially an alliance of classes or parts of classes. Gramsci realised that there are many struggles in which people are involved which do not have a class character. Thus Gramsci's concept of hegemony has a national-popular, as well as a class, dimension and this is what makes it particularly relevant to an understanding of power in Scotland.

This strategy of building up a broad bloc of varied social forces, unified by a common conception of the world, is termed a 'war of position'. In order to achieve and maintain its hegemonic dominance the hegemonic bloc, which is bound together by ideology, must retain its monopoly of shared meanings and understandings. Because it acts as the cement for such a broad alliance this ideology cannot be a pure class ideology. It has to be a synthesis of the historical traditions of a country and representative of the diverse social movements which make up the hegemonic bloc. It has to be rooted in and appeal to what Gramsci calls 'common sense'; the uncritical, often confused and contradictory, and largely unconscious way in which a person perceives the world.

Because hegemony depends on the building up of a system of alliances it is never unassailable. When hegemony is seriously
threatened, and a process of extensive reorganisation is needed in order to re-establish it, the characteristic response is a strategy of what Gramsci called 'passive revolution'. This occurs through the agency of the State and without the active participation of the people. Thus social reforms which have been demanded by the opposing forces may seem to be carried out, but they are usually no more than a measure intended to disorganise these forces and damp down or diffuse any popular struggles.

(c) Power

The traditional Marxist-Leninist view has been that there is a sharp separation between the sphere of economics where the production of surplus value takes place, and the sphere of politics where the struggle for state power occurs. Power according to this view is concentrated in the state. Gramsci rejects this and argues that, on the contrary, the social relations of civil society interpenetrate with the relations of production.

To this end Gramsci suggests that power, instead of being understood as something which is restricted to the coercive apparatuses of the State, should be conceived of as a relation. Power, in Gramsci's sense of the term, is thus a mixture of hegemony and coercion, "hegemony armoured by coercion" (Simon, 1982, p.27).

Thus far more is meant by 'political power' than the winning of State power; for to gain control over the State it is necessary to win a substantial measure of hegemony in civil society. Border lairds, like landowners in general, have since the Reform Act of 1833 experienced a gradual decline in their control over the State in terms of the holding of formal political office. This has been the result of parliamentary reform acts geared towards obtaining universal manhood suffrage and the various reforms which have taken place in the sphere of local government.
Border lairds, like the majority of Scottish landowners, are now, for the most part, no longer actively involved in local or parliamentary politics. At the same time, however, that their control over State power has declined they have retained their powerful hold over many aspects of Scottish civil society. They have been able to do so because Scotland has not followed the classic trend Gramsci pointed to since the French Revolution, of civil societies and States fitting each other. For as Nairn points out, Scottish civil society was 'guaranteed' in its independent existence by the Union:

The church, the law, the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie of the Royal Burghs: all these institutions and the dominant classes linked to them were confirmed in what they had demanded of separate identity. So was the distinct social culture they represented (1975, p.27).

It is this which has led Nairn to call Scotland "a hippogriff: a manifest bastard in the world of nationalist wedlock" (1975, p.27). It is this also which makes 'power' in Scotland a peculiar beast and the reason why conceiving of it as a matrix, a piece of raw material which is moulded and remoulded, shaped and distorted by time and space, coupled with Gramscian ideas of hegemony and civil society, is the most useful way of trying to explain, in political terms, how the fortunes of the great families rose and fell.

3.7 "Politics" in Scotland

"Good general accounts of modern Scotland exist", Michael Fry argues, "but politics are granted only a subordinate part in them." He argues that this is due to a combination of several factors. Firstly, the fact that "the activity is among the few in which Scots have not excelled, save perhaps after they have emigrated." Secondly, the fact that "when not dominated by one party, the country has normally conformed to the pattern in the rest of Britain," and thirdly, the fact that "with a legislature 400 miles away, politics could hardly have stood at the centre of national life or even have contributed to its preservation." Thus
whereas for other countries political history has tended to be the foundation of all history this has not been the case in Scotland where social history has assumed this role. Scotland has "accordingly produced little in the way of political historiography" (1987, p. 1).

Fry's argument in Patronage & Principle is that "a Scottish political tradition can be disinterred from oblivion and neglect" (1987, p. 1). He points out that, when he started his research in the mid 1970s, interest in Scottish political history "usually petered out after 1707, almost entirely in 1745" because with the Union "it had usually been assumed that Scottish political history was over and done with" (1987, p. 3).

Much of today's historical understanding of Scotland, Fry argues, is erected on the shaky foundations of the lost or betrayed causes of the Scottish past. This has two effects: it generates emotions "which console the country for the fact that so much of its serious political activity ran and runs into the sands of indifference and ineptitude" and it produces myths which interplay with other forces to shape history but at the same time "obfuscate reality" (1987, p. 4).

What seems to have happened is that during the Scottish Enlightenment, in the Edinburgh of the 1820s:

... ideas about Scotland were formulated that proved amazingly resilient. One set came from the Whigs, composing their elegant disquisitions in the comfortable splendour of the Signet Library, the other from Scott, scribbling desperately away in Castle Street. Both owed much to Burkean notions of an organic constitution and a continuity between past and present. But each saw in them different implications for the future of the country (Fry, 1987, p. 3).

The Scottish Whigs' interpretation of history was pro-union. "It regarded the Union as an act of far-sighted statesmanship which would be logically consummated in Scotland's more or less full assimilation to the rest of Britain." As such, the Scottish
Whigs' "unqualified admiration of the English blinded them to all but the blessings of assimilation" (Fry, 1987, p.3).

The Scottish Tory interpretation of history also had what Fry describes as a "peculiar aspect". Whereas:

In England it was concerned with the ascent of the nation into statehood, the rights and privileges of estates and corporations, the strength of the constitution and the law. In Scotland it was besides deeply tinged with nationalism. As Scott wrote, she had since 1707 been left 'under guardianship of her own institutions to win her silent way to national wealth and consequence.' Inside the Union, therefore, they could still fructify; their destruction was in any event to be deplored. But Scott's veneration of history degenerated among many coarser souls into mere nostalgia, into a sentimental wallowing in the lost causes of 1707 and 1745 (1987, p.3).

Thus the nineteenth century saw the creation of two myths which between them have shaped Scottish history and Scottish historical consciousness "by defining which choices could be perceived as consistent with the national spirit and which not" (Fry, 1987, p.4). Fry points out that the myths made by the Scots of the early nineteenth century "helped to distil the complexity of the real world as they sought to advance themselves without sacrificing their identity" (1987, p.4).

Over time rival myths have been created which have both drawn from and challenged the dominant ideologies of the nineteenth century. These find expression in the ideologies of socialism and nationalism. Both, Fry argues, regard themselves as "requiters of the lost causes, always assuming that a socialist or nationalist meaning can be read back into them" (1987, p.4).

We are, therefore, faced with a selection of Scottish histories from which we can pick and choose, discard or dismiss at will. This is more akin to the situation in France, where, as Neal Ascherson points out "it is thought evident that French history as perceived by a Communist, by a middle-of-the-road Republican and by a Catholic monarchist will be a matter of three quite different gardens" than to the situation in England where "there is still an
assumption that 'our' (in quotes) history can only have one focal point, one perspective" (1988, p.153).

Initially this is most disconcerting for the English student raised on a diet of Walter Bagehot!

Thus in attempting to write a section on politics in the Scottish Borders I found myself faced with two major difficulties. Firstly, the fact that there are very few accounts of modern Scotland which could be called political historiographies, or in which politics play a prominent part. Secondly, that in order to derive anything from the good general (with the emphasis on the social and economic) accounts of modern Scotland which do exist and the local histories, which exist in abundance, one has to fathom one's way through layers of myth (whose existence is often unacknowledged by the author) which give the history its shape but which distort reality into the bargain. At times one thinks one can see the light, only to find like the Great Gatsby did, that as we run faster and stretch out our arms further it recedes before us and like boats against the current we are borne back ceaselessly into the myths about the past.

The only way out of the miasma is, it seems, to return to the Weberian tradition of scrupulously examining the details of the historical record and deliberately resisting the temptation to impose on history a theoretical scheme. My aim is humble in that all I attempt to do in this chapter is to say, on the basis of many hours spent in the archives of the Borders Regional Library H.Q. at St. Mary's Mill, Selkirk, something about the direct involvement of the great Border landowning families in both local and parliamentary politics and to see how this has changed over time. If my account has been coloured or distorted by the myths, whose influence I am competent only to acknowledge, not dispel, this is purely unintentional.
In Chapter Four 'Local Politics in the Scottish Borders' I try to establish the influence and importance of the Border lairds in local politics, administration and government. In Chapter Five, 'Parliamentary Politics in the Scottish Borders', I switch my attention to the field of parliamentary politics and try to establish how far and to what extent the great families have been involved in, and exercised influence over, the parliamentary political process.

My reasons for treating local and parliamentary politics as two separate chapters are partly historical and partly a matter of convenience. Firstly, from the introduction of feudalism into Scotland in the late eleventh century, and until the reorganisation of Scottish local government following the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1973, local politics/government remained an area in which landowners were able to establish and maintain hegemonic control. At this point it is appropriate to clear up a piece of potential terminological confusion.

It is important to realise, as J.E. Shaw points out, that the term 'local government' is misleading on two counts. Firstly, local authorities have no governmental power:

Their powers and duties are limited to the administration, within defined local areas, of those functions authorised by the Government of the country, by Charter or Commission from the Crown, and more generally, by Act of Parliament (1942, p.1).

Secondly, "local government as a term for local administration appears to be of comparatively modern use" (1942, p 1). It can, Shaw argues, be traced back to the 1880s and the discussions leading up to the English Local Government Act of 1888. The foundations of local government in Scotland, however, were laid
way before this and to understand the present system, in which
landowners do not play an active part, it is necessary to have
some knowledge of the past. When I use the term 'local
government', I follow the contemporary convention of using it as a
convenient shorthand for the administration of local affairs both
before and after the 1880s.

In some respects treating local and parliamentary politics
separately is purely a matter of convenience, for until the
Parliamentary Reform Act of 1833 they were not separate spheres
but overlapping and intersecting parts of the same system. It is
here necessary to point out that until the reorganisation of
Scottish local government in the mid 1970s there were two main
units of local government; the county and the burgh. The
institutions of local government were different in each and these
will be explained in detail in the course of Chapter Four. Despite
these differences in the patterns and institutions of local
government, both county and burgh were equally and intimately
involved in the wider parliamentary political process. In the
counties, for example, the Commissions of Supply, a body made up
essentially of local landowners, determined in effect, who could
vote and who could not. This was because the Commissions of Supply
not only collected the National Land Tax (they had been instituted
by Act of Convention in 1667 primarily for this purpose) but
apportioned the land tax by dividing the valuations. This was a
most important duty because the amount of the valuation
apportioned to a freeholder determined his eligibility to vote for
the return of a Member of Parliament. Meanwhile in the burghs, it
was the Town Council who had the right to elect the M.P.

Until 1833 local and parliamentary politics in Scotland were,
therefore, very much part of the same overall process. For
simplicity's sake, however, I am going to treat them separately.
In Chapter Four I shall look at local politics in terms of the
county and the burgh, the various institutions characteristic of
each, and the developments over and within time. In Chapter Five,
'Parliamentary Politics in the Scottish Borders', I concentrate
specifically on parliamentary politics in the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk and in the Royal Burgh of Selkirk from the Union of 1707 until the present day. It is my intention to establish, or at least portray, the involvement of the great families in the wheeling and dealing, bribery and corruption which is supposed to have characterised Scottish politics before the Reform Act of 1833 and to see how far their role in the parliamentary political process was to alter in the face of parliamentary political reform.
In the first section of Chapter Four my attention will be focused on the various institutions of local/county government (the Sheriffs, the Commissions of Supply, the County Councils, the Regional and District Councils, the Justices of the Peace, the Lieutenancy & the Militia) in the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk. These two counties (which formed the old Scottish Middle March) make for an interesting comparison. Both Border counties, they have, as we have seen, different patterns of landholding. Selkirk, as Chapter One established, is the smaller and quieter of the two and represents a county dominated by a single great landowner - the Duke of Buccleuch. Roxburgh, on the other hand is a larger county and has always had more than one large estate. They also have rather different political histories which, we can perhaps infer, are a direct result of their different patterns of landholding.

Having looked at the institutions of county government in the counties of Selkirk and Roxburgh in the first section, the subject of my attention in the second section is the burgh; the other unit of Scottish local government prior to the 1974 reorganisation. Here I focus upon the Royal Burgh of Selkirk, and look at how the affairs of the burgh were administered and by whom.
Local Politics in the Scottish Borders

4.1 County Government

(a) Roxburgh and Selkirk

Anne Whetstone argues that there are two important points to take into account concerning Scottish county government in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Firstly, because the Scots liberally borrowed from the English system and adapted it to meet their own needs and circumstances, the same officials north and south of the border varied considerably in importance. Hence in England it was the Lords Lieutenants and the Justices of the Peace who were the most important, while in Scotland it was the Sheriff and the Commissioners of Supply. The Sheriff was only a minor official in England but was the key to Scottish county administration in the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

All in all:

The four main institutions of county government - the Sheriffs, the Justices of the Peace, the Commissioners of Supply and the Lieutenants - were thus able to reach a balance of duties and responsibilities which was uniquely Scottish and which ever since has confused English historians (Whetstone, 1981, p.x).

The second major difficulty concerns the fact that county administration developed more slowly in Scotland than in England. This has led to the assumption that the development of Scottish county administration must have followed that of the English, when in fact the English government adopted an attitude of "benign neglect" (Whetstone, 1981, p.x).

The next step is to look at the four main institutions of county government - the Sheriffs; the Commissions of Supply, along with their successors, firstly the County Councils, which were in turn
replaced by the Region and District Councils, the Lords Lieutenants; and the Justices of the Peace — separately and in turn.

(b) The Sheriffs

Before 1745 Scotland did not have a uniform system of national justice. The existence of independent franchise courts meant that judicial power remained firmly lodged with the nobility and lairds. Article XX of the Act of Union established this:

That all Heritable Offices, Superiors, Heritable Jurisdictions, Offices for Life, and Jurisdictions for Life, be reserved to the Owners thereof, as Rights of Property in the same manner as they are now enjoyed by the Laws of Scotland, notwithstanding of this Treaty (Cited in Donaldson, 1970, p.273.)

Heritable jurisdiction was an obvious target for reform, but one which the Scottish aristocracy were eager to hang on to. England’s desire to abolish the system of heritable jurisdiction was restrained by the costs of buying these rights back. It was not until 1745 and the upheavals of that year that the system of heritable jurisdiction came to an end.

Until the end of the system of heritable jurisdiction Selkirk, like other Scottish counties, had been under the jurisdiction of a high sheriff. This office in Selkirkshire had been held by the Murrays of Philiphaugh. The family were paid £4,000 compensation when the office was reformed (Craig-Brown, 1886, pp.233-234).

The most important effects of the reorganisation of Scottish justice were the strengthening of the sheriff courts and the creation of the offices of Sheriff Depute and Sheriff Substitute.

The Sheriff was the key figure in Scottish legal and county administration in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Unlike the hereditary sheriffs of the past, the Sheriff Deputes and Sheriff Substitutes performed their duties personally. Initially
all status and prestige was conferred upon the Sheriff Depute; with the Sheriff Substitute being no more than a personal assistant to the Sheriff Depute, having no formal powers of his own. By 1877, however, an almost complete reversal of roles had taken place. The Sheriff Substitute was by this date involved in the day-to-day legal and administrative affairs of the county, with the Sheriff Depute assuming a much less active and more honorific role.

With reorganisation, the office of sheriff was transformed from a heritable one into a professional one. In The History of Selkirkshire Craig-Brown argues that:

The change was truly radical. Regular courts were now held by judges skilled in law, trained to impartiality, and free from local bias. Lairds of regality were now stripped of jurisdiction which they had not always used with a single eye to equity; landowners dropped into the position of ordinary subjects and justices of the peace had their powers curtailed (1886, pp.233-234).

To some extent Craig-Brown is correct. The Heritable Jurisdictions Act laid down that the Sheriff Depute had to be an advocate with at least three years experience. He was required to spend at least four months a year in his Sheriffdom and in addition he was expected to continue his practice so that he did not lose touch with legal developments. The Sheriff Depute was to be paid a salary which varied according to the population and area of his Sheriffdom. He was barred from being a Member of Parliament on the grounds that this would take him outside Scotland, and was also barred from becoming a member of the Commissions of Supply.

The office of Sheriff Depute was thus conceived of as a professional appointment and the Sheriff Depute was regarded as a member of the legal and social elite of Scotland.

The reforms of 1748 had abolished heritable sheriffdoms but Craig-Brown's assertion that "landowners dropped into the position of ordinary subjects" (1886, p.234) would seem to be somewhat incorrect. The great noblemen and landowners continued to have
much influence in appointing Sheriff Deputies until well into the nineteenth century. This was the case in most Scottish sheriffdoms. What the lairds considered important in a potential Sheriff Depute was personal loyalty rather than legal ability. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, however, lairds began to try to justify their personal choices in terms of being the best choice for the county. This can be seen in the Duke of Buccleuch's recommendation that Sir Walter Scott should be made Sheriff Depute of Selkirk on the grounds that Scott was Selkirk's only proprietor who was fit to hold the office.

Most of the early Sheriff Deputies were men with county ties which was useful, for different reasons, to both the government and the nobility. From a purely practical point of view, the fact that Sheriff Deputies tended to have fairly, if not extensively, detailed knowledge of the county was useful to the government in matters of administration. As for the magnates, the fact that Sheriff Deputies tended to have ties with the county, even if these were somewhat tenuous, was very important because it meant that the Sheriff Deputies could help in their securing of political power. If a Sheriff Depute had a tie with a great landowning family such as the Scotts of Buccleuch, this in effect constituted a tie with the county. Scott was, therefore, a particularly apt choice for the office of Sheriff Depute for Selkirk, because in addition to being extremely well qualified in terms of his legal training and experience, he was related to the Scotts of Buccleuch and extremely proud of the fact.

By the 1820s, in part due to the influence of Henry and Robert Dundas, it was much more difficult for an unqualified man to become Sheriff Depute. Spurious legal qualifications were no longer enough to secure an unsuitable man with county ties the office of Sheriff Depute. Such a practice was by this time regarded as highly undesirable.

Before the reforms of 1748 the Scottish sheriffs had had wider jurisdiction than the Sheriff Deputies had after 1748. The pre-1748
sheriffs had primary jurisdiction in the vast majority of civil cases. Their criminal jurisdiction had excluded the four pleas of the Crown, but had included all the most common crimes such as theft, assault and disturbing the peace. In addition the sheriffs had had jurisdiction over some capital crimes. After 1748 this was restricted to the Court of Justiciary. Sheriff courts thus became limited to lesser crimes with a maximum punishment of a £50 fine or two years imprisonment.

The reforms of 1748 in effect gave the Sheriff Depute comparable administrative functions to the English High Sheriff. The Sheriff Depute now executed all exchequer writs, accounted for Crown dues and duties in his sheriffdom, called jurors, received the writs for parliamentary elections and determined the average prices of grain in the county; a practice commonly known as 'striking the friars'. This was a duty of utmost importance because these prices determined ministers' salaries and some agricultural rents. In addition to his administrative functions, the sheriff (at first the Sheriff Depute, later on more often the Sheriff Substitute) was in charge of the deployment of force within his sheriffdom. In times of civil disorder and disobedience he was the one to call out the militia and the Volunteers, and to order the magistracy and constabulary to act. In other words, he was the link between the county and the government.

Although the sheriffs' powers of jurisdiction diminished after the 1748 reforms their work loads had increased; partly because of the population explosion which was occurring at this time, and partly because of developments in industry and commerce brought about by the Industrial and Agricultural Revolutions. The idea behind one of the 1748 reforms, that of the Sheriff Depute being a practising advocate but resident in his sheriffdom for four months, had been to ensure that the county was served by a man who was in touch with the law and with the affairs of his sheriffdom. It was not long, however, before the impracticalities of such an idea became evident. By 1814, only twelve of the thirty Sheriff Deputes were meeting the four months residence requirement because of the
difficulties of trying to combine this with keeping a practice going. Most of the routine work of the sheriffdom was being delegated to the Sheriff Substitute. It was becoming more and more the exception rather than the rule for the Sheriff Depute to judge cases. When he did judge a case it was usually because it was particularly difficult; because sensitive issues were involved or because his personal attention was specifically requested.

In addition to Sheriff Deputes finding it increasingly difficult to combine meeting the four months residence requirement with keeping a practice going, it was the increased workload, brought about by the factors previously mentioned, which led to the reforms involving the office of Sheriff Substitute. A distinction was made in 1853 between the jurisdiction of the Sheriff Depute and that of the Sheriff Substitute. The Sheriff Substitute became the judge of first instance in civil cases and in summary civil cases, and the Sheriff Depute the judge of appeal in civil cases. It had not been necessary to make such a distinction in 1748 because the Sheriff Substitute, as a mere personal assistant to the Sherill Depute, had had no legal duties.

More reforms involving the office of Sheriff Substitute took place in 1877 and the Sheriff Substitute became transformed. Anne Whetstone argues, from a personal assistant to the Sheriff Depute, possessing little or no legal training, into a highly qualified Crown appointee. As such the Sheriff Substitute, after 1877, performed most of the local duties which had been assigned to the Sheriff Depute a hundred and twenty nine years earlier. This, Whetstone argues, was one of the major developments of the century in both the legal system and in the system of local government. It is interesting to note that the County of Selkirk had highly qualified Sheriff Substitutes some thirty years before this date (see Appendix 1).

In addition to the reforms which took place around the offices of Sheriff Depute and Sheriff Substitute, the nineteenth century experienced a considerable number of administrative developments
in other areas of local government, for example, the development of national boards of supervision. Membership of the national boards of supervision — that is, those for health and nuisances, the fisheries or the poor laws — tended to be limited to Sheriff Deputes. Meanwhile, membership of the county prison and police boards was usually a job for the Sheriff Substitute. Most duties could usually be performed by either the Sheriff Depute or the Sheriff Substitute; with the exception of questions of boundaries which by the new acts were designated the concern of the Sheriff Depute. From 1868 Selkirk shared a Sheriff Depute with the counties of Roxburgh and Berwick.

(c) The Commissioners of Supply, the County Councils and the Regional & District Councils

The sheriffs, originally the Sheriff Depute, latterly the Sheriff Substitutes were, as we have seen, the key individuals in the legal and administrative framework of the county. Meanwhile, the most important bodies in eighteenth and nineteenth century Scottish county government were the Commissions of Supply.

The Scottish Commissions of Supply were instituted by Act of Convention in 1667; about the same time that the English Land Tax Commissions were established. They were established primarily for the collection of the cess, or National Land Tax. The Scottish Commissioners of Supply were essentially landowners which meant that, unlike their English counterparts, landowners collected the land tax from their fellow landowners. The Sheriff Depute had been prohibited by an Act of 1748 from becoming a member of the Commissions of Supply.

The amount of land tax fixed for Scotland by the Treaty of Union was £48,000, and every shire had to pay a certain quota of this. Within the shires the duty of dividing the valuations and apportioning the land tax was crucially important prior to 1833. This was because the amount of the valuation was what determined a
freeholder's eligibility to vote for the return of a Member of Parliament.

Whereas the activities of the English Land Tax Commissioners were confined to the collection of the land tax, the Scottish Commissioners of Supply were responsible for the collection and supervision of all local taxes. It was the Commissioners of Supply who imposed all the important county assessments. They prepared the Valuation Roll of all lands and heritages for the purpose of assessment; they met expenditure connected with the Militia and they imposed a rate to meet the general expenses of the county. In addition the Commissions of Supply became the single most important body for expressing the views of landholders in Scotland. Their meetings became a forum for county opinion, a place where national and local issues were regularly discussed.

It was thus fiscal power which gave the Scottish Commissioners of Supply control of county government and this situation remained until 1889 when the introduction of county councils destroyed the commissions in all but name. The commissions continued to exist until 1930 as a forum for discussion amongst the county's great landowners. In a practical sense, however, the commissions became redundant in 1889.

A look at the official lists of Commissioners of Supply for the County of Roxburgh for the period 1858-1921, which are the years the Borders Region Library H.Q. has records for, is interesting because it illustrates, precisely, the point about the meetings of the Commissions of Supply being a forum for discussion amongst the county's great landowners (see Appendix 2). It also shows how the size of the Commissions declined drastically after 1889.
Scottish local government was reformed in 1889. County Councils were established and these took over all the important duties of the Commissions of Supply. The reform had occurred partly because of a general feeling that in an increasingly democratic society it was inappropriate to have as one of the key institutions of local government a body that was composed of, and represented, the landed classes. In practice, however, the reform turned out to be a change in name rather than a change in personnel. Once again it was the landed classes who were well represented on the new county councils as a look at the members of Roxburgh County Council illustrates (see Appendix 3).

(e) The Local Government (Scotland) Act 1929

In 1929 the Government attempted, by the Local Government (Scotland) Act, to widen the areas of local administration. The Act intended to reduce the number of small local authorities while increasing the scope, and consolidating the duties, of all those remaining, and to reduce the burden of local rates. It intended to transfer to these new local authorities all essential services such as highways; public health; police; education and valuation of landed heritages; and the functions of parish councils, which included poor relief.

The Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1929 was, Shaw argues, "a courageous and statesman like proposal" (1942, p.27). The fact, however, that the new authorities were called 'county councils' - because the area prescribed was the county - continued to raise opposition from towns and parochial authorities with sufficient valuation to provide for themselves. This led to several concessions being made during the passing of the Bill, and when the Act was brought into operation in 1930 town councils were given substantial representation. Instead of being rated by the
'county councils' the burghs continued to pay by requisition based on the valuation of the burgh.

(i) The Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973

Regions and Districts

The county councils existed in Scotland from 1889 until the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1973 reorganised Scottish local government in line with the proposals outlined in the Wheatley Commission. The Commission had recommended a two-tier system of local government. Local government was to be split into the Regions/Islands - Borders, Central, Dumfries & Galloway, Fife, Grampian, Highland, Lothian, Strathclyde, Tayside (Regions), Orkney, Shetland and the Western Isles (Islands) - and the Districts. The Borders Region was to comprise the Districts of Berwickshire, Ettrick and Lauderdale, Roxburgh and Tweeddale.

The absence of the great landowning families, in terms of formal membership of the new local authorities, is striking. There are no members of the great families formally involved with any of the four district councils. There are three landowners who are members of Borders Regional Council; Major N.P. Thompson, J.K. Askew, C.B.E., B.A., J.P., and the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Minto, O.B.E., J.P. (see Appendix 4a). Only the Earl of Minto is a member of one of the traditional, great Border landowning families.

In Scotland as a whole one of the most important effects of the 1973 Local Government (Scotland) Act was to increase party activity at the local level. The Borders, however, along with the Highlands, Dumfries and Galloway (other rural areas with strong local traditions), is still overwhelmingly characterised by a tradition of non-partisan local politics at both the regional and the district levels. The exception is the District of Berwickshire which has consistently been held by the Conservatives. This, it would seem, is a reflection of the strong agricultural interests in the county.
For a breakdown of the political composition of Borders Regional Council and the four district councils (Berwickshire, Ettrick & Lauderdale, Roxburgh, and Tweeddale) which make up the Borders Region, since reorganisation see Appendix 4b.

(g) The Justices of the Peace

The Justices of the Peace, Anne Whetstone argues, were introduced into Scotland by James VI in 1609 to be the King's representatives in the countryside; replacing the sheriffs who had fallen under the control of the nobility. It was accordingly ordained that in every shire there should be yearly appointed by His Majesty some "godlie, wyse and vertuous gentilmen of good qualitie, moyen and reporte, making residence within the same, in sic number as the boundis of the schire sail require, to be: commissionaris for keeping his majesties peace" (1609 Act Establishing Justices of the Peace, cited in Donaldson, 1970, pp. 170-171).

The Justices of the Peace were intended to have very important judicial powers within the shire, and also extensive administrative duties. These were ratified and defined from time to time by statute, but it does not appear that they were generally acted upon until the Union. It is doubtful, J.E. Shaw argues, whether these pre-Union Justices were able to exercise their criminal jurisdiction except to a limited extent.

The Scottish J.P.s, however, never, not even after 1707, rose to the status of their English counterparts. Prior to 1707 they failed to establish themselves because the nobility and the traditional local courts proved to be far stronger than the justices and their courts. After the Union serious crimes against the peace of the kingdom could only be tried before the national courts. This was because such crimes could only be tried before a jury, and in Scotland it was only the Court of Justiciary which used juries. In England, on the other hand, juries were used by the quarter sessions. This meant that, in effect, the Scottish quarter sessions only had the same powers of criminal jurisdiction
as the ordinary sessions in England. The Scottish justices, therefore, although granted the same authority as English J.P.s by the Act of Union, never managed to fulfil their potential.

Neither did the Scottish Justices have greater civil jurisdiction or administrative functions to compensate. During the eighteenth century their only important civil duty was in the area of wage and price controls, and administrative duties, which would have belonged exclusively to the English J.P.s, were shared with the sheriffs and the Commissioners of Supply. The reforms of 1747 strengthened the office of Sheriff Depute and by doing so sealed the fate of the Scottish J.P. as a complement to the Sheriff Depute rather than his replacement. Many of these administrative duties were transferred to the County Councils by the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1889.

In England, prior to the Justices of the Peace Act of 1906, the qualification for appointment as a Justice of the Peace was the holding of heritage of the annual value of £100. In Scotland there was no particular qualification requisite. An advisory committee suggested nominations which the Lord-Lieutenant submitted to the Lord Chancellor to be included in the next commission.

Appendix 5a lists titled Border landowners who were Justices of the Peace in the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk in the year 1866. Appendix 5b gives the names of members of the present Borders Regional Council who are Justices of the Peace.

(h) The Lieutenancy & the Militia

In Acts of the Scots Parliament dating as far back as 1438, the King's Lieutenant, afterwards called the Lord Lieutenant, is referred to. His duties, J.E. Shaw argues, appear to have been chiefly connected with organising and being responsible for the raising and assembling of the local loyal forces in the county on behalf of the Sovereign.
The establishment of a permanent lieutenancy in Scotland, however, like the establishment of a militia, was a result of the Napoleonic Wars. The fact that before 1793 there had been no lieutenancy in Scotland meant that it developed along English lines; in this case no pre-1707 institution complicating the following of the English pattern. The government had no fears about introducing a permanent lieutenancy, composed essentially of the landed classes, into Scotland but had more reservations about the loyalty of a permanent militia. The Napoleonic Wars, however, made this a necessity. When initial attempts were made to enrol men in the militia lists in August and September 1797, there were riots in the lowlands. These did nothing to help dispel the government's fears.

The English lieutenancy of the eighteenth century was a hierarchial institution; the offices of which were restricted to the landowning classes. The office of Lord Lieutenant was in both countries held by the greatest landowners; as a look at the Lords Lieutenants for Roxburgh and Selkirk illustrates (see Appendix 6a). The Vice-Lieutenant was appointed by the Lord Lieutenant and held a permanent warrant during the lifetime of the Lord Lieutenant to act during his absence from the county. The difference, however, is in terms of the Deputy-Lieutenants; who, in Scotland, did not have to meet any property requirements until 1802. After this date property requirements were introduced but these were not as high as the ones their English counterparts had to meet, on the grounds that Scotland was a poorer country. On this note I found a very interesting bundle of papers in the Borders Region Archives, dated c.1900, appointing various people as Deputy-Lieutenants. These letters state that the Queen had no objection to their appointments. There is also an accompanying letter/declaration from each, stating that they had "a yearly income arising from personal Estate, within the U.K., of not less than £200." Only one of these individuals, the Hon. John Beresford Campbell, had a title.
After the French Wars the military role of the lieutenancy faded. The office of Lord-Lieutenant became a sign of political favour, granted to those who supported the government in power. It thus became a means of exerting government influence on the countryside. Its importance in Scotland after 1815 lay in the local prestige its offices granted rather than in terms of military or political power. However, the military aspect did not die out altogether. Under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act of 1907 the Lord Lieutenant was made President of a county's Territorial Forces Association which was constituted for the administration of the Territorial Forces in the county. One of the Lord Lieutenant's chief functions after the end of the Napoleonic Wars was to be responsible for recommending to the Crown, through the Lord Chancellor, suitable persons to be added to the Commissions as Justices of the Peace.

For more detailed information regarding the composition of the Roxburghshire and Selkirkshire Lieutenancies see Appendices 6a and 6b.

4.2 The Royal Burgh of Selkirk

(a) Introduction

In this section I turn away from the county as a unit of local administration and look at the burgh; which was the other unit of Scottish local government prior to the 1974 reorganisation. I pay particular attention to the Royal Burgh of Selkirk, whose history has to a large extent been dominated by the Scotts of Buccleuch.

Before studying the Royal Burgh of Selkirk in some detail it is first of all necessary to say something about the burgh as a unit of local government/administration, and in particular about the various types of burghs which have existed.
(b) King's Burghs/Royal Burghs; Burghs of Regality
and Burghs of Barony

(1) Kings' Burghs/Royal Burghs

From the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries what we now call Royal Burghs were known as Kings' Burghs. In the twelfth century all that was meant by this phrase was that the burgh was founded by the king as royal demense; enjoying royal protection and owing rent to the crown. At this time the Royal Burgh of Selkirk, for example, was known as the King's Selkirk. The term 'royal burgh', burgum regalis, was not used until the fifteenth century when it was introduced to distinguish the king's burghs from the burghs of barony founded by magnates.

In royal burghs the burgesses were the king's tenants, and the rents of their burgages, the customs on trade, and the issues of courts held in the burgh went to the royal revenue. Royal burghs each possessed a monopoly of merchandise within a give area and were the only centres of foreign trade.

(ii) Burghs of Regality

In burghs of regality a lord of regality had a jurisdiction over his lands equal to that of a king, but this relation did not of itself bring a corresponding extension of the commercial powers of the burgh. That, however, might be done by special arrangement, as was the case when Glasgow was made a free burgh of regality in 1450.

(iii) Burghs of Barony

Burghs of barony at this early stage were few and, for the most part, ecclesiastical. They were erected by a subject-superior under licence from the King, a requisite which was not observed in England. As far as commercial privileges were concerned, there were no hard and fast distinctions at this early stage between
burghs of barony and royal burghs. In 1603 Selkirk was elected temporarily into a burgh of barony of the Earls of Angus. Local historians argue that this, however, was only a notional burgh of barony. Their evidence for this is that Selkirk still came in for criticism from the Convention of Royal Burghs with regards to her electoral practices.

Having distinguished between the various types of burghs it is now time to look at the institutions of burgh administration common to all types of burgh. These are the provosts and the town councils.

(c) The Provost

The link between the burgh and the Crown was the Provost. In many burghs it was common practice in the seventeenth century for a local laird and his family to be chosen by the council to be the provosts of a burgh. Since the council was usually dominated by the same families it often happened that office of provost was held by the same families year after year. Until 1687 this had been the case in the Royal Burgh of Selkirk. Selkirk, however, was (and still is) a royal burgh, and in 1687 James II & VII chose to exercise his right to appoint the Provost. His choice was John Riddel and the Town Council was not amused. It would seem that they did not so much disapprove of John Riddel himself as of James II & VII exercising his kingly right. In any case the Town Council objected and the local historian, John Gilbert (1985), describes a power struggle which took place between Selkirk Town Council and John Riddel. The Town Council regarded the choice of Riddel as a move by James II & VII to control the burghs in order to control the election of M.P.s, and so win support for himself and his pro-Roman Catholic policies. This meant that the relationship between Riddel and the town council was stormy to say the least. At one point he was accused of removing funds, imprisoning people unjustly, and removing evidence from the town charter chest. Riddel protested his innocence but in the Scottish Records Office, Gilbert points out, there are several pages taken from Selkirk
Town Council minutes for 1687 and 1688. Riddel is allegedly supposed to have removed the evidence!

It was the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the removal of James II and VII that settled the feud. With William III's arrival and acceptance in Scotland in 1689 Riddel ceased to be Provost.

The case of John Riddel is interesting, Gilbert argues, because it shows that, at this time, Selkirk was to some degree independent politically from the surrounding landholders. This independence is again reflected in the numerous arguments which took place between the townsfolk and the surrounding landholders over the common. Selkirk's common was a large and valuable resource; being a source of grazing land, arable land, peat for fuel and turves for building. Consequently many of the local landholders wanted a share in it: John Riddel was one of these. Riddel took the matter to the Convention of Royal Burghs who ruled that the Royal Burgh of Selkirk possessed the common and, as such, had exclusive rights to pasture, fuel and divot. However, John Riddel, the Convention of Royal Burghs ruled, was entitled to common pasture. The townsfolk of Selkirk resented this and resorted to violence; forcibly driving Riddel's animals off the common and rioting against his men. Thus, as Gilbert points out, some of the greatest disturbances in the town's history were caused by the town's actions against the neighbouring lairds.

(d) The Town Council

Like the office of provost, the evolution of the town council is also somewhat confused. This confusion, on both counts, is because the administration of burghs did not attract the attention of Parliament until the passing of an Act in 1649; after which representatives from the burgh started to attend. One thing, however, is clear, and this is that Selkirk Town Council was, as Ian Brown argues, until 1833 very much under the influence of the Duke of Buccleuch (Brown, 1985). Buccleuch's influence over Selkirk Town Council will be dealt with primarily in the context
of parliamentary politics and, as such will be dealt with in the next chapter. In this chapter I want to concentrate on the institutions through which he exerted his influence.

When the 1649 Act was passed Selkirk at the time was governed by a council, two bailies and a provost. The Convention of Royal Burghs was worried about the way burgh officers in Selkirk were elected because, as Gilbert argues, it was a process in which money most definitely talked.

Two bailies, a dean of guild and a treasurer were chosen annually at Michaelmas (29th September). Their predecessors of the previous year also remained on the council if they were still fairly wealthy. In addition to these the council comprised a deacon and a 'colleague' from each of the five crafts as well as ten merchant councillors and five trade councillors; these last representing non-incorporated trades. There was no question of the old council electing a new council annually. The council continued in office as long as they did not "decrease in their substance" (Gilbert, 1985, p.83). If they did they were replaced by those burgesses who were better off. As Gilbert argues, "in other words the main qualification for being a councillor was wealth. It is quite clear that in seventeenth century Selkirk 'money talked'" (1985, p.84). Thus the Convention of Royal Burghs wanted to regularise Scottish burgh elections, hoping that this would make them more genuinely democratic.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century the crafts as a whole began to take an interest in how their parliamentary representatives cast their votes. In 1789 the weavers decided that their representatives had to consult with the whole craft before voting. This can be seen, Gilbert argues, as a sign of two things. Firstly, the growing demand for the franchise amongst the ordinary people. Secondly, he argues, it also represents the desire of the crafts for a share of the bribes distributed by candidates before parliamentary elections.
The Industrial Revolution brought many more craft workers into the town throughout the course of the eighteenth century and thus helped, Gilbert argues, to gradually undermine the hegemony of the crafts. The ultimate blow to the political importance of the crafts, however, was the Reform Act of 1833 which, by abolishing the right of the Town Council to elect the M.P., removed whatever vestiges of political power remained.

The great Reform Act of 1833 fell short of the expectations which had accompanied it. While it did succeed in loosening the grip of the crafts, by making eligibility to vote dependent upon a £10 property qualification, it merely reinforced the clout of Buccleuch's hegemonic stronghold. This is one of the major themes of Chapter Five.

4.3 Conclusion

Thus it can be seen that until the reorganisation of Scottish local government in the mid 1970s the great Border landowners were actively and intimately involved in the administration of local affairs. In the county of Roxburgh the two Border dukes, the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe, exercised the most power and influence. In the Royal Burgh of Selkirk this privilege was Buccleuch's alone.

Until 1748 it was landowners who were the hereditary sheriffs of a county. Following the reforms in the system of Scottish justice in 1748 hereditary sheriffs were replaced by Sheriff Deputes who were qualified, practising advocates. Great landowners such as the Duke of Buccleuch, however, were able to use their power and influence to determine who was appointed.

It was the local lairds, both great and small, who made up the Commissions of Supply which, until 1889, were the most important bodies in Scottish county administration. When the powers of the Commissions of Supply were transferred to the county councils,
following the Act of 1889, it was the same individuals who became members of the new bodies. Within both the Commissions of Supply for the County of Roxburgh and on Roxburgh County Council, it was the greatest landowners, such as the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe, who held the most important positions. The Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe, between them, held the Convenorship of Roxburgh County Council for a period of forty three years between 1900 and 1975.

The great Border landowners such as the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe were thus able to exercise influence indirectly, through the office of Sheriff Depute, and directly by virtue of their positions on the Commissions of Supply and on Roxburgh County Council. In addition they were also able to exercise their power and influence through the institutions of the Lieutenancy and through the Commissions of the Peace. The functions of these two offices were intermingled because it was, and still is, the duty of the Lord-Lieutenant to recommend to the Crown the names of suitable persons to be appointed as Justices of the Peace. These two institutions are important because they are also areas of local affairs largely unaffected by the 1973 reorganisation of Scottish local government. The Duke of Buccleuch, for example, is the present Lord-Lieutenant of Roxburgh, Ettrick & Lauderdale, and as such is directly involved with the selection of J.P.s. This then is one aspect of local administration in which the great landowners do still continue to have a role.
CHAPTER FIVE

Parliamentary Politics in the Scottish Borders

5.1 Background

Michael Fry describes Scotland after the Union as a country in which "the Parliament was departed, the Government all but invisible." It was a country in which "a factitious aristocracy had been tamed by the need to seek favour in London," in which "the bourgeoisie was disfranchised, but did not seem to mind" and where "the mob was apolitical, the peasantry pious and docile." People were raised "by religious controversy, between the churchmen who wandered on the heights of an untainted Calvinism and those who sunk into urbane rationalism; but their disputes assumed no political aspect." The Scottish Enlightenment had represented a revolution in the world of thought but "still left the literati politically quiescent." In short, the Union offered the Scots "peace and progress at home, security and commerce abroad." But more than this "it allowed them to dispense with the distraction of politics" (1987, p.6) and this the Scots, Fry argues, regarded as a blessing.

In some respects, Fry argues, the Union had changed much. While "landed property naturally remained the basis of political power, which was diffused through kinship and personal connections" (1987, p.7), the aristocracy had, to some extent, been "subdued" (1987, p.6) by the need to curry favour in England. Other groups, however, Fry argues, especially the country gentlemen and the lawyers, "won more wealth, broader responsibilities and higher social standing" (1987, p.7).

In other respects the Union had hardly changed anything. The Church, legal and educational systems, plus the privileges of the royal burghs remained "not only untouched by the Treaty of 1707
but actually guaranteed by it" (1987, p.6). The legal system had emerged from the Union not just with all its prerogatives practically intact, but with a higher status due to a growing trend for sons of the nobility and landed gentry to enter the profession.

The Union, it would seem, thus brought about a shift in the balance of power and opened up the space for the formation of a new hegemonic block.

According to Charles Hope of Granton, Lord Advocate 1801-1804, before the Union the job of ruling Scotland had been shared among five Ministers. After the Union these functions were discharged by the Lord Advocate alone. "He now held 'the whole executive government of Scotland under his particular care'" (Fry, 1987, p.9).

Despite the Union, Fry argues, Scotland was still a different country. He cites the 'Parliamentary Debates', 22 June 1804:

'Its laws, its customs and its manners have undergone no change. In the application of general Acts much local explanation is required and therefore the Lord Advocate must frequently act on his own responsibility.' [Thus] this vestige of a Scottish Government, while in almost every respect minimal, was a key intermediary between the local oligarchies and resources of power in London (Fry, 1987, pp.9-10).

This process depended, essentially, on the distribution of patronage which, far from being regarded as corrupt and undesirable, was an accepted part of the political life of the time. Voters, Fry points out, considered it part of their representatives' duty to obtain patronage for them, and so increase their social standing. Patronage, however, "was necessarily a dangerous tool, since Scots could rarely get enough of it: in reality electoral interests might rise and fall because of, or in despite of, the distribution of patronage" (1987, p.10).
During the first decades of the Union the Scottish political machinery was under control of the Secretary of State for Scotland. This office was abolished in 1746, Fry argues, "out of misguided political spite" (1987, p.10). The dominance of the house of Argyll, followed by the premiership of Bute, were poor substitutes. When Bute fell in 1763, Fry argues:

... there was simply a void, which by Scots was acutely felt. They did not know to whom they should turn in London and had nobody to speak for them there who was not himself prey to the conflict of factions (1987, p.10).

What was needed, Fry argues, was one man to take control of the machinery, a man who had the right qualities and the right connections.

The man who seized the moment and captured the balance of power was the lawyer, Henry Dundas. Neither a nobleman, nor at first a landowner in his own right, Dundas was regarded as something of an upstart. Through his legal connections he was given the job of Solicitor General in 1766 and of Lord Advocate in 1775.

Dundas's success, Fry argues, depended on a combination of charm, cunning and charisma which when taken together with his indisputable legal ability made him the perfect fixer of elections. He knew how to play into the hands of the Scottish aristocracy, advertising himself as ready, willing and able "to attend to the interests of a landed class, left leaderless by absentee magnates, and to ensure their direction of Scottish affairs." Never an idealist, but a naturally shrewd manipulator of men, he was, Fry argues, "only too prepared to play by the rules of a corrupt age. Time and experience were to bring out his vices: cynicism, gluttony for power, authoritarianism." In his early days he had had liberal sympathies, being drawn towards reform of the electoral system and Catholic emancipation, but these "did not survive a tempering in the realities of oligarchial government" (1987, p.10) based upon the building of an intricate network of alliances with local political interests.
In addition to his personal talents, Dundas's success, Fry argues, can be partly explained by the fact that:

A social inferior, and treated as such, he could pose no threat to the ruling circles in the South; at the same time he could deliver north of the border whatever they wanted. So he was safe enough to find favour with the English and potent enough to master the Scots - precisely the combination which both had long sought. He was called the Minister for Scotland, or simply the manager. At his height he was universally popular and respected. Both reflecting and advancing Scotland’s integration with the U.K., he was to all, even to opponents, the best national leader since the Union (1987, p.11).

Dundas had his act off to a fine art, dealing with both recalcitrant individuals and also attempts to establish a more organised opposition; such as the one led by James Fox in the 1780s with equal success. When Henry Erskine was Lord Advocate and, with a group of fellow reformers, demanded an inquiry into the burghs, Dundas who was then Home Secretary, casually assured Parliament that "the fact is that the abuses are purely imaginary and the Scottish nation does not feel them to exist" (Fry, 1987, p.12).

Fox’s effort to establish a more organised opposition failed but, Fry argues, it did fertilise the seeds of a permanent opposition:

To speak of party is premature, but there was in Scotland a perceptible ideological gap between those holding that the constitutional principles laid down in 1688 and 1707 needed to be rescued from executive abuse, and those content with the cosy, corrupt system which had in practice evolved. It was a distinction with meaning, a clearer one than any in England - especially as the rulers of Scotland, increasingly labelled Tories, maintained their monopoly of power through a lot of nonsense. Still, most Scots with influence scarcely questioned the assumption that their constitution was free and happy. The opposition, for which it was natural to adopt the name of Whig, remained ineffectual till it acquired some wider base than a political nation so circumscribed could provide (1987, p.12).

While resisting the temptation to pass historical judgements I am not qualified or competent to make, it is possible to make some tentative, general observations. What emerges, and not just from
the work of Fry, but from all the literature I have come across, both local histories and works about Scotland generally, plus the archive material I have studied, is that, after the Union, landed property continued to remain the basis of political power. It was to remain as such throughout the nineteenth century and well on into the twentieth.

5.2 The Counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk

In the counties, Michael Fry argues, "the electoral system seemed designed for corruption" (1987, p.7). While in England the gentry had the franchise, here antique laws and rules for the suffrage, based on the distinction between owners and proprietors, restricted it to large landowners. Ownership of the superiority was what entitled a landholder to vote, and this was quite separate from the physical ownership of land. It meant that if a landholder was a superior he could sell the land and yet retain the right to vote. Alternatively, he could break down his rights into £10 units of value and assign these to nominees or sell them to friends of the same political persuasion who were then entitled to vote. Thus if a landowner, in a small county especially, owned a lot of land and retained the superiority, it was relatively easy to build up voting strength. Fry references J. Brash, who in his 'Paper on Scottish Electoral Politics 1832-1854' (Edinburgh, 1974), has shown that this device was used by the Tories in Roxburgh, Selkirk and Peebles.

From the Union of 1707 until the abolition of hereditary sheriffships in 1745, the chief electoral interests in both Roxburgh and Selkirk were controlled by their hereditary sheriffs. In Roxburgh the chief interest was thus that of the Douglases of Cavers and in Selkirk the Murrays of Philiphaugh. In the neighbouring counties of Berwickshire and Peeblesshire the hereditary sheriffs also controlled the electoral interests. In Peeblesshire the hereditary sheriffs were the earls of March; in Berwickshire the earls of Marchmont.
In Berwickshire and Peeblesshire the earls of Marchmont and the earls of March continued to control the chief interest until nearly the end of the eighteenth century; even though by this time hereditary sheriffs had been abolished. In Berwickshire during the latter half of the eighteenth century the earls of Home, whose interest was directed by Henry Dundas working alongside the Duke of Buccleuch, contended with the earls of Marchmont for control of the county.

During the latter part of the eighteenth century the principal interest in Roxburghshire belonged to John Ker, 3rd Duke of Roxburghe and Henry Scott, 3rd Duke of Buccleuch. Both were minors at the time of the 1745 election. This meant that a kinsman of the Scotts of Buccleuch, Walter Scott of Harden, was virtually in control of the county; winning both the 1745 and 1761 elections. Scott resigned his seat in 1765, arranging for the return of Gilbert Elliot of Minto as he did so. Minto held the seat unopposed until his death in 1777.

Upon Sir Gilbert Elliot, 3rd Baronet's death, his son, Sir Gilbert Elliot, 4th Baronet, declared himself a candidate at the by-election. In addition to the great reputation of his father, Sir Gilbert Elliot, 4th Baronet, depended heavily upon the support of the Duke of Buccleuch. In this election he had it, and defeated Lord Robert Ker, the Duke of Roxburghe's brother, with a majority of 7 votes.

Buccleuch's influence in the 1777 by-election was certainly not a one-off. By his opposition to Pitt, Elliot lost Buccleuch's support in the election of 1784. Displeased with Elliot, Buccleuch joined with Roxburghe in support of George Douglas of Springwood Park. Elliot realised what he was up against and knowing he had no chance of success, withdrew before the poll.

These examples of the building and subsequent destruction of interests and alliances in the county of Roxburgh illustrate very nicely the processes of hegemony at work. Similar processes can be
observed in the smaller, quieter county of Selkirk where Buccleuch also held the principal aristocratic interest. During the minority of the third duke it was managed, until 1841, by Archibald, Duke of Argyll, and then by Charles Townsend, Buccleuch's step-father. Buccleuch, in theory at least, did not have an absolute monopoly of interests in Selkirkshire. Walter Scott of Harden; the Murrays of Philiphaugh; the Fringles of Haining and the Elliots of Minto (who had their principal interests in Roxburghshire), all had interests in the county. It was with the Buccleuch's, however, that the real power lay. A quotation from a letter from Gilbert Elliot of Minto to Charles Townsend, dated 9 July 1760 illustrates the extent of the Scott family's power in Selkirkshire:

The Buccleuch interest is not so much estimated by the votes it can at present command as by the credit... it bestows upon any candidate it adopts.... With your assistance I believe I shall have no great reason to apprehend the assault of my antagonist (cited in Namier & Brooke, 1964, p.496).

In Berwickshire the chief interest was, until 1820, managed by the Buccleuch-Dundas partnership. Meanwhile in Peebleshire the political scene remained quiet. The Duke of Queensberry had the principal interest but this was to some extent only a nominal interest. Lord Chief Baron Montgomery sat as the duke's Member from 1755-1768, and during that time managed to establish himself to such a degree that by 1802 he was credited with the leading interest in the county. In addition he managed to secure, in turn, the return of his two sons who sat on their own interest.

While Peebles, Berwick and Selkirk were relatively quiet, in Roxburgh there was much parliamentary political activity. In February 1788 the county was divided into two parties when John Ker, 3rd Duke of Roxburghe, and Henry Scott, 3rd Duke of Buccleuch, the two leading interests, declared their support for different candidates. Roxburghe supported the sitting Member, Sir George Douglas, while Buccleuch had transferred his interest to John Rutherfurd of Edgerstone. The dukes were reported to have said that they would behave honourably. Neither would make votes
and their backing different candidates would not jeopardise their personal friendship.

This attempt by Buccleuch and Roxburghe to maintain a united hegemonic front despite having differences of opinion was directed, it seems, by a desire to keep out Gilbert Elliot of Minto at all costs. Buccleuch and Roxburghe had both supported George Douglas in 1784 in order to thwart Gilbert Elliot. By switching his interest to Rutherfurd in 1788, Buccleuch did not really make things too difficult; for as long as neither duke supported Elliot he would automatically be out of the running anyway.

In the face of the Buccleuch-Roxburghe alliance Elliot may well have been tempted in 1788 to call it a day for good. He was, however, made of stronger stuff and persuaded his uncle, Admiral John Elliott, to try and make a compromise with the Duke of Roxburghe and Sir George Douglas which would allow him to try again more successfully when the time was ripe. Thus in the election of 13 June 1790 Elliot supported Sir George Douglas, and with his aid Douglas was able to outwit Buccleuch and Dundas. The next election, the election of 1796, was Elliot's big chance. Instead of supporting Sir George Douglas, this time he stood against him. Having had their fingers burned in the previous election Buccleuch and Roxburghe were determined not to let complacency turn the result against them. They joined forces by backing Douglas against Elliot. Sir George Douglas was consequently returned.

In October 1797 Sir Gilbert Elliot became Lord Minto. However, even as Lord Minto, Elliot could not contend with the Buccleuch-Roxburghhe hegemony. When Sir John Riddel applied to him for support in the election of 1802 Minto was prepared to give it, but was blocked by the fact that Buccleuch and Roxburghe were not prepared to give up Sir George Douglas if he offered again. Thus Minto realised that "there is an understanding between the dukes
for the county to the exclusion of my interest at all events" (Thorne, 1986, p.579).

The Duke of Roxburghe died in 1804. In the election of 1806 the Duke of Buccleuch supported John Rutherfurd. Minto had hoped that because the Duke of Roxburghe had left no "creditable relations" (Thorne, 1986, p.579) that Buccleuch might be conciliated on his son's behalf. However, Lady Minto realised that such optimism remained a pipe dream for:

The game seems completely up... there can be no doubt that the two dukes have disposed of the county alternately for their joint lives, and that the promise to the Duke of Buccleuch for this term is held sacred by most of the Roxburghe party.... The Duke of Roxburghe's whole interest... consists of sixteen votes, but unfortunately the loss of sixteen... turns this election for Rutherfurd as it before kept him out; it seems to me useless for us to hold out (Thorne, 1986, p.578).

In the election of 1807 Rutherfurd was unopposed because this time Gilbert Elliot realised he would not have much chance if he did stand. In 1811, amidst rumours about disagreements with the Duke of Buccleuch, Rutherfurd retired due to ill health. In the subsequent election Buccleuch supported Alexander Don and by doing so made Gilbert Elliot feel that he was in with a chance; as Don was a relatively unknown candidate. His confidence was also boosted by the fact that Buccleuch's popularity was temporarily on the wane because of his conduct of the lord lieutenancy. On the day Elliot won by 7 votes but his triumph was short lived. Having fulfilled the Mintos' dream his father died the following year. Elliot seemed thereafter to lose heart in his political career, and in the election of 25 July 1814 Alexander Don replaced him unopposed.

Meanwhile over in the county of Selkirk, Buccleuch continued to hold the principal interest. There the sitting Member, Mark Pringle, was doubly secure in his seat because in addition to having a good interest of his own he was supported by Buccleuch and Dundas. One gets the impression that Buccleuch treated politics as a game and would-be politicians as puppets. By 1802
Buccleuch decided to support another of his friends, John Rutherfurd, who then replaced Pringle. In 1806 it was once again time for a change. In this election Buccleuch decided to support Colonel Elliot Lockhart of Borhwickbrae whom Lady Minto described as "a very unfit man to represent a county in all respects" (Thorne, 1986, p.579) and whose personal fortune would not support his attendance at Parliament. Most importantly, however, Lockhart had the support of the Duke of Buccleuch. Gilbert Elliot was not invited to represent the county. There was no contest and Eliott Lockhart remained secure in his seat thereafter. In Lady Minto's view the power of Buccleuch was so great that he was able to treat the county of Selkirkshire like a proprietary burgh.

After the Union, Michael Fry argues, the burghs, unlike the counties, declined politically. To a large extent this was because they were no longer a separate estate of the legislature. There were 66 burghs and because some were tiny they were divided into districts consisting of 4 or 5 burghs. This grouping of widely scattered burghs - for example, Selkirk was grouped with Lanark, Linlithgow and Peebles for its representation - made them difficult to manage. Only Edinburgh returned a Member itself. The total number of burgh seats was 15, which meant that electoral manipulation was less complex than in the counties. It was, however, Fry argues, worse in that the M.P. was chosen by the corporations, of which membership was confined to certain interests; usually the craftsmen's or merchants' guilds. Each council elected its successor and was naturally inclined to elect itself. Thus very few members of the urban population possessed the franchise. Not only was there no popular franchise, as Fry points out, "not even the richest and most respected citizens were necessarily represented" (1987, p.8).

The causes of burgh and parliamentary reform thus became linked, because if the practice of councils electing and re-electing themselves was to come to an end, by implication, the right to choose the M.P. would be granted to a larger body of voters.
Before the Reform Act of 1833, Ian Brown argues, "Selkirk's council was very much under the influence of the Duke of Buccleuch" (Brown, 1985, p.126). The particular duke Brown is referring to was Henry, 3rd Duke of Buccleuch, who had been tutored by Adam Smith in France and was described as "a noble man with no taste for high office but with the closest ties with governing circles in London" (B. Lenman, 1981), Integration, Enlightenment and Industrialisation: Scotland 1746-1832, p.76, cited in Brown, 1985, p.126). This duke worked hand in hand with Henry Dundas and the result of this partnership was a strengthening and consolidation of his power and influence over Selkirk Town Council.

The election of 1802 provides a nice example of Buccleuch's power in operation and is well documented by Ian Brown in the local history of Selkirk, Flower of the Forest (1985), which is edited by John Gilbert. In this election the sitting M.P., Viscount Stopford, had once again been promised the council's support. However, another candidate, Colonel Dickson came forward and he had the support of the Duke of Buccleuch. It is recorded in the Selkirk Town Council Minutes that "in respect of their regard for his Grace the Duke of Buccleuch and who, is friendly with the interest of Colonel Dickson, (the council) unanimously resolves and agrees to support the said Colonel Dickson" (Brown, 1985, p.126).

Sure enough, Colonel Dickson became a freeman of the burgh and was subsequently elected.

The Colonel Dickson episode testifies to the immense power of landowners such as the Duke of Buccleuch. He was elected because Buccleuch desired it and he was rejected when he fell out of the Duke's favour. It did not in fact take long for Colonel Dickson to fall from favour. In 1806 another election was called and the Duke's new favourite was Sir Charles Ross. Once again, as can be
seen from Selkirk Town Council Minutes, the council supported the Duke's choice:

... the circumstances of his (Sir Charles Ross) being connected with the Duke of Buccleuch will have due weight with the Council, it being their anxious wish to cultivate the good understanding that has so long subsisted between His Grace and this Burgh from whom many marks of friendship have been experienced (Brown, 1985, p.126).

From this it seems as if Selkirk Town Council was totally under the influence of the Duke of Buccleuch. Only once, prior to 1830, Brown argues, does reform appear to have been discussed by Selkirk Town Council. This took place in 1818 when some townsfolk urged the council to petition Parliament on the need for burgh reform. The Selkirk Town Council Minutes for 17 June 1818 show that this request was rejected. Thus it seems fair to say that while the movement for reform was gathering momentum in some areas of Scotland it was relatively slow to catch on in Selkirk and that this was partly because of the hegemony created and maintained by the Duke of Buccleuch and exercised over Selkirk Town Council.

By the 1830s, however, things had begun to change. A national campaign dedicated to parliamentary reform was gathering momentum. This was largely due, Brown argues, to the increasing economic clout of the emerging middle classes who were demanding a say in the election of the Government and the running of the country. The Whigs were the party of reform and their chances for the election to be held in May 1831 looked good.

Sure enough, they achieved a resounding victory and a Reform Bill was introduced and passed easily through the Commons. This made for a very tense situation in the Borders because the Duke of Buccleuch was one of the major opponents of reform. Brown says that there are reports of Borderers gathering in Kelso Square waiting for copies of London newspapers with coverage of the Reform Bill's progress to be brought in by stagecoach. When the Bill was thrown out by the House of Lords "this proved to be the signal for widespread demonstrations against the ruling clique of
landowners and the High Church who had defeated the Bill" (Brown, 1985, p.127).

In Hawick there were actually riots with Henry Scott, the sitting M.P. for Roxburghshire, being openly abused. The Duke of Buccleuch, whose slightest wish had been Selkirk Town Council's command, was hissed at and booted, as were other members of his family, for using "the yeomanry, soldier and the hangman as instruments for preserving the peace and reforming the Government" (Kelso Mail, March 1831, cited in Brown, 1985, p.127). Meanwhile many weavers from Galashiels travelled to Selkirk and marched through the town waving reform banners. In Jedburgh, Sir Walter Scott had been booted, hissed and stoned when he spoke in favour of the Tory candidate, Lord Henry Scott, at the hustings. Brown also quotes from Lauder Town Council Minutes. Here the supporters of reform were so desperate to see a Whig victory that they made "savage and brutal attacks on the person of Mr. Charles Simpson, one of the members of the council who was finally carried off for the purpose no doubt of thus illegally carrying the election of the candidates of the opposing party" (Lauder Town Council (LTC) Minutes, 4/5/1831, cited in Brown, 1985, p.128).

This opposition to Buccleuch and what he represented could perhaps be interpreted as the first signs of a crack in his hegemonic fortress. It was, however, only a crack, not a major break. As Brown points out, while the cry for parliamentary reform was "well voiced" in the Borders, the actual "level of attacks on the opponents of reform was not as high as in other parts of the country" (1985, p.127).

It was clear that change was inevitable and the burgesses of Selkirk realised this. They decided that if they could not prevent it they could try and have some say in shaping its course. It had been suggested in the Scottish Reform Bill, that Selkirk, along with the burghs of Linlithgow, Peebles and Lanark, should form a new electoral division. The burgesses were not happy with this suggestion and proposed instead that a new Border burgh seat,
consisting of the burghs of Jedburgh, Hawick, Kelso and Selkirk, should be established. A petition was sent to Parliament giving the populations of the various towns: Jedburgh 3,617; Kelso 4,321; Hawick 5,222 and Selkirk 1,880. Realising that with a combined total population of just under 15,000, their argument might not carry much force, the burgesses suggested that the burgh of Peebles which had a population of 2,198 could be added. This would make the total population of the new constituency just over 17,000. If this were still not enough, the neighbouring towns of Melrose and Galashiels could be added which would take the total population of the new constituency over 20,000.

The burgesses, however, were arguing in vain, for with the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1833 the Royal Burgh of Selkirk lost its right to burgh representation and became part of Selkirk County Constituency. The councillors thus lost their automatic right to vote in general elections. To be eligible to vote they had to satisfy the same qualifications as everyone else, to be male and to own, or occupy, property worth at least £10 per annum.

The Parliamentary Reform Act of 1833 was followed by a reform of burgh government, the aim of which was to end the system of the direct representation of trade guilds on the town councils. The Convention of Royal Burghs had, for a long time been unhappy with the way this process operated in Selkirk, and by giving the franchise to all £10 property owners/renters hoped to put an end to it. Selkirk Town Council were thoroughly opposed to this proposed legislation because it would drastically reduce the size of the Selkirk electorate. Prior to 1833, 108 members of trades guilds had been able to vote - the hammermen having 42 votes, the cordiners 18, the weavers 19, the tailors 21 and the fleshers 8. Under the new system of a £10 property qualification they calculated that only about 20 out of this 108 would qualify to vote.

As a logical consequence of the decline of trade-guild representation, the Town Council argued that merchant-guild
representation was bound to increase. This would not, they argued, be desirable for the merchants already had difficulty in filling the 10 places allocated for merchant councillors. The Town Council thus petitioned Parliament to reduce the property qualifications to £5 to enable more members of trade guilds to vote. Behind the Town Council's reasoning was the fear that the 33 places on the council might not be filled. They suggested that to overcome this, in addition to reducing the property qualification to £5, that the number of councillors be reduced to either 17 or 21. But as Ian Brown points out:

Parliament heeded none of these requests and on 4 October 1833 the last meeting of the old council took place and on 5 November, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., 110 householders residing in Selkirk could vote in the Town Hall for the town's first directly elected council (1985, p.129).

5.4 Roxburgh & Selkirk: 1833-1868

Michael Fry argues that "in Scotland the great Reform Act turned out to be imperfect" (1987, p.28). It certainly did not fulfil the aspirations of the Borderers. Ian Brown argues that most of the Border towns had a reputation for radicalism during the years following the 1833 Reform Act and this took the form of an attempt to break, or at least considerably loosen, the Buccleuch family's hegemonic stronghold. He refers to the election of 1865, a contest between two Border lairds, construed as a contest between radicalism and reaction. The 'radical' candidate was William Napier, brother of Lord Napier of Ettrick, and the Tory candidate was Lord Henry Scott, one of the Scotts of Buccleuch. According to the Southern Reporter, 2/2/1902:

In the town of Selkirk where they polled, Napier was the popular candidate, for the town voters were Radical to a man; the market square was crammed with the Souters of Selkirk (Brown, 1985, p.136).

At this time in Scotland there existed a very basic sense of anti-Toryism. The gut reactions of 1832, epitomised by the baker who travelled up to Edinburgh to hold out a rope in front of the Duke of Buccleuch, yelling "I'll give anybody 5s (25p) to hang the
Jock" (Hutchison, 1986, p.2), had by the 1860s materialised into an organised movement for reform, with an active reform pressure group, the National Reform League.

As Ian Brown points out that the National Reform League was basically an English movement with branches in Scotland. It was, as in England, a socially-diverse movement; with leaders tending to be middle-class merchants and tradesmen, but with an active working-class voice also. This can be seen, as Brown points out, from the composition of the League in the Borders, for here "textile managers combined; the chairman of the Hawick Branch was Charles Hunter, a stockingmaker, while in Selkirk blacksmiths and weavers sat on the local League executive" (1985, p.136). The middle-class elements drew upon working-class support to attain their ends by the additional pressure it could bring. But this created a movement whose strength and weakness resulted from the same quality; that is, its diversity. For middle-class elements sought to constrain the radicalism of those demands being most actively voiced by the League's more plebian members. It is for this reason, as Brown also points out, that the radicalism of the National Reform League is often over-exaggerated.

The differing sections within the movement meant that there was never one unified voice. Even after the Great Reform Act, when the newly-enfranchised richer middle classes had left the movement, which now became more solidly lower class, there were still differences as to potentialities and tactics. These contradictions can be seen, for example, at one meeting of the National Reform League, which was covered by the Southern Reporter, where it was revealed that several of the members were not in favour of immediate and universal manhood suffrage and a secret ballot, on the grounds that it could "not be got all at once but only be reached step by step" (Southern Reporter, 21/3/1867, Brown, 1985, p.136).

Despite these differences, The National Reform League was not prepared to accept the proposals put forward in a second
Parliamentary Reform Bill which became the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1868. On paper these proposals, which intended to give the right to vote in parliamentary elections to all male householders in the burghs, sounded more democratic than they in fact were. Yet in reality the proposals contained in the Bill meant that the property qualification would only be reduced slightly. In fact in Britain as a whole, after the passing of the 1868 Reform Bill, only one tenth of the adult population was eligible to vote. At a meeting of the National Reform League held in Selkirk in 1867 one member summed the situation up very succinctly when he pointed out that:

The very first principle of the Bill was wrong in so far that it would represent property but not the millions that produced it and that the working classes were of no more weight in the balance than an insect in one scale would have against a 561b weight in the other (Southern Reporter, 4/4/1867, Brown, 1985, p.136).

5.5 Parliamentary politics in the Borders: 1868-1988

While the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1868 did not satisfy the more radical demands of the National Reform League and only resulted in one tenth of the adult population in Britain being able to vote, for the emerging middle classes in Selkirk and Galashiels the impact of this Act was quite dramatic. This was because the Act applied to male householders in the burghs and the Royal Burgh of Selkirk, along with the burghs of Hawick and Galashiels had been made into a new constituency known as the Border or Hawick Burghs. Hawick, with the largest electorate, was the Returning Burgh.

If the Royal Burgh of Selkirk and the town of Galashiels had remained part of the Selkirk County Constituency it would have been quite a different story. In the case of Galashiels, as Ian Brown points out, if Galashiels had remained part of the county constituency "the right of all male householders to vote would have been withheld until 1884" (Galashiels', 1983, p.141). The inclusion of Galashiels in the Hawick Burghs constituency was,
therefore, "an important development in the working man's fight for his right to vote" ('Galashiels', 1983, p.141). As for the town of Selkirk, the result of the Royal Burgh of Selkirk being included in the new Hawick Burghs constituency was a dramatic increase in the number of voters in the town. Ian Brown argues that this is reflected in the voting patterns for the election of Selkirk Town Council. He takes, by way of illustration, the Town Council elections of 1867 and 1868. In the 1867 Town Council Election Basil Henderson came second with 70 votes. In the 1868 election he came second again, but this time with 298 votes.

On the surface it therefore seems that, for the emergent middle classes, at least, of Selkirk and Galashiels, the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1868 did go a considerable way towards having the desired effect. Ian Brown, however, argues that:

It should be noted that not all electors were in favour of the removal of the Burghs of Hawick and Galashiels from their respective counties as it would in the words of one Liberal mean that:

'Roxburghshire and Selkirkshire were to be handed over to the Duke of Buccleuch and his successors forever to do whatever they pleased with them' (1985, p.141)

The pattern of parliamentary politics in the Borders from 1868 until 1950 is that of an ongoing battle between a succession of Liberals, often with dominant personalities and radical views, challenging the Conservative interest as represented, largely, by the Scotts of Buccleuch (The official title of the Conservative Party in Scotland is the Conservative & Unionist Party and from 1912 until 1965 it was known as the Scottish Unionist Party). This pattern shaped the character of Borders politics today, even though the Scotts of Buccleuch are no longer directly involved or formally involved in the parliamentary political representation of the Borders.

The first general election to be held after the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1868 took place in the same year amidst a background of Tory unpopularity. Checkland & Checkland see this as a result
of their part in the corrupt system of political management prior to 1833, of which the Buccleuch-Dundas partnership was a major part. For "the early acceptance of liberalism by the Scots after 1832 had owed much to revulsion against the generations of corrupt political management by the Tories both nationally and in the Scottish cities" (S. & O. Checkland, 1984, p.83).

It was not just in the cities, however, that Tory unpopularity was rife, as the experiences of Selkirkshire and Roxburghshire testify. Here, as in other rural areas, the Game Laws and the legal right of Hypothec caused much bitterness amongst tenant farmers. Under the Game Laws, hares and rabbits were made the property of the landlord, which caused great resentment. This, incidentally, is a classic case of controversy caused by property being regarded as things, that is, the produce of and an income from the land, instead of the older, more traditional idea of a right in the land. The Scottish Police Act of 1862 compounded the unfairness of these laws, in that gamekeepers could be sworn in as special constables at the insistence of the lairds, who were normally the local magistracy. Tenant farmers also resented Hypothec; a legal right giving the landlord absolute security for rent over a tenant's crops and livestock.

Thus in the General Election of 1868 the new Hawick Burghs constituency was won by the radical, academic, liberal George Otto Trevelyan. There was in fact, not even a contest, as the Hon. George Elliot, brother of the Earl of Minto, and the only other candidate to come forward, withdrew from the contest before the election, realising that he could not possibly command enough support. Once again the parliamentary aspirations of the Mintos had been thwarted, although this time not by a Scott of Buccleuch. Thus George Otto Trevelyan was declared the first M.P. for the Hawick Burghs Constituency and held the seat unopposed until 1880 when the Conservatives put up a candidate, James T.S. Elliot of Wolfelee. Brown points out that this, the first contested election in the Hawick Burgh, was given additional excitement by the youths...
who covered passers-by, both Liberals and Tories, with soot and dye!

During these years the movement for reform did not die down. In 1884 a Bill to assimilate the county and burgh franchise was passed by the House of Commons. It was, however, thwarted by the House of Lords and this, Brown argues, "led to a revival of mass meetings and demonstrations throughout the country aimed at forcing the protectors of aristocratic and landed privilege to give way" (1985, p.141). Demonstrations were held in the Border towns, the largest one being the one held in Hawick on the 20th September 1884, where 10,000 people from all over the Borders were present. In 1884 a new Reform Bill was passed and abolished the property qualifications.

Meanwhile, the Liberal reign continued in the Hawick Burghs. The 1892, 1894, 1895 and 1906 general elections and the general elections of 1909 and 1910 (the latter was uncontested) were won by Sir John Barron, a manufacturer from Leeds. The outbreak of World War One in 1914 resulted in the postponing of any election until the end of hostilities. There was thus no general election until November 1918. By this time the Hawick Burghs Constituency did not exist. It had been done away with by a Franchise Bill, passed in the March of that year which made the three burghs part of the constituency of Roxburgh and Selkirk.

The end of World War One brought many changes; material, structural and intellectual. Some of these changes manifested themselves when Britain went to the polls in November 1918. This time men, and propertied women over 30, were entitled to vote, women having been granted the right to vote as a return for their effort during the War.

In the first battle for the new constituency of Roxburgh and Selkirk, two candidates fought for this seat. The duel this time was not between the Unionists and the Liberals but between the new political force of Labour, and the Liberals. The Labour
candidate, T. Hamilton, Brown argues, put up a brave fight and obtained a very creditable 5,574 votes. This posed no threat to R. Munro, the Liberal candidate, who took the seat easily with 13,034.

No Unionist or Labour candidates fought for Roxburgh and Selkirk in the General Election of 1922 which is commonly regarded as one of the most uninspired contests ever. The contest was between a Liberal and a Liberal Coalitionist. Henderson, the Coalitionist from Hawick, narrowly defeated his opponent, Hamilton Grant. Brown cites the local press who took consolation in the fact that, although this was not the most exciting election campaign to cover, "the constituency may congratulate itself upon having for the first time in many years a Member who has a direct personal interest in the Borders" ('Galshiels', 1983, p.143). This theme is all important in Borders politics today.

The Labour Party had not entered a candidate to fight for Roxburgh and Selkirk in 1922 but Labour had made its debut on to the political stage in no uncertain terms. It was partly the threat posed by Labour which led the Borderers to vote Unionist in 1923. The Unionists were thus able to take advantage of the complex and confusing political circumstances generated by World War One and move to a position of political dominance over the Liberals in Scotland generally. In the Borders this Unionist dominance was to last, with only a single, brief, interruption, until 1964. From 1923 until 1950 the two Unionist M.P.s who represented Roxburgh and Selkirk were both Scotts of Buccleuch.

In the General Election of 1923 the Earl of Dalkeith (son and heir of the Duke of Buccleuch) represented the Unionists and easily unseated Henderson, the Liberal sitting Member. Protectionism was the significant issue of this election and Dalkeith's success can be explained partly, Brown argues, by the fact that he was a supporter of Protectionism.
The General Election of 1923 provides a little anachronistic interest. While this general election saw the formation of Britain's first Labour Government, the constituency of Roxburgh and Selkirk chose as their representative a Tory laird from the very family who had been opposed to letting them have the right to vote less than a hundred years earlier. If the Buccleuchs' hegemonic fortress had started to crack in the middle of the nineteenth century it had certainly been reconstructed by 1923.

A few months later, in 1924, another general election was called. This election saw the beginnings of the general decline of the Liberal Party throughout the British Isles. This decline was reflected in the constituency of Roxburgh and Selkirk, where the Earl of Dalkeith once again easily took the seat for the Unionists. More revealing of things to come on a national level, however, was the fact that Labour just failed to push the Liberals into third place.

In 1928 a further Reform Act was passed which enabled all adults over the age of 21 to vote. In May 1929 this new enlarged electorate went to the polls. The Southern Reporter urged people to vote for the Unionist candidate, the Earl of Dalkeith. The Countess of Dalkeith was also given space to address the women electors of Roxburgh and Selkirk. In addition to urging people outright to vote for the Earl of Dalkeith, the issues of the Southern Reporter at this time are full of reports about local Unionist activities. Dalkeith won the General Election of 1929 but the result was close with less than 4,000 votes separating the three candidates.

Two years later, the General Election of 1931 took the form of a straight fight in Roxburgh and Selkirk constituency with Dalkeith defeating the Liberal candidate David Keir by 21,394 votes to 17,420. Dalkeith's father died shortly before the General Election of 1935 and he succeeded to the title of Duke of Buccleuch. His place as Unionist candidate in this election was taken by another
member of the Buccleuch family, his brother, Lord William Scott. The result was a resounding victory for Scott.

Ten years later in the General Election of 1945, amidst the increasingly tense political circumstances of post-war Britain, he continued to hold the seat, although with a significantly reduced majority.

Perhaps elements of false confidence and complacency were beginning to set in because five years later, in the General Election of 1950, the Liberal, MacDonald, thwarted the Buccleuch's electoral dominance and by doing so temporarily threatened that of the Unionists. He obtained 15,347 votes to Scott's 14,191 and Thomas's 9,413 for Labour. Having experienced defeat, Scott did not stand for election the following year. For that election the Unionists chose as their candidate an Englishman working for the Scottish Tourist Board, Commander C.E.M. Donaldson, who reversed the result of 1950.

This was the last election for the seat of Roxburgh and Selkirk. County boundary changes introduced by the 1951 Conservative Government added the county of Peebles to the constituency.

The constituency boundary changes did not see an immediate change in the pattern of Unionist dominance. Commander Donaldson won the new constituency of Roxburgh, Selkirk and Peebles - now with an electorate of over 60,000, one of the largest constituencies in Britain, - for the Unionists. In doing so he beat S. Graham (Liberal) and L.A. Morrison (Labour). He was re-elected in 1959 with an even larger majority.

The General Election of October 1964, however, was a different story, for while Donaldson won it, he did so with a significantly reduced majority. Two factors, Brown argues, were responsible. Firstly, Donaldson supported the Beeching Report which threatened to axe the region’s rail link. Secondly, and more importantly,
perhaps, this general election saw the debut of David Steel, who came a very close second, on to the Border's political stage.

Donaldson died in the following year. His death meant a by-election, the result of which was a victory for Steel and the Liberals. His victory in this by-election meant that Steel became the youngest ever M.P. - 'the Boy David' - and won the seat that he holds to this day.

The 1964 by-election had seen David beat Goliath but David was only to have his strength put to the test again soon. The resignation of the Labour Government in 1966 meant that Steel had to fight to retain his seat. This time his majority was convincing but not quite so comfortable.

The lowering of the voting age from 21 to 18 meant that an enlarged electorate went to the polls in 1970. A record five candidates attempted to capture their support in the Roxburgh, Selkirk and Peebles Constituency. The result was a victory for Steel but with the Conservative candidate, Fairgrieve, coming a close second.

The miners' strike and 3-day weeks of 1974 took Britain to the polls twice in 1974. Both times Steel was returned for Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles with impressive majorities. His successes impressed the Liberals so much that he was elected Leader.

In the General Election of 1979, which heralded the arrival of Thatcherism and the end of the post-war consensus, Steel's seat remained secure and he again won by a very comfortable overall majority.

The General Election of 1979 was the last election in the Roxburgh, Selkirk and Peebles constituency. In 1983 Parliament accepted the Boundary Commissioners' Report and the proposal to split the constituency in two. The constituencies from 1983 onwards are thus based on the new District Authorities comprising
the Borders Region - Ettrick & Lauderdale, along with Tweeddale, comprising one constituency; Roxburghshire, along with Berwickshire, the other. Since reorganisation there have been two General elections and both constituencies have both times returned a Liberal/S.D.P. Alliance Member of Parliament.

NB. For voting figures/electoral statistics please see Appendix 11.
Once-upon-a-time, as all good stories start, the Border lairds were all powerful. While a miasma of myth surrounds the Borders, the lairds and the land, several facts can be clearly distinguished by the twin spotlights of historical and sociological inquiry. These are, firstly, that from the thirteenth century there have existed in the Scottish Borders, a small number of families who have, throughout history, exerted enormous amounts of power and influence in all aspects of Scottish civil society. Secondly, the basis of this power has always been vested in, and derived from, the land they own. Thirdly, their power has, over time, been remoulded, its shape altered and its form changed.

Thus what started out as military power, became with the Agricultural Revolution, economic power; and it was economic power, its uses and abuses, that was the subject of Johnston's tirade at the beginning of this century. There are, as I have already pointed out, many weaknesses in Johnston's polemical denunciation of the Scottish aristocracy, but the major one is that he does not conceive of the role played by the lairds throughout history in any terms other than purely economic ones. Fergusson's account, on the other hand, is more acceptable in that he realised that there was also a political dimension to their power, which was consolidated throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries; at the same time that the economic basis to their power was being gradually eaten-away. The political dimension thus became the most important one and remained so until the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974.

What happened after 1974? In many ways both Johnston's and Fergusson's accounts can be read as predicting the long-term decline of the Scottish laird. True, they no longer wield vast
quantities of military, economic or political power, but neither have they become impotent and consigned to the archives of history.

In the Scottish Borders, what seems to have happened is that during the 1970s, while politics as a channel of lairdly influence was becoming increasingly inaccessible, some of the more enterprising lairds like the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe were busy hewing open a new one. This involved the cultivation of the ideological dimension and the corresponding creation of a Scottish 'heritage' industry. Lairds started to act in a radically-different manner, opening their stately/ancestral homes to the public and stressing that while they were lucky enough to own such places, they were really only looking after them, keeping them in trust, for 'us'; for you and I (see Newby et al, 1978). They became increasingly keen to appear like the man in the street; separated from him only by the weight of the burdens and duties History had ordered them to carry.

The Border lairds, along with lairds throughout Scotland, were, therefore, preparing themselves to face the future and to avoid oblivion. They were doing so, however, by selling the past. We are here reminded of Marx's maxim:

... and just when they seemed engaged in revolutionising themselves and things, in creating something that has never existed, precisely in such periods of revolutionary crisis, they anxiously conjure up the spirits of the past to their service, and borrow from them names, battle cries and costumes in order to present the new scene of world history in this time-honoured disguise and borrowed language (K. Marx, The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, cited in L. Feuer, [ed.], 1959, p.320).

The potential of Marx's analysis is enormous but the fact remains that Marxist accounts, from Johnston to McGrath, from Dickson to Foster, are inadequate in their treatment of power in Scotland. More specifically, Johnston's Our Scots Noble Families and McGrath's 'Foreword' to Who Owns Scotland? are of no help in providing an understanding of the role of the great Border
landowning families in Scottish history and accounting for their continued existence. Coates & Boddington pinpoint exactly what contemporary Marxists, such as the above mentioned, have done to Marx:

The very scientific quality of his analysis of the contemporary phase of human society has been, as it were, turned against him in that people continue to follow him talking about what is and was, and they seem to have lost sensitivity to the fact that historical forces, the living activities and consciousness of people, are pressing hard against the 'natural trends' of the market and commodity system (K. Coates & S. Boddington, 'Introduction', Heller, 1974, p.10).

What is required in order to understand the present-day power of Border lairds, which is essentially ideological power, is an approach which overcomes the inadequacies and limitations of contemporary Marxism, while allowing us to draw on the valuable insights provided by Marx. Such an approach is provided by the work of Agnes Heller and her disciple, Patrick Wright. Their work will be the subject of Chapter Six.
PART III

Explanatory Remarks

In Part II I showed that throughout history the great Border landowning families such as the Scotts of Buccleuch, the Innes-Kers of Roxburghe and the Elliots of Minto between them ran local affairs. They were also very active in the wider parliamentary political scene which, until the Reform Act of 1833, was part and parcel of the same process.

The activity and involvement of Border lairds in local and parliamentary political affairs is a tradition which goes back as far as the thirteenth century; the time that these families started to acquire their lands. It is a tradition that started to die in 1950 when Lord William Scott of Buccleuch lost his seat in the constituency of Roxburgh & Selkirk to the Liberal, A.J.F. MacDonald. The final death throes came in the mid 1970s when Scottish local government was reorganised in line with the proposals outlined in the Wheatley Commission. The old system of local government based on counties and burghs was done away with. It was replaced by a two-tier system of local government based on the Regions and the Districts. After reorganisation Border landowners, with the notable exception of the Earl of Minto, ceased to be active in local politics.

But, and this is one of the most fundamental points in the entire thesis, the Border lairds did not stop exerting power and influence in the everyday life of the Borders following the Local Government (Scotland) Act of 1973. At the same time that politics as a channel of influence was becoming blocked, certain Border lairds were busy securing new ways to make their presence felt. This was to take the form of lairds' stately/ancestral homes being opened to the public on payment of an entry fee. Thus 1975 saw the opening of Bowhill, Border home of the Duke and Duchess of
Buccleuch, to the public during the summer months, followed by Drumlanrig Castle, their Dumfriesshire stately home in 1976. Floors Castle, ancestral home of the Duke of Roxburghe, opened its doors two years later in 1978. Others followed including Mellerstain and Manderston. Mellerstain is the stately home of Lord and Lady Binning, while Manderston was bought by a man called William Miller in 1864 out of the fortune he made from trading with Russia in hemp and herring. It now belongs to Mr Adrian Palmer, William Miller's great-great grandson. Manderston is interesting because it is another nice illustration of how in Britain the bourgeoisie's greatest desire has been to become assimilated into the aristocracy, symbolised by the acquisition of a stately home (see Wiener, 1985).

Thus a Scottish Borders' 'heritage industry' was born. Here I must point out that the opening of stately homes to the public which took off in a big way in the late 1970s was not an entirely new process. After all Abbotsford, the home of Sir Walter Scott, just outside Galashiels on the banks of the Tweed, was opened way back in 1833. One hundred and twenty three years later, in 1953 - a time when Border lairds were still actively involved in local politics - the punters started to be admitted to Traquair House. Traquair is the oldest inhabited house in Scotland and is described by the present owner, Mr Peter Maxwell Stuart, the 20th Laird, as "a living symbol in stone and mortar of lost causes" (Traquair Guidebook, 1981). The lost causes to which the 20th Laird is referring are those of Catholicism and Jacobitism.

There is a difference, however, in terms of what Abbotsford and Traquair on the one hand, and Bowhill, Drumlanrig and Floors on the other, represent. This difference can be seen in terms of the distinction between 'history' and 'heritage' which I deal with in detail in Chapters Eight and Nine. It is at present sufficient to say that while Abbotsford and Traquair have been concerned primarily with Scottish 'history', Bowhill, Drumlanrig and Floors represent the deterioration of history into 'heritage'; with all its corresponding commercial, political and ideological
implications. Likewise, these will be dealt with fully in Chapters Eight and Nine. Briefly, however, my point is that there is no clear-cut distinction between 'history' and 'heritage' in terms of 'truth' (history) and 'ideology' (heritage); for 'history' with its guise of respectability and academia is just as ideologically loaded as 'heritage' with all its commercial, political and ideological undercurrents.

What I am explicitly concerned with in the next two chapters is understanding these processes which have facilitated the successful movement of the lairds' power from the realm of politics to that of ideology. Traditional Marxist accounts fail to deal with this adequately. What is needed, therefore, is a way of explaining this transformation which overcomes the severe limitations imposed by such accounts.

As the parameters of the power matrix shift more and more towards the ideological, the temptation to ignore economic and political reality must be avoided. To give way to this temptation would be to end up as guilty of narrow-minded oversimplification as the accounts under criticism. An approach which overcomes the limitations imposed by crude materialism, while at the same time not being blind to real economic and political issues, is offered by Patrick Wright in his book *On Living In An Old Country* (1985). Wright's approach is the subject of Chapter Seven.

*On Living In An Old Country* is essentially about England but there is an obvious possibility for fruitfully extending Wright's analysis to Scotland. This is what I intend to do. Before embarking upon such a task, however, it is necessary to devote some time to studying Wright's major influence, the Hungarian philosopher Agnes Heller. Chapter Six is devoted to this undertaking.

It is necessary to have a separate chapter on Heller which comes before the chapter on Wright for several reasons. Firstly, because the sheer complexity of Heller's ideas warrant it. Secondly,
because without a fairly in-depth look at Heller's most important ideas, the structure of On Living in An Old Country and the development of Wright's own ideas would be very difficult to follow. This is because On Living in An Old Country consists of six 'occasional essays' which are "linked by their preoccupation with a shared set of themes" (Wright, 1985, p.3). These six essays which make up On Living in An Old Country are given an overall framework by the philosophy of Agnes Heller and to this end it is necessary to understand something of her work. Both problems are compounded by the fact that Wright writes in a style which is both literary and rich but also at times oblique and implicit. In order to establish exactly what his project is and apply it to Scotland it is thus necessary, first of all, to go back to Heller.
Agnes Heller is a highly complex and prolific writer. Certain of her works, most importantly, her *Renaissance Man* (1978), *A Theory of History* (1982) and the long essay 'Everyday Life, Rationality of Reason, Rationality of Intellect' (1985) are more directly relevant for my purposes (as they were to Wright's) than, for example, her *Beyond Justice* (1987), *On Instincts* (1979b) and *Radical Philosophy* (1984b). Having said this, however, these works, most importantly, *Radical Philosophy*, do provide a valuable insight into Heller's philosophical stance and her political and moral commitments. This is important because, in addition to offering a way of understanding our world, Heller is committed to changing it.

The most explicit statement of Heller's philosophical, political and moral convictions is to be found in her *Radical Philosophy*. In this book Heller argues that philosophy in the twentieth century suffers from an inferiority complex and regards itself as 'superfluous'. *Radical Philosophy* is really an attempt to show how philosophy can be resurrected from the realms of mere pedagogy and be transformed once again into a critical enterprise. Her reason for this is her argument that the social sciences need philosophy. They need it to provide a "unitary answer to questions of how one should think, how one should act, how one should live at all" (1984b, p.5); questions upon which philosophy has always been premised.

Before making her plea for philosophy to come off the defensive and return to work, Heller traces the development of philosophy's
changing conception of itself. This is worth outlining in some detail because it reveals how philosophy has been its own worst enemy. It is not science which has made philosophy 'rootless' but philosophy's continual rejection of what has gone before.

The process began with Novalis. Before Novalis philosophy was not concerned with self reflection but, rather, with the task of the constitution of the world. After Novalis this easy harmony between "the task and the aptitude for the task had collapsed" (Heller, 1984b, p.2). With its suitability to the task of establishing the constitution of the world being questioned, philosophy was forced to reflect upon itself. Philosophy was not prepared to accept defeat at the hands of science that easily. Rather it presented itself in the garb of the 'exact' sciences, claiming to be as 'exact' as they were. Thus, Heller argues, it was not the advance of the 'sciences' which made philosophy 'rootless'. This process was achieved firstly by philosophers themselves and secondly, in the nineteenth century, by positivism.

Novalis (1772-1801) had set the ball rolling; Kant kept it in motion, posing questions not only about the task of philosophy but about the aptitude and ability of philosophy as well. He regarded all philosophy, apart from that of Hume, as naive and uncritical. Philosophy, he argued, was derived from an ineradicable metaphysical need, but this did not mean that the need itself could be justified. He attempted to demarcate the limits of philosophy but was quick to stress that although it had limits, philosophy need not, and should not, cower in the face of science. Heller describes this as the 'novel courage' of philosophy. This 'novel courage', however, was not enough to sustain it at Waterloo when "bourgeois philosophy and bourgeois society bade farewell to their heroic epochs at the same time" (Heller, 1984b, p. 2).

Forty years later, Heller argues, Feuerbach was not able to see any difference between philosophy before, during and after Kant. He regarded all previous philosophies as 'speculative' and criticised them for not taking into account actual people and
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the immediacy of humanity itself. Philosophy had to be reformed again.

The work of Feuerbach, Heller argues, offered two ways forward, both of which were taken up. The first led to existentialism and 'Lebensphilosophie', the second to the radical philosophy of Marx.

Ten years later Marx, in his thesis on Feuerbach, characterised all previous philosophy, including that of Feuerbach, as mere attempts to 'explain' the world. For Marx explaining the world was not enough; the world had to be changed. Whereas Novalis had argued that philosophy had to explain not nature, but philosophy itself, Marx turned this point on its head arguing that questions had to be posed not to philosophy, but to the world: the world had to be changed so that philosophy itself could be transcended.

In the nineteenth century philosophy experienced a different sort of attack. This time its assailant was positivism. Developed initially by Saint-Simon, but more explicitly and influentially by Auguste Comte in nineteenth-century France, the roots of positivism can be traced back to Francis Bacon (1561-1626), the forerunner of the British empiricist tradition.

The central tenet of positivism is the idea that all human knowledge is contained within the boundaries of science and that whatever questions cannot be answered must be left permanently alone. Thus the attempts of theology and metaphysics to go beyond the world of observation in order to enquire into first causes and ultimate ends were rejected.

While conveying a warning and ultimately rejecting theology and metaphysics, the positivist programme did not reject philosophy in toto. It saw philosophy as having the potential to perform a useful function, that of explaining the scope and methods of science, pointing out the more general principles underlying specific scientific findings, and exploring the implications of science for human life. Philosophy was thus conceived of as the
handmaiden of the natural sciences. Philosophy, however, must abandon for good the claim to have any means of attaining knowledge not available to science. Thus, Heller argues, positivism severely disarmed philosophy and forced it into a hibernation which it must now come out of.

6.2 The Role of Values

The French Revolution marked a fundamental turning point in the discussion of values, their status and implications. These changes are most clearly expressed in the philosophy of Kant.

Before the French Revolution the main tendency of Kant's philosophy, as expressed in The Critique of Practical Reason (1781), was to give the world norms. After the French Revolution he was concerned with the problem of how a world can be created for the norm. This is the concern of Religion, The Metaphysic of Morals (1785). In Marx, Heller argues, this thought "reaches its self-conscious" (1984b, p.132): one can only give the world a norm, if one also gives a world to the norm.

For Heller the scandal of nineteenth-century philosophy, which we call positivism, is that "it did not want to give the norm a world, and thus ceased to give the world a norm." There cannot be a philosophy, she argues, which does not have an ideal of the highest good and "there is no original philosophy which has not wanted to give the world a norm." Today, she argues, it is more than this for "to give the world a norm means to give a world to the norm: today there is no other way" (1984b, p.132). Thus for Heller values are so crucial because it is through values that philosophy can once again become a critical enterprise, an enterprise concerned not just with explaining but with changing the world:

Philosophy is obviously not a god: alone it cannot change the world. To the extent that it presents the world with a norm which can give the norm a world, it can however be part of a praxis that changes the world. All those people who want to end society based on relationships of subordination and
superordination today need philosophy. They need norms and ideals which give a perspective from which they can change the world. Philosophical value discussion is itself such an ideal: to put it precisely, it is the ideal of democratic value discussion and opinion formation. A norm ought to be given to the world, so that a world can be created for the norm (1984b, p.132).

Her argument is thus not just that today there is a need for a radical philosophy but "that there are radical needs which today cannot be explicated at all without philosophy" (1984b, p.133).

6.3 Renaissance Man: Everyday Life & A Theory of History

Heller's work is perhaps most easily understood if one accepts it for what it is; a set of highly-complex ideas about history and historiography, historicity and historical consciousness, all interwoven and inextricably linked to a theory of everyday life. All these ideas have to be seen against the intellectual background of the Renaissance to which they owe their existence. This is the subject of her Renaissance Man and it is to this work that we must first of all turn.

(a) Renaissance Man

The Renaissance is really Heller's starting point because it represents the watershed between medieval and modern. The Renaissance is so important because by being the "first wave of the protracted process of the transition from feudalism to capitalism" (1978, p.20) it has shaped not only the economic and social structure of society ever since but has united these changes in the economic structure of society with changes in the realm of ideas. This is why it is so important.

As a result of this transition from feudalism to capitalism human relationships became structured and formed in accordance with the developing division of labour. Thus we have the beginnings of class consciousness. From the Renaissance onwards an individual's consciousness is to some degree, because of this, his class
consciousness, (in the sense of class in itself), but not totally, because the consciousness of the various classes is itself constantly changing. Moreover, for the first time ever, an individual could as an individual rise out of his class, for now he belonged to a class as a result of his place in the productive process, not just in consequence of his birth.

Thus the Renaissance destroyed what had been thought of as the 'natural', and to use the title of Foucault's book, 'order of things'. The relationship between individual and community was dissolved, along with the natural bond linking man to his family, his social estate and his 'ready made' place in society. The impact was devastating for in the process of transformation a whole social and economic structure, an entire system of values and way of life, were shaken. Everything became fluid; social upheavals succeeded one another with unbelievable speed, individuals situated 'higher' and 'lower' in the social hierarchy changed places rapidly and loyalty from 'inferior' to 'superior' for the first time became problematic. The virtue of 'honesty' took on a special significance in all of this in that it came to represent something to hold on to in the midst of uncertainty. It was, as Heller describes it, 'the process of social development unfolding in all its plurality' (1978, p.9).

It was not just the basic structure of society that was affected. The impact of the Renaissance extended from the social and economic sphere to the realm of culture and knowledge. Thus the way men thought underwent a fundamental change. Most significantly a distinction was made between subject and object, a distinction which is at the very heart of Western thought. It was the emergence of this dualism which Foucault sees as paving the way for the birth of the human sciences at the end of the eighteenth century, "when man constituted himself in Western culture as both that which must be conceived of and that which is to be known" (Foucault, 1975, pp.344-5).
This distinguishing between subject and object made for the emergence of a dynamic concept of man. Dynamic man emerged from what Marx called 'the state of limitedness' (Heller, 1978, p.9) and is characterised by his 'versatility' and 'many-sidedness'. The form of his existence is a 'dialectic of man and destiny'. In other words the interdependency of person and society had become central.

In addition to laying the foundations for the birth of the human sciences by providing the epistemological conditions of possibility for their existence, the Renaissance cultural elite also started to make a distinction between myth and history. This enabled the Renaissance to be the first era that was able to choose for itself a past. The significance of this is developed in the section on A Theory of History.

Before turning to an analysis of A Theory of History it is important to spend some time examining Heller's theory of everyday life as expounded in her Everyday Life and in the long essay 'Everyday life, rationality of reason, rationality of intellect' (1985) which is essentially a revision of the book. This is a necessary exercise for two reasons. Firstly, because the distinction between 'History' and 'everyday knowledge' is fundamental to understanding her A Theory of History. Secondly, because it is Heller's theory of everyday life which is at the centre of Wright's project. As he says in the Introduction:

The essays in this book turn to a theory of everyday life in order to define the main characteristics of a vernacular and informal sense of history which is certainly not exhausted by the stately display of tradition and national identity in which it finds such forceful and loaded public expression.... I shall draw from both early and later writings with the aim not of elaborating or evaluating the theory per se, but of using it more strategically to trace the possible sources of a shared sense of history in contemporary everyday life (Wright, 1985, pp.5-7).
Everyday life is so fundamental because it is, for Heller, what distinguishes man from the animals. With the animals we share the need to eat, sleep and reproduce. These are all invariant activities, essential to the self-reproduction of individuals and of animals. But unlike the animals in addition to sleeping, eating and reproducing themselves, humans have to reproduce society. "We may define 'everyday life' as the aggregate of those individual reproduction factors which, pari passu, make social reproduction possible" (1984a, p.3).

Everyday life is a complex of lived relationships. It is the melting pot, situated in relation to the individual's spatial and temporal locality in which the process of objectification occurs. This is the process in which the individual, by attempting to shape his world, thereby shapes himself:

Everyday life always takes place in and relates to the immediate environment of a person. The terrain of a king's everyday life is not his country but his court. All objectifications which do not relate to the person or to his immediate environment, go beyond the threshold of the everyday (1984a, pp.6-7).

Everyday life is the world into which the individual is born and which exists ready-made and independent of him, and where his viability as a person is put to the test. To be viable as a person the individual has to learn:

... to 'use' things, to acquire the customs and meet the demands of his society, so that he may bear himself in a way that is both expected and possible in the given circumstances of that society. Thus, reproduction of the person is always of a historical person existing in a concrete world (1984a, p.4).

In capitalist societies, from the eighteenth century onwards, Heller argues, the person, throughout his life, is required to make a more sustained effort to substantiate his claim to viability; a claim that in earlier societies would have been met on attaining maturity. The individual's daily existence throughout
his life thus takes the form of "a battle with the world's sharp edges" (1984a, p. 5). But if in modern capitalist societies there are more sharp edges to be battled with, there are also more alternatives from which to choose. This is a direct result of the transition from feudalism to capitalism which has meant that everyday life has been structured by the developing division of labour. Thus while the individual still belongs to a class this is now, Heller argues, because of his place in the productive process, not just because he happened to be born there (Scottish noble families being an important exception here!). As such it is possible for an individual to rise out of his class, move to a new place in the productive process and thereby find himself a new class.

Everyday life as a concept is, therefore, so important because more than anywhere else "it is in everyday life that human beings are tested as to whether they are - in Goethe's words - 'grain or husk'" (1984a, p. 7).

Having outlined the philosophical background to Heller's work, located it against the background of the Renaissance, and examined her concept of everyday life, we can now move on to an analysis of A Theory of History.

(c) A Theory of History

Central to Heller's A Theory of History, and to her work as a whole, is the idea that history is always a prisoner of its own historicity. It is but a mere reflection of the historical consciousness of the age.

At the very beginning of A Theory of History Heller outlines what she calls the 'six stages of historical consciousness'. This is not an exercise in recapitulating historical periods or the histories of particular countries, etc. What Heller is trying to do is to offer, as one who is trapped by her own place in history, locked within her own historicity, an account of how other stages
of historical consciousness came to understand themselves in relation to historicity.

Within this framework no single stage of the development of historical consciousness can be understood as the outcome of its precursor. Thus although the Greek period and the Judaic-Christian tradition are both seen as stages in the developmental line towards our historical consciousness "this is not the same as the statement that our society can be understood in any way as the 'necessary result' of ancient Greek, Jewish or Roman societies, or even that any real bonds existed between these societies and ours" (1982, p.330). The paradox is, of course, that this idea of a 'developmental line' is itself a reflection of our present state of historical consciousness and there is thus the temptation to conceive of our stage of historical consciousness not only as the latest, but also as the 'highest' one.

The six stages of historical consciousness have two fundamental things in common. Firstly the fact that they are all bounded by historicity for:

_Historicity is not just something which happens to us. It is not a propensity we 'slip into' as into a garment. We are historicity: we are time and space.... Human beings can conceive of time and space without quantity, relation and modality, but they cannot conceive of categories outside time and space (1982, p.4)._ Secondly, the fundamental question of historicity is what she calls "the question of Gaugin: 'Where have we come from, what are we, where are we going?'" (1982, p.4). All six stages of historical consciousness are essentially attempts to answer this question.

Bearing these considerations in mind let us now look at the stages of historical consciousness.
Heller's first stage of historical consciousness is somewhat different to the other five stages in that it is not really a consciousness of historicity at all. While Heller does not periodise her stages, the first stage refers essentially to all preliterate societies. In the preliterate state one was born into a clan/tribe and this was the world. This world was not only the existing order but 'the order of existence' whose genesis was normally explained and legitimated via the myth.

Heller calls this, the first stage of historical consciousness, the state of "unreflected generality". In this sense 'generality' means that the genesis of the values, habits, customs and institutions of the group in question are part and parcel of the genesis of the world, the universe as such. It is an 'unreflected' generality because 'man' is not thought of independently but as identical with the clan or the tribe of the myth.

At this stage of historical consciousness past, present, and future are not distinguished from one another and the image of space is not distinguished from the image of time. This means that the present is both the here and the now and historical consciousness is correspondingly a consciousness of the present and does not encompass the present or the future.

At this stage of historical consciousness the question 'where have we come from, what are we, where are we going?' has not really been formulated for the myth still offers all the answers. This is achieved via the omnipresent motive of 'lesson'. "Since genesis legitimises the existing order as the order of existence, myth tells us what we ought to do and what we have to avoid, what we should fear and what we can hope" (1982, p.7).
Myth delivers warnings to the believers. It always contains a strong sense of fate but there is always a sense that this fate can be influenced by human practices and can be induced to show mercy if the correct ritual practices are followed. These usually take the form of healing rites, human sacrifices etc.

Myth not only explains our being and our existence, it also arranges our experiences. It is thus "the image of the world order." At this stage of historical consciousness, Heller argues, "understanding and action are potentially divided" because "one understands the world and acts in terms of this framework" (1982, p. 7).

While forming the everyday life, thought and experience of the believers, myth in some ways stands apart from everyday life. This is because the stories of the myth are expressions of a collective consciousness which cannot be deliberately corrected or falsified, unlike everyday stories which can always be corrected or falsified.

(b) Second stage - the consciousness of generality reflected in particularity: the consciousness of history.

With writing, Heller argues, the consciousness of history emerges. From this moment 'Being' means not just 'Being-in-time' but also 'Being-in-a-particular-time'" (1982, p. 81).

Heidegger argued that the Persians were the first historical nation in that they were the first to develop a consciousness of history. Heller refutes this, arguing that it was the Jews and Greeks who were really the first to express historical consciousness. This is because 'they reflected on their own body politic (their state) as on the upshot of human decision" (1982, pp. 8-9). This resulted in the image of the 'alternative' emerging, a recognition of the fact that, for example, because men made their state there is always the possibility that they could have created it in a different way. Heller argues that "this image
could only break through completely with the Greeks since the political historiography of the Old Testament, in the last instance, combines human decision and divine providence" (1982, p.9).

This stage of historical consciousness is the consciousness of generality reflected in particularity because it is taken that "the supreme good is the good of the state (of my state, my people), whilst the good and the happiness of men (of individuals) derives from it" (1982, p.9). Within limits, at this stage of historical consciousness individuals are free to define what the good of the state is, how it can be achieved and maintained and how it may ensure the goodness and happiness of the citizens. Thus central to this stage of historical consciousness is the consciousness of change.

Consciousness of history at this stage implies a new form of rationality. In the state of unreflected generality rational action meant guarding and observing the homogeneous norms of conduct in order to ensure the reproduction of society. Now "the norms of rational argumentation develop and the correct and incorrect forms of argumentation are distinguished" (1982, p.10).

In this stage of historical consciousness myth no longer answers the existential question of historicity and secular explanations of genesis which are individual and competitive develop. As Heller says, "the particular genesis thus becomes disconnected from general genesis and the former is made subject matter by historiography. So it is that true knowledge of history (history as episteme) was born" (1982, p.11).

As a result "historical space, in comparison to the image of space on the level of unreflected generality, widens. All peoples have to be understood (their motives interpreted, their fate explained) who had once been or who are now; our friends or foes." For example, Roman historiography embraced the whole of the then civilized world. "Yet because generality is always reflected in
particularity, the time of historiography is limited to the lifetime of the city, the people to whom the historian belongs" (1982, p.11).

At the second stage of historical consciousness the existential question of historicity is answered most powerfully by tragedy. "Tragedy expresses our 'Being-in-a-particular-age' but it also expresses the challenge of the age to Being" (1982, p.11). This is expressed most powerfully by Aristotle and also in the Bible.

On the subject of the relationship between tragedy and the consciousness of history she argues that:

... the consciousness of history in tragedy does not always express the final reconciliation of age and Being.... The end of history casts its dark shadow on the fate of the actors. We are the women of Troy. Perhaps we do not head in any particular direction. If we go nowhere, there is nothing left. To be in a particular age means to be in a people, in a state, in the age of this people and this state. If Being and age cannot be reconciled, they perish together. The last part of the existential question of historicity can be answered in only two ways: in terms of reconciliation, or in the negative. In answer to 'Where are we going?' there is either the perennial present, or nowhere (1982, p.12).

(c) Third stage - the consciousness of unreflected universality

The previous stage of historical consciousness was the 'consciousness of generality reflected in particularity'. Thus the collapse of a particular world, that is, one's own world meant the collapse of the world as such. In the third stage of historical consciousness things are different because of the birth of the 'universal myth'. This is symbolised for Heller by the rise of Christianity when "The 'King of the Jews' became the redeemer of humankind" (1982, p.13).

In the first stage of historical consciousness, that of unreflected generality, the question of what man is is not raised because the myth gives a complete answer. In the second stage of
historical consciousness, when generality is reflected in particularity, the question is raised from the perspective of the particular body politic in which generality is reflected.

In the third stage of historical consciousness the myth, which is now universal myth, offers the complete answer to the question of what man really is. Universality is unreflected and particularity is excluded. "Human nature is created according to the intentions of the Creator. This Creator is universality per se" (1982, p.13). One's salvation hinges solely on one's relation to universality.

When universal myth replaces ancient myth there is a corresponding change in the nature of heroes and heroines. The heroes and heroines of ancient myths conquered countries while the heroes and heroines of Christianity conquer souls in the belief that every person's personal salvation will lead to the redemption of humankind.

When universal myth becomes the dominant form of historical consciousness it is essentially an "unreflected consciousness of historical totality." This form of historical consciousness "offers a final answer to the existential question of historicity" (1982, p.14) in terms of beginning and end; that is, Creation-Fall-Redemption-Last Judgement.

The consciousness of unreflected universality is essentially, she argues, the consciousness of ideality. Whereas the consciousness of generality reflected in particularity found its most powerful expression in tragedy, art becomes the only "form of objectivation which is capable of harmoniously expressing the ideality of universal myth and the reality of particularistic life" (1982, p.15). However, there is a limit to the power of art for the redemption of humankind cannot be painted, only the Saviour who redeems humankind. Likewise the salvation of our souls cannot be painted either, only the human being's suffering and struggling.
In this stage of historical consciousness consciousness originates from 'ideality', but transforms real time and real space into ideal time and ideal space. This is its way of answering the question of what man is, what humankind is and what history as a whole is about. It encompasses the past, present and future.

The universal myth demands belief but it does allow for the possibility of interpretations. By doing so it points the way towards the next stage of historical consciousness. This is symbolised for Heller by the Holy Trinity conceived as three epochs, that of the Father which demands obedience; that of the Son where love is all and that of the Holy Spirit which is the epoch of Freedom (1982, p.15).

(d) Fourth Stage - consciousness of particularity reflected in generality

This stage of historical consciousness is characterised by two distinct levels. The first is essentially a rejection of the universalised and idealised historical consciousness of the preceding stage in that it is "the consciousness of a new beginning in history." This is followed by what she calls "the consciousness of generality reflected in particularity" (1982, p.16). This basically means that attention is paid to the unique as well as to the general. Culture, states and peoples are seen as having their own different histories and are considered as such.

Now that 'history' has become pluralised, consciousness about history comes to mean consciousness about histories which are compared and contrasted. The comparison of different histories leads to statements about regularities. A conception of history emerges in which every civilization follows the same stages of development: ascent, flourish and decline. This results in a questioning of where we are now.

At the fourth stage of historical consciousness 'real time' widens continuously and 'world history' is born. While 'real time'
widens, 'ideal time' disappears. Historical consciousness has come
to terms with the decline of a culture and at the same time with
the birth of a new culture in a new rational future. It is the
start of what Max Weber described as the 'disenchantment' of the
world:

The disenchantment of the world begins its tortuous journey.
Consciousness about history promotes the distinction between
'cultural' product on the one hand and 'natural' product on
the other; between our lives and our life-conditions (Heller,
1982, p.18).

A contradiction between temporal and eternal emerges. Human nature
becomes the focal point of world construction. Because it is
'nature' human nature is 'eternal'. But it is also human and as
such is temporal, dynamic and changing as well. In order to
resolve the contradictions freedom and reason are attributed to
human nature. These qualities were regarded as being able to
account for change, dynamics and history. Human beings are born
free and they are endowed with reason. Because they are free, they
can change themselves and their world. Because they are endowed
with reason, they can increase their knowledge and therefore can
create a rational society by applying this.

Freedom at this stage is no longer identified with political or
ethical freedom. The question of 'what are we?' is no longer
answered by ethics. The model of a social contract replaces this.
It suggests that human nature is both the source and the limit of
our possibilities and that we have to make the best of it "The
new European culture was identified with the dawn of rational
humankind, bourgeois civil society with rational society,
bourgeois and citizen with freedom and reason, thus with human

Like real time, real space widens as well. It encompasses the
space of history and the space of the universe. While ideal time
disappears, ideal space becomes transformed into the infinite
eternity of metaphysical systems. When ideal time becomes
resurrected with Kant's 'Copernican turn', ideal space disappears.
Geographical space and the space of history become distinct. The first encompasses the whole of the globe, the second, Heller argues, the territories of 'high cultures'.

As a result of all these changes at the fourth stage of historical consciousness the individual becomes increasingly 'problematic'. Feelings become less 'natural' and much more reflected. It is at this stage of historical consciousness that we witness the birth of a nostalgia for lost simplicity and sublimity as "the problematic individual looks back with painful yearning and respect to the non-problematic individual" (1979a, p.184) of former times.

(e) Fifth stage - the consciousness of world-history
or the consciousness of reflected universality

Theatre mundi is already set in the period between the siege of the Bastille and Waterloo. Junius Brutus made his appearance on the stage of Rome: Danton coined his final catchwords whilst already in front of the limelight of world history, and being fully aware of his presence on the stage of theatre mundi. Goethe's dictum truly expresses the feelings and ideas elicited by this experience. 'It is appropriate to these times to measure our small private affairs on the immense scale of world-history' (Heller, 1982, pp.20-21).

The fourth stage of historical consciousness was characterised by the pluralisation of history into histories. At the fifth stage of historical consciousness these are replaced by 'History' (with a capital H), universal history, world history. "World historical consciousness relativizes our culture in so far as it reflects on itself as the only true self-consciousness of historicity" (1982, p.21).

World historical consciousness is primarily philosophy of history. It is secular and addresses representative subjects such as the 'great man'. Two contradictory images of the future exist alongside each other. One is the image of redemption, the other the cry of despair.
World historical consciousness places emphasis on 'real time' within the framework of ideal time. The past (that-which-is-not-yet-present) is construed as 'a foreign country', as 'different' in comparison to our times. The devalorisation of the past replaces the nostalgia for bygone times which characterised the fourth stage of historical consciousness. This devalorisation is the result of the growth of science.

Kant, Heller argues, stood on the borderline between the two epochs (stages four and five). In Kant the idea that reason has to establish an ethical (or moral) state or society in the future is still present. This now becomes relegated ever more to the background:

The 'dialectic' of virtue ('Tugend') and 'world-process' (Weltlauf), the primacy of the religious attitude as against the moral one, the emphasis on 'beyond good and evil' or on 'value-free science' all of these express basically the same concern (1982, p. 22).

In this stage of world historical consciousness the dominant questions are 'what is history?' and 'what is civilization?' The question of what man is becomes subordinated to these questions. This is because of the emergence of a fundamental distinction between the person and the Man. The person relates to his world primarily through identification while the Man approaches his life as a conscious object and makes choices and decisions on the basis of deliberately chosen values (ethical, moral, religious or political) which can be in opposition to the dominant ones prevailing in mainstream society or the world at large.

Man becomes:

... the subject of history, but not the person. The person becomes subject to history. Man is universal, but not the person. The person is identified with the universal called 'the man' only if he or she becomes the subject of history or resigns history completely (1982, p. 23).
Men of genius or exceptional talents are regarded as the conductors of history and come to be worshipped as such. For unlike the person, they are not subject to rules.

The person becomes created nature (creature) and at the same time nature itself become created. It becomes demystified and dehumanised. "History creates nature to the extent that it changes nature (both theoretically and pragmatically). Knowledge is power: the universal man possesses power, but not the person" (1982, p.24).

In this stage of historical consciousness particularity is envisaged as the bearer of universality. Certain individuals are worshipped as world-historical individuals because they represent the person becoming universal Man. In the same way particular nations, peoples and classes were supposed to embody universality per se. Such nations, peoples and classes were acclaimed as 'world-historical' nations, peoples and classes.

The fifth stage of historical consciousness is still characterised to a large extent by the consciousness of particularity reflected in generality. This consciousness of particularity reflected in generality does not fade away, "it remains prominent in the struggles for political democracy" (1982, p.25). The idea that man is born free and endowed with reason, which is fundamental to the fourth stage of historical consciousness is, Haller argues, a belief which is at the heart of all movements whose aim is political democracy.

The consciousness of particularity reflected in generality does not fade away but at the fifth stage of historical consciousness its formulation has undergone basic changes. "In the previous epoch man was identified with the bourgeois; now human being becomes identified with the worker and the woman as well" (1982, p.25). However, some do not fit as easily into these categories. She argues that the intellectuals become increasingly disconnected from their original backgrounds. Intellectuals have two options.
Firstly that of importing universality to groups and identifying themselves with an existing integration. Secondly, their other option is:

... to turn their backs on history and particular societies (as unworthy of universality) and to mystify themselves and their being as the ontological absolute, as the identity in negativity. Intellectuals are 'problematic' individuals par excellence and as such they become the scourge of God (1982, p.26).

The status of the artist at the fifth stage of historical consciousness undergoes a corresponding transformation. Art becomes conceived as a 'historical' product. Works of art are scrutinized in their capacity of being embedded in time and the artist himself becomes problematic.

Some of the most important tensions of this stage of historical consciousness are reflected in Goethe’s Faust. For Faust, Heller argues, is the problematic individual, with the will to the absolute. He wants to know everything, live every experience and cannot accept old age, death or limited knowledge. Against practical reason, the primacy of theoretical reason comes to the fore, combined with the totality of life-experience. Goethe, she argues, like Kant, stood between the two epochs.

The fifth stage of historical consciousness points the way towards a new epoch in which "the fear of death does not have to be subdued; the fear of moral transgression has to be regained" (1982, p.27).

The sixth stage - the confusion of historical consciousness:
the consciousness of reflected generality as a task.

With World War One the belief system of reflected universality was fundamentally shaken. This was intensified by the traumatic experiences of World War Two; the Holocaust, Hiroshima and the Gulag which gave rise to what Heller calls "the main contradictions of the modern age." These are, firstly the fact
that the relatively-autonomous and independent sphere of civil society contains two internal and contradictory logics. One of these promotes the growth of inequality and domination via encouraging the internalisation of market and by maintaining the exclusive character of private property. At the same time, however, civil society has another logic in that it establishes "the negative but equal freedom of individuals." To this end its second logic is "the unfolding and enforcement of this freedom (of human rights) in the process of democratization, equalization, decentralization of power." Simultaneously, she argues "the development and growth of industry implies a third logic to an ever increasing extent: the limitation of the market through the centralization of the allocation of resources by the state" (1982, p.284). As a result historical consciousness has become 'confused'.

Attempts to sort out the confusion tend to take the form of following one or other of these various contradictions (Heller calls them 'logics') of the modern age. Socialism, for example, in its various forms represents a theoretical proposal to solve the contradictions. Neo-Conservative right-wing authoritarianism represents another.

As a result of this confusion of historical consciousness "philosophies of history were brought to trial for having allegedly been responsible for everything that happened" (1982, p.28). Nietzsche, Hegel and Marx were all accused of being instigators, or at least accomplices of, mass murders. Yet, she argues, these trials were primarily ideological and equally the offsprings of philosophies of history.

The various offspring of philosophies of history in the age of the confusion of historical consciousness have worked out three alternative theoretical proposals to cope with the confusion. Heller says that they can be labelled as "Research Institute Facticity", 'Grand Hotel Abyss', and 'Mental Asylum of the Radicalization of Evil'" (1982, p.30).
She describes 'Research Institute Facticity' as "the consciousness of pragmatic particularity." It is the frame of mind which advocates, not the abolition of existing institutions, but accepting them with the view to possibly, at the most, removing any dysfunctions. In such a philosophy science is unproblematic. "Rationalization becomes an article of faith and rationality becomes mere problem solving." It is not concerned with the "riddle of genesis," nor the dream of the future but with the present and the future of the present, painted in "rosy colours." This state of affairs is succinctly expressed in her statement that "Faust is transformed into Sherlock Holmes" (1982, p.30).

'Grand Hotel Abyss' expresses the opposite extremity. It regards pragmatic consciousness with contempt. Its vision is that of a negative totality. The present is once again an age of radical sinfulness but this time without redemption: "History has missed the bus." Human beings have become completely malleable, manipulative and one-dimensional. Without the possibility of redemption we are relieved of moral commitments; "the 'man in the street' who enjoys TV dramas about space wars and the destruction of our earth while peacefully consuming his dinner" (1982, p.31). However, this unhappy consciousness is open to all kinds of what Heller calls "anthropological radicalism" which it can interpret as a sign "the unhappy consciousness of reflected universality is ambiguity" (1982, p.32).

'Mental Asylum of the Radicalization of Evil' is the other theoretical proposal which the philosophy of history has worked out as an attempt to cope with the confusion. The main idea of this proposal is that if violence and force transformed us into their objects, we have to practice violence in order to find our personality. The radical deed thus becomes a healing rite.

In some respects it seems as if the wheel has come full circle. Once again the question of 'where have we come from?' assumes utmost importance. To this end "we keep discovering our earthly time, the past." This is particularly significant because "within
the last two hundred years our earthly history has been expanded by about 700 years" (1982, p.32). To this end "our present history is in fact world history." This is because by striking "ever deeper into the well of the past... we have the consciousness of being coeval with periods long gone." In addition to this "the present population of our globe is equal in number to the sum total of its inhabitants throughout all human histories. And, more importantly, humankind as an idea has become a fact" (1982, p.33).

6.5 History, Historiography, the Philosophy of History & Their Relationship to Everyday Life

Thus while not attempting to recapitulate any real historical periods or developments in her six stages of historical consciousness, Heller makes the point that History was born about 200 years ago at the end of the eighteenth century. Her argument is that History with a capital 'H' is both "a project of modern civilization" and the form of existence of modern times, in that it expresses the "life-experiences" (1982, p.281) of modern civilization.

There are, Heller argues, two main 'objectivations' whose aim is the understanding of history. These are historiography and the philosophy of history. Historiography is the oldest of these and its functions cannot be replaced by any other kind of objectivation. The philosophy of history, however, emerged at the end of the eighteenth century alongside History with a capital 'H'. Heller regards it as "only a subspecies of philosophy, not an independent objectivation" (1982, p.213). As such it can be replaced by other philosophies.

In A Theory of History Heller gives an account of the theoretical procedures, the modes of verification and falsification of historiography and the philosophy of history. She tries "to understand the roots of the various historiographies and philosophies of history as inseparable from the various stages of
historical consciousness that they actually express" (1982 p.51). I am not going to go into this, concentrating instead on the relationship of historiography and the philosophy of history to everyday knowledge.

Historiography and the philosophy of history have both been contrasted with everyday knowledge. They are commonly regarded as representing 'true' knowledge, in contrast to mere opinion. Heller's point is that everyday knowledge and understanding cannot be distinguished from episteme (historiography) and philosophy in the way that many historiographers and philosophers of history would have us believe. For Heller both historiography and the philosophy of history have roots in everyday thinking. This leads to her arguing "that not only is the need for historiography and philosophy deeply embedded in everyday consciousness but that these basic determinants are as well" (1982, p.79).

However, everyday knowledge is different from historiography and the philosophy of history. The structure and functions of everyday understanding are different and so is the content. For a start, everyday knowledge is never coherent. It selects fine fragments of 'true knowledge' and uses them practically and pragmatically. It is also partial in character. It is at the same time the basis of both historiography and the philosophy of history:

More precisely the problems formulated on the level of episteme are the problems of everyday life and consciousness. We may describe them as the forms of 'imputed consciousness' in Goldman's sense of the word: they make the implicit explicit, the vague clear; the covert overt, the incoherent coherent (1982, p.80).

The relationship between everyday knowledge and the two forms of true knowledge is not a relationship of cause and effect. Yet she suggests that in modern times the two forms of true knowledge influence everyday consciousness in that:

... they offer a language absorbed quickly by everyday self-understanding. People who have never read Condorcet or Hegel or Marx or Nietzsche or Ranke or Toynbee or Block speak their language. Even most scholarly historical writings can be
'spoken' by the mediation of belletristic literature and the mass media (1982, p.80).

Central to A Theory of History, therefore, is the idea that historiography and the philosophy of history do not stand in opposition to everyday knowledge. They both have their roots in everyday knowledge and thought. Heller is critical of historiography and the philosophy of history for forgetting this. While realising that "the function of historiography cannot be replaced by any other kind of objectivation" (1982, p.213) she regards the philosophy of history as a mere 'subspecies' of philosophy which is certainly not indispensable.

To this end Heller offers a 'theory of history' as an alternative to the philosophy of history. This theory of history "has to restrict itself to the analysis of such objectivations that have history as their specific subject matter. It has to examine how (past and present) histories understood themselves in their capacity as histories" (1982, p.51). It has to realise that "'once upon a time there was a man' means that there is someone who tells his story and there will be someone who will tell it" (1982, p.4). In other words it has to realise and accept its own historicity and that it cannot be avoided.

In this chapter some of the more important ideas in Agnes Heller's work have been looked at in considerable detail. Ideas must be put to work. It is now time to see how Patrick Wright, in his study of the national past in contemporary Britain, uses Heller's ideas to turn handles on the real world.
CHAPTER SEVEN
An Anthropological Museum?
Patrick Wright's On Living in an Old Country

7.1 Intentions & Influences

The inspiration behind On Living in An Old Country was Wright's return to Britain from North America in the Summer of 1979. On returning he felt as if he had "stumbled inadvertently into some sort of anthropological museum" (1985, p.1). He experienced what Neal Ascherson has described as the very "worst kind of nightmare" which happens "when you seem to enter your home, see again all the furniture that always was there, and do not recognise it" (1988, p.4).

Wright returned to Britain amidst what Raymond Williams has described as "the visible weakening of England" (Ascherson, 1988, p.4). A time when the centralised nation-state was weakening and uncertainty setting in about whether there was still such a thing as a definable "English way of life" (Ascherson, 1988, p.4). As Wright himself remarked, "in the eye of the returnee everything may seem identically familiar, identically strange. But this does not necessarily mean that the scene is actually all sewn up" (1985, p.3).

Sure enough all looked nearly the same and after all:

There isn't some public barometer of change announcing the numerical decline of those who speak English or eat Yorkshire pudding or are kind to dogs. (Unless the unemployment totals displayed on Labour town halls fulfil that purpose). And yet the loss of inner identity and certainty is taking place, as invisible as that 'consuming, swallowing wind' (Ascherson, 1988, p.4).

The country Wright had come back to was "full of precious and imperiled traces - a closely held iconography of what it is to be
English - all of them appealing in one covert way or another to the historical and sacrosanct identity of the nation" (1985, p. 2).

Wright tries to show how this national past which is "above all a modern past" has been captured by the Right of British politics and defined, not just in relation to "the general disappointment of earlier historical expectations, but also, and more pointedly, around the leading tensions of the contemporary political situation" (1985, p. 2).

Thus it was more than mere coincidence that 1979 was the year Wright started to think about the modern past for it was also:

... the year in which Margaret Thatcher started to project her governmental mission in terms of the merely political (and therefore changeable) consensus of liberal democracy but in the transcendental and eternalised measure of an imperial national identity which she alone could secure against the series of indefinite but nonetheless persistent threats which have played that conveniently demonic role in her public rhetoric (1985, pp. 2-3).

On Living in an Old Country consists of six main essays which are linked partly by their preoccupation with two major themes. These themes are: (1) the political development of Thatcherism; and (2) the ways in which the past has been secured as a cultural presence in modern Britain. A more important link, however, is provided by the philosophy of Agnes Heller which acts as a supporting, containing framework for the whole book. Having discussed the work of Heller in a general sense in the previous chapter, it is now necessary to say something about the specific nature of the intellectual bond between Wright and his mentor.

7.2 Wright & Heller: The Intellectual Bond

In many ways Heller's work can be regarded as the painful process of man's coming to terms with modernity; a process which is by no means completed. The great changes and social transformations brought about by the Renaissance were the "first wave of the protracted process of the transition from feudalism to capitalism"
As such it shook an entire system of values, destroyed a way of life and reshaped the economic and social structure of society. Ever since man has been trying to pick up the pieces and reinstate himself in this new fast-moving, future-directed, society of unstable equilibrium. Feuerbach's Captain Forward has become for Heller an image of modernity:

Captain Forward is Janus-faced. The right cheek reflects the glamour of world-theatre, the left cheek the dirt of the prose world; the right one the plentiness, the left one the emptiness of life; the right one is a challenge to freedom, the left mirrors the burden of necessity; the right bears the mark of self-realization, the left that of security and personality (Heller, 1982, p. 289).

It is this ambivalent nature of the Janus-faced Captain Forward which provides the most basic and fundamental link between Wright and Heller. For central to the work of both is the fact that while the transformations brought about by modernity are widely experienced in terms of loss rather than gain, they both see modernity as containing positive potentials. These include the growth and development of science, of human rights and moral responsibility, of socialism and democracy. Modernity may have brought about the disenchantment of the world but the potential is there for the world to be re-enchanted. It is just a case of unseating tradition from its reactionary throne and freeing history from those who seek to capture it (on both the Right and the Left) and render it impotent, as "history-which-is-already-made," be it "the already completed past of nationalist encouragement (or of left-wing nostalgia)" (Wright, 1985, p. 255).

(a) Particularity & Individuality

Wright applies Heller's theoretical/philosophical principles specifically to the situation within the U.K. today. His approach is in contrast to both right-wing and left-wing nostalgic approaches, and crudely simplistic Marxist approaches, with their assumptions about the inevitable progress of the universal working class. At the same time it does not collapse into post-Marxist
pessimism. For Wright believes that the dream of progress can be resurrected and transformed into a reality. In order to understand how and why this is possible in contemporary Britain it is necessary to go back to Heller and the distinction she makes between 'particularity' and 'individuality'. This is a distinction which is absolutely fundamental, both to Wright's work, and for my own purposes.

'Particularity' and 'individuality' represent different stances towards the social world which coexist within each personality. The 'particularistic' viewpoint is the most fundamental in that it is there when we are born. It is formed by the particular qualities and dispositions with which the individual is born. As the individual grows up it extends out to those who share the same integration; that is, family, village, football team, nation. Consequently it is expressed most basically as an awareness of the difference; the 'opposition' between 'us' and 'them'. It is thus also the common cultural perspective of the group in which one comes to self-understanding.

The 'individual' stance, on the other hand, does not operate by the person relating to the world through identification. It assumes a critical distance between the person with his given qualities and the environment in which he finds himself. Thus the individual viewpoint involves approaching one's life as a conscious object and making a selection from the system of customs provided by the social environment. This selection, Wright argues, is made on the basis of values which are deliberately chosen; be they ethical, moral, political etc. These are then realigned with the particular cultural and personal disposition from which the person starts. It is quite possible, as Heller stresses, for a person to develop and follow an individual hierarchy of values - a world view - which contradicts the dominant norms or values prevailing in the world at large. On Living in an Old Country is all about the competition between different value hierarchies/world views within contemporary Britain.
Both particular and individual stances coexist within each personality and consequently everyday life itself combines both stances. It is this which gives it its ambivalence, vitality and the potential for change. For while everyday life retains its heterogeneity and ambivalence there is always the potential to resist the forces of the existing hegemonic bloc by the formation of a new balance of forces.

Certain symbols and images are important in this respect. Both Heller and Wright stress the importance of the experience of 'home' which plays not only an extremely prominent part in everyday life but is one of its most primary, most expressive and most ambivalent symbols. Wright picks up on the fact that the symbol and experience of 'home' cuts across the particularity/individuality divide in that it is expressive of both. As he puts it:

'Home' is therefore not just evocative of the familiar (if often agonising and also brutal) disposition of personalities in which so much everyday life is experienced; it is also the interior space in which some recognition can be given to endowments and potentials which have no opportunity for realisation in the world as it is outside - the space, indeed in which disregarded potentials and needs may themselves find some limited 'home' in the world (1985, p.11).

He goes on to argue that:

... the utopian symbolism of 'home' has certainly been used to romanticise the patriarchial family, to idealise domestic drudgery and to vaunt a national heritage of 'stately homes'; it also engages meanings and aspirations at the level of everyday life which are of a far more open-ended, critical and searching kind than any merely muck-raking definition of 'ideology' would be able to accommodate (1985, p.11).

What Wright, inspired by his reading of Heller, therefore seems to be suggesting is that even if an elite tries to achieve hegemony by capturing 'history', as Margaret Thatcher and her Government have done, to project the "unitary image of a privileged national identity which has been raised to the level of exclusive and normative essence" (1985, p.255), there exists at the level of
everyday life an expression and recognition of heterogeneity with the potential to challenge the dominant hegemony.

It is by considering Wright and Heller together that both the potential and the limitations of their analyses for my own work become apparent. Heller deals with the experience of modernity at a much more general and philosophical level, while Wright, deriving his inspiration from Heller, attempts to show how the tensions and contradictions of modernity are manifested in contemporary Britain.

Wright mentions "the continuing tensions between the 'nations' of Britain" but does not develop this point. Had he done so he may well have found that 'Hope' need not always be the "mother of fools" (1985, p.27); for it is here in Scotland that there is most hope of breaking out of the iron cage of Thatcherism. As I learned during my initiation process, the reasons for this optimism stem from the fact that Scottish history has not been captured by either the authoritarian right or the nostalgic left. Because the Scottish past has not been captured and transformed into 'history-that-is-over' it retains a potency which the English past does not have. In this way it fulfils Wright's plea that:

... while the earlier Marxist philosophy of history with its assumptions about the inevitable progress of the universal working class should certainly be discarded, there is continuing need for a theory of possible history which can be fought for in accordance with the political principles of socialism (1985, pp.255-256).

Fundamental to modernity being experienced in terms of loss rather than gains is the paradox that it was modernity itself that gave birth to the categories of universal progress and regress. These categories have become universalised and this is at the root of modernity being experienced as loss. We select indicators of progress and regress, such as 'success' and use them as yardsticks with which to measure the amount of progress or regress in different cultures. This, Heller argues, is fundamentally wrong. It is wrong because it means we are trying to play God and by
doing so are placing ourselves outside history. We have no right to do this because, she argues, we are history.

In Britain after World War Two we were sold a dream of progress, a dream which has subsequently been shattered. This is reflected, Neal Ascherson argues, in the changed meaning of the very word 'change':

When I was young - and not just because I was young - we looked forward with confident impatience to change. Planned, controlled, beneficial change would continue to clear slums, sweep up the remains of empire, raise living and educational standards, tidy away - firmly but kindly - the last aboriginals who still raved about martial glory or the pride of wealth. Now, as it seems to me, change is set almost exclusively in the minor key, change seen overwhelmingly as loss (1988, p.3).

This sense of 'change as loss' is, Ascherson argues, essentially a failure of social trust which seems to affect persons of all political faiths. He points to the incongruity of Home Secretary Douglas Hurd quoting Philip Larkin:

The statues will be standing in the same
Tree-muffled square and look nearly the same.
Our children will not know that it is a different country.
All we can hope to leave them now is money (1988, p.4)

while belonging to a government which seems to believe that the only thing worth leaving is money. Ascherson cites Glenys Kinnock in Marxism Today reflecting on the shattered dreams of the post-war Welfare State generation, "ours was a hopeful generation... my brother and I were taught to appreciate the orange juice and dinners and milk" and compares this with the post-Marxist pessimism of Ken Livingstone who believes that "the human race lost its way when it took up 'selfish, acquisitive' agriculture as a short cut to progress, and is likely to choke itself in filth and radiation" (1988, p.6).
Heller's is a much more optimistic vision. She does not deny that:

It is a tough world into which we are born and in which we have to make our way. In this tough world, people work, eat, drink (usually less than they need) and make love (usually by the rules); people rear their children to play a part in this tough world and timorously guard the nook they have managed to corner for themselves; the order of priorities, the scale of values in our everyday life is largely taken over ready-made, it is calibrated in accordance with position in society, and little in it is moveable. There is little opportunity to 'cultivate' our abilities beyond, at least, narrow confines (1984b, p.15).

but points out that while modernity brought about a dramatic increase of social insecurity it also brought about an increase in potential and possibility. Thus:

With the disintegration of community ties the industrial becomes an 'accidental' individual (his class - or stratum - affiliation is of accidental character) but, at the same time he becomes a free individual as well, at least potentially (Wright, 1985, p.13).

On the subject of progress Heller cites Collingwood. If "there is gain without any corresponding loss then there is progress. And there can be progress on no other terms. If there is any loss, the problem of setting loss against gain is insoluble" (Heller, 1982, p.300).

Ours, Heller argues, is a society characterised by dissatisfaction; in the sense of dissatisfaction with the life-world as a whole. This can be seen within the U.K. in terms of the tensions between the four 'nations', racial and religious tensions, the oppression of women and tensions between rich and poor. How can one accept that there has been any progress, in the sense of gain without any corresponding loss in such a society? Her verdict is that:

... there is no progress or regress in modern society because there are both gains and losses which are incommensurable unless we use human beings as mere means, which we must not do. Yet it still must be emphasised that there is progress and regress in modern society in that the ideas of (universal) progress and regress were born in this society and these ideas express this society's form of existence (1982, p.301).
Within modernity dissatisfaction has become universalised and this, Heller argues, is in fact a gain without losses because:

... the idea that every human being, if unfree or unequal, has the right to dissatisfaction, is a progress in fact achieved in the society of unstable equilibrium. It is a conditional one, but this condition is the condition for the want of which the new idea of progress (again without losses) could not even have come about (1982, p.304).

It is appropriate to conclude this section with a quote from Heller's A Theory of History:

It is a truism of present-day journalese that the first genocide happened in our century. Those who constantly repeat it ignore the fact that the first great work of world literature (another project of 'History') describes a genocide - the destruction of Troy and the extermination of its population. The summit of Republican Rome (which everyone learns of in school) was also a genocide. The place where Carthage once stood was ploughed by brave Roman soldiers, and the former inhabitants of the city were killed or sold as slaves. 'Victrix causa dies placuit, sed victa Catoni': even if (as claimed by Lucan) Cato felt sympathy for the vanquished, the deities were with the victor, which demonstrated that one could avoid a bad conscience about what happened. But the assertion that the first genocides have happened in our century is not based on ignorance. This 'forgetfulness' is the expression of a radically new phenomenon. As there are no less and no more monstrous deeds in present history than in past histories, so there are no less and no more genocides; we simply have a bad conscience about them; 'we in general', since they cannot be accepted as accompanying our project of 'progress' - they lack harmony with our values and in fact contradict them, thereby making us feel outraged. Even so, this in itself would not suffice to elicit the qualms of conscience. One can (and should) feel these qualms only if one is the perpetrator of, or the accomplice in, the evil deed. But we do feel pangs of conscience about infamous crimes without being either perpetrators or accomplices. This can only be explained by presuming that, wittingly or unwittingly, we share another feeling as well: that the crimes in question could have been prevented by us if only we had been resolute enough. We feel a personal responsibility for all actions which annihilate and revoke the values we regard as valid. This feeling of responsibility could be viewed as imaginary: after all, what can one person do against the powers of the world? Yet this is not an imaginary or affected, but a most authentic feeling. Everyone has the power to do at least something against the horrors of the world. If cumulated, this could amount to some weight (1982, p.308).
7.3 The Past as a Cultural presence in Modern Britain:
Wright's Use of Heller

Wright conducts his study of the modern past through the ideas of Heller. His approach is informed by her work as a whole but in particular by the ideas contained in her A Theory of History and Renaissance Man. He also makes extensive use of her concept of everyday life, especially her distinction between particularity and individuality.

In Wright's study of the modern past three themes are of particular importance. These are (1) the golden age/rural idyll; (2) the search for the unique; and (3) the fascination of remembered war.

(a) The Golden Age/Rural Idyll

The modern past, Wright argues, frequently assumes the idealised air of the golden age. It is strongly flavoured by the romantic belief that "the true potentialities of human development must be seen in the light of traditional (Heller speaks of 'natural' but not in a way that implies any pre-historical state) and deeply settled communities that have already been destroyed" (1985, p.21). We are reminded here of Raymond Williams' The Country and the City in which Williams makes the point that throughout English literature we are constantly referred back to successive "golden ages", rural "Old Englands" which are "dying out now" (1985, p.11). These "Old Englands" are always firmly located in the childhoods of their authors. Thus, "old England, settlement, the rural virtues - all these, in fact, mean different things at different times, and quite different values are being brought to question" (1985, p.12).

The modern past does not escape this problem of perspective for it is, Wright argues, from the "thematic repertoire" (1985, p.12) of everyday life that it comes to be defined. In a world in which
traditional values have become disordered and social hierarchy disrupted, old forms of security, that is, the traditional 'family' become appealing. To compensate for rationalisation and bureaucratisation the imperial past becomes idealised; "a theatre in which adventures of personal action can still be played out" (1985, p.22). An interest is taken in "the last crafts of foregone times when the traditional techniques and understanding (the practical reason) of everyday life were apparently still sufficient to the world and when, as can fondly be imagined, age brought wisdom rather than meaningless decrepitude" (1985, p.22). Accompanying this is a belief that the people of the earlier stages of industrial capitalism were 'non-problematic' individuals.

This, Wright argues, romantic ideal of the 'non-problematic' individuals in early industrial capitalism is not just a right-wing nostalgic phenomenon but also a left-wing one, "one which cherishes the romantic memory of a time when the working class could more easily produce its own meaningful world view: the unproblematic community of the 'general interest'" (1985, p.22).

Running alongside this recurring theme of the golden age/rural idyll is the belief that science has become increasingly independent from everyday life. This is important because it "opens a space in which a non-practical relationship to nature has developed" (1985, p.21). This in turn leads to a belief that everyday life has become more and more dominated by the repetitive thinking which rationalised and routinised activities demand.

(b) The Search for the Unique

Everyday life, Wright argues, is characterised by a sense of the unique, an expression of 'subjective surplus'. This is "subjective experience which finds no realisation in the constrained and rationalised activities of much modern everyday life" (1985, p.22).
This sense of the unique takes the form of a search for that "auratic (possessed of 'aura') object, place or site which seems to bear meaning in itself" (1985, p.22).

It is, therefore, the foundation upon which the 'heritage industry' is built. A quotation from the catalogue of 'Treasure Houses of Britain' illustrates this nicely:

The mellow red brick of a Tudor manor house reflected in its moat; the domes and statues, cupolas and turrets, of one of Sir John Vanburgh's baroque palaces rising out of the mist; or the portico of a Palladian mansion seen across a lake at sunset, deer grazing by the water's edge. A deeply romantic picture this may be, painted in the golden light of Constable and Turner, but it shows what a central place the country house still holds in the British national consciousness, and what dreams of Elysium it continues to offer in an egalitarian twentieth century (Hewison, 1987, p.52).

At a much more banal level this search for the auratic object is a celebration of the customary lifeworld of traditional everyday life which is threatened. Wright takes as an example of this the classical revivalism in architecture of which Quinlan Terry is the foremost expression, as against the Modern Movement.

(c) The Fascination of Remembered War and the Redeclaration of the Second World War

Under Margaret Thatcher, Wright argues, there has been a consistent redeclaration of World War Two. This process began early on in her first term of office with the establishment of the National Heritage Memorial Fund which was grafted on to the remains of the National Land Fund. The National Land Fund had been set up in 1946 with £50 million from the sale of surplus war materials, under the guidance of Labour Chancellor Hugh Dalton. Dalton's idea was for the fund to work as a 'thanks-offering and war memorial' for the Britons killed in World War Two:

... 'the beauty of England, the famous historical houses, the wonderful stretches of still unspoilt open country'; surely it would be a fitting memorial that these 'might become part of the heritage of all of us' (The Times, 22/4/1977; Wright, 1985, p.45).
In practice the National Land Fund never really achieved anything and there were even debates about whether it actually existed. Enoch Powell argued that in 1946 the Exchequer had merely lent itself £50 million, and as a junior Minister acting on behalf of the Tory Government, reduced it in 1957 to £10 million.

The 1979 Tory government under Thatcher conceived of the National Heritage Memorial Fund as an attempt to redress earlier breaches of promise to those who fell. Thus, Wright argues:

... the National Heritage Memorial Fund presents one of the Thatcher government's first (and perhaps less than fully conscious) attempts to revive the Spirit of the Second World War and to set up its own patriotic measure against that long drawn-out betrayal known in more polite circles as the post-war settlement. For in Conservative rhetoric the Second World War has been redeclared - not against Hitler this time, but against the kind of peace which followed it: if Spitfires and Lancasters are in the skies again, they now fly against 'socialism' and the 'overweening state' (1985, p.46).

In taking over the remains of Dalton's National Land Fund the National Heritage Memorial Fund, Wright points out, also transformed it. Dalton's memorial had been intended as a memorial, specifically, to those men who had died in World War Two. As far as the National Heritage Memorial Fund is concerned:

... all it invokes is a generalised and everyday sense of the way things used to be, and in this respect it stands as an early engagement with that anxious and vernacular sense of historical existence which Thatcher has deliberately gone on to make the ground of so many spuriously 'historical' gestures and pleas (Wright, 1985, p.46).

Two events in 1982, Wright argues, furthered Thatcher's cause. The first of these was the raising of the Mary Rose, Henry VIII's flagship, from the bed of the Solent estuary at Portsmouth on 11 October 1982. This, Wright argues, was an 'historical' event because it provided a sense of continuity with the past summed up in the words of the BBC 2 television announcer that this was "the first time we have seen this in 437 years", thus postulating the
existence of "an imaginary collective subject - a transhistorical national identity going by the name of 'we'" (1985, p. 163).

The raising of the Mary Rose was also, Wright argues, a redeclaration of World War Two in that the whole event became "articulated into the more mythical and redeclared present which the Second World War holds in contemporary British consciousness" (1985, p. 174). To this end he quotes the following passage from Ernie Bradford, a '"historian and writer'" (1985, p. 171) of books about ships and the sea, including one on the Mary Rose, The Story of the Mary Rose:

The whole operation so far had in some ways resembled the pattern for the British during World War Two: the first hard, lonely years with very limited resources and all the odds stacked against a small group of people: to be followed by evidence that their endurance was winning; and to be followed again by very great support as it was seen that they had proved their cause (Wright, 1985, p. 174).

Once again, Wright points out, most of this 'very great support' was to come from the United States of America, although this time in the form of donated funds.

It was coincidence that the raising of the Mary Rose took place in the same year that the Falklands crisis blew up. It was not, however, as Wright points out, a coincidence without meaning:

For just as it was 'we', subjects of a publicly sustained national culture, imagination and sense of identity, who were ready to receive the Mary Rose in its full contemporary significance, it was also 'we' who were drawn up with whatever incredulity or passion, into Thatcher's unlikely adventure in the South Atlantic. Their participation in this national culture - and the collective sense of identity which it holds in place - marks the ground held in common by the raising of the Mary Rose and the Falklands war (1985, p. 164).

Once again:

Just as the recovery of the Mary Rose was presented as giving 'us' something back - something which we hadn't seen for 437 years - the Falklands war proved that 'we' are still powerful, still capable of rallying to one flag with confidence and moral righteousness, still, above all, capable of action and
therefore no longer the 'waverers and fainthearts' of Thatcher's victorious Cheltenham speech (1985, p.165).

The experience of, and fascination with, remembered war thus serves both a patriotic and a pragmatic purpose. It serves, Wright argues, to bring a sense of meaning to the constrained, empty and routinised experience of contemporary everyday life:

Abject and manipulative as it undoubtedly is, the public glorification of war can express the real counterpoint which the experience of war has provided to the routinised, constrained and empty experience of much modern everyday life (1985, p.23).

The sense of purpose provided by war, Wright argues, makes it seem, in a limited respect, more meaningful than everyday life. It also has a cathartic, purifying effect. On this he cites Stephen Graham on the mass carnage of World War One:

In England and Scotland also, it is noticeable that the war has given us a truer perspective and cleared away the Lilliputian obstructions of modern life. We see Shakespeare great and wonderful again, and our mockers of Shakespeare shrink to figures like those men made of matches that used to appear on Bryant and May's match-boxes (Wright, 1985, p.24).

One is reminded here of Nairn's point that solemn moments in Anglo-Britain tend to be given Shakespearean vestment as their "badge of national continuity" (1988, p.125).

Thus this fascination with remembered war ultimately strengthens particularistic sentiments and integrates them around the symbol of the 'nation'. It provides a sense of unity against external threats by allowing 'us' to participate in these ceremonies of remembrance and recollection. By doing so it further reinforces this sense of unity and belonging.

Thatcher plays on these particularistic sentiments, integrated around the symbol of the 'nation' and reworks them to her own ends. She redeclares World War Two as "a struggle against 'socialism'," exposing treacherous "'moles' in high places" (Wright, 1985, p.180), such as Anthony Blunt, who represent the
socialist 'enemy within', as she does so. Actual memories of World War Two are thus transformed into a national myth which is so strong that World War Two is declared all over again. We should think twice, therefore, Wright argues, before we dismiss this 'quickening' effect of war as a mere Neo-Conservative nationalist invention because "the Second World War may well have been redeclared against a new enemy by Margaret Thatcher, but this is only possible because there is something there to redeclare" (1985, p.24).

7.4 The Nation

These three interrelated themes of the golden age/rural idyll; the search for the unique; and the fascination of remembered war work together to facilitate a political conscription of the past. They converge around the symbol of the nation which is "the modern integration par excellence" (Wright, 1985, p.142). To this end "'the nation' has become a key figure in British politics, one that must be understood and carefully negotiated if we are to move beyond the passive experience of deadlock to an active public engagement with the issues determining our situation" (1985, p.141).

Wright suggests that this preoccupation with the 'nation' is indicative of the present crisis within Britain, in which traditions and customs are being destroyed by the process of social development. At the same time that traditions and customs are being destroyed in the name of 'progress', an ever deepening source of cultural meaning is sought with which this changing society can legitimate itself. In this situation "tradition appears as an artifice, articulated not in particular or essential connection to people's experience, but at the generalised and diffuse level of an overriding 'national' identity" (1985, pp.141-142).

Thus the 'nation' is not so much a historical, geographical or political entity in that "the 'nation' of this concern therefore
has no easy relation to the existence of the nation-state. Rather, it is instead more of "a structuring of consciousness, a publicly instituted sense of identity which finds its support in a variety of experiences, and which is capable of colouring and making sense of others" (1985, p. 142).

One of the most fundamental elements of this structuring of consciousness is, he argues, "a historically produced sense of the past which acts as a ground for a proliferation of other definitions of what is normal, appropriate or possible" (1985, p. 142).

Thus while everyday life is characterised by "a shared romantic orientation" which takes the form of "an anxious readiness to receive the past," closer historical attention "will also reveal that very different versions and appropriations of the past will continue to emerge from different classes and groups" (1985, p. 25).

Wright discusses this possibility of alternative definitions of the past and alternative/oppositional senses of history in relation to the British labour movement as a whole. He takes, as an example of the existence within British everyday life of alternative and oppositional versions of the past competing within "a shared romantic orientation" (1985, p. 25), the outrage Michael Foot, as Leader of the Labour Party, provoked at the Cenotaph on Remembrance Day 1981. On this occasion Foot was attacked by the media for representing "a recalcitrant and perhaps even oppositional sense of history." In view of the incident at the Cenotaph, Wright argues that we have to ask the question "what is this national past, and how does it bear on the critical expressions of history which come from within the labour movement?" (1985, p. 142).

In order to begin to understand this process, Wright argues, we have to regard the national past as a public philosophy of history, made up of a number of "interpretative representations of
history and the concrete presence of the National Heritage" (1985, p.146).

7.5 The National Past and Public Philosophies of History: The Past as Interpretation and the Past as Presence

The national past as a public philosophy of history, Wright argues, postulates the existence of a collective subject "'the nation' as the place and state in which 'we' live." In this sense, he argues:

... the national past can be thought of as a controlling attribute of citizenship: something that at a generalised level enables citizens (and in Britain, of course, there are legally only subjects of the Crown) to find a unity (as contemporary racism shows all too clearly, out-groups are produced in this process) between themselves and to override unresolved socio-political contradictions and differences. While its definition is certainly not genuinely open to all, the nation nevertheless occupies the public stage as 'ours', not just the possession of a few (1985, p.146).

The overriding 'national' perspective of the national past is, however, not a homogeneous one. Instead it resembles a matrix which contains "both interpretative representations of history and the concrete presence of the National Heritage" (1985, p.146).

With regards to the first point, the past as 'interpretative representations of history', Wright points out that nineteenth-century historiography gave the national past a legitimising capacity by providing a basis for the systematic study of national institutions. The teaching of school history is important in this respect, for although people may not remember much of their school history, certain models, stories, and what Heller calls 'general sketches', remain and inform everyday thinking. This, Wright argues, is the case because these models, stories and 'general sketches' are exercised again and again by politicians and the media seeking to make public sense of current events. He takes as an example of this this process at work Margaret Thatcher's use of Churchillian oratory during the Falklands Crisis. Thus the educational system, the press, T.V.,
historical fiction, advertising, the conventions of political rhetoric and the culture of national tourism, he argues, are all agencies of public meaning. They work alongside, and in close relation to, living memory and Heller's 'sense of historical existence', in the formation of the national past.

Apart from this sense of the past as interpretation, there has been in recent decades, Wright argues, an increasing stress on the past as something which is actually present, symbolised by "the concrete presence of the National Heritage" (1985, p.146). The physical presence of the National Heritage is represented by museums, stately homes, ancient monuments, etc. (see Hewison, 1987) and is re-enacted in displays of pageantry and pomp, such as royal weddings, and Remembrance Day. Nowadays, Wright argues, the National Heritage is also organised in relation to traditional working class, culture, industry, local forms of conviviality and the countryside which, he stresses, is increasingly projected as an image of nationhood and the family. In a paper he wrote with Michael Bommes (1982), Wright refers to these organisations of National Heritage at the small-scale, local level as 'micro heritages'. The importance of this theme will be developed in the next two chapters.

Within the overriding perspective of the national past the two parts of the matrix are dovetailed:

As a public presence, therefore, the 'national past' tends to institute as fact its thematic generalisation of history, and it presents this interpretative work in terms of what at the same time it stresses as the National Heritage. This dovetailing of these two aspects mean that an urgently preservational emphasis characteristic of the National Heritage can slide over to provide cover and substantiation for the interpretative account forming the other part of the 'national past'. This dovetailing is evident at a structural level between the two main foci of television history, where a 'documentary' treatment of the sites and objects of National Heritage tends to corroborate, and in some cases is deliberately used to authenticate fictional dramatisations of the past (1985, p.145).
The national past as a public philosophy of history, Wright argues, also establishes several distinct ways of conceiving of the present. These do not work to secure and stabilise a national account or representation of the past, but rather to monopolise a legitimising, but abstract, sense of 'pastness' around present social and political events or issues. He differentiates three such alignments, each of which has made its entry into the past through bourgeois culture.

The first of these alignments is what Wright calls "the complacent bourgeois alignment" (1985, p.147). Such an alignment makes it possible to think of historical development as complete, as a process which finds its accomplishment in the present. Historical development is conceived of as a cumulative process which has delivered the nation into the present as its manifest accomplishment. It is celebratory and complacent - 'we' are the achievement of history. The past is, quite simply, our 'heritage', and as such is something to be venerated in the sense of being displayed, exhibited, visited and written-up.

The darker side of this ideology is "the anxious aristocrat alignment" (1985, p.148). This is coloured by the idea that the present might actually be 'over'. It is organised around a sense of betrayal in which citizens are always on the brink of barbarism. Historical development is entropic and, once again, "'we', like the monks of Lindisfarne during the Dark Ages are the trustees or custodians of the past" (1985, p.148).

The third way of conceiving of the past in relation to the present is what Wright describes as "the anti-traditionalist technicist alignment." This is when the past continues to exist in the present but does so in discontinuity with modern social reality. 'Disjunction' is the key word here. The past still exists in the present, but is conceived of as something which is 'other'. It is regarded "not as something which has been betrayed but as a true swap of backward traditionality with which the leaders of modern rationality want nothing to do" (1985, p.150). This is the type
of alignment common amongst monetarist Tories, in which the past becomes associated with such things as the 'clutter' of trade unions. Such things must be tidied away.

The three ways of conceiving of the past, along with its mobilisation around current social and political events should not, Wright argues, be seen in isolation from one another, for in fact they often combine. He points to the way, for example, the complacent bourgeois alignment and the anxious aristocrat alignment converge around the meaning of the word 'preservation'. The conscious bourgeois alignment venerates both the preservation of the physical and the traditional National Heritage. The anxious aristocrat alignment's main concern is the preservation of traditional social relationships:

Preservation thus comes to its ambivalent and complex meaning: it applies to the maintenance of old buildings and the like, but at the same time it can be implicit and in a displaced way about preserving those social relations which are taken for granted and legitimised by the public rendition of history as the national past (1985, p.149).

The national past is thus a public philosophy of history, made up of various ways of conceiving of the past, which at times combine and coalesce with one another. Having established this, we can now return to the scene at the Cenotaph on Remembrance Day 1981.

7.6 The Labour Movement & the 'National Past'

All three alignments, the complacent bourgeois alignment, the anxious aristocrat alignment and the anti-traditionalist technicist alignment, can be present, Wright argues, on the same occasion and at the same time. This was the case in the public response to Remembrance Day 1981, when Michael Foot turned up at the Cenotaph wearing a green, untailored garment which was either "a dufflecoat with its early CND connotations, or a donkey jacket, resonant of sullen proletarianism" which was "distinctly out of place on the back of the Leader of the Labour Party during the

Firstly, reverence for the tradition and spectacle of Remembrance Day itself represents the complacent bourgeois alignment. The fears of the anxious aristocrat, of barbarism and betrayal finds expression in the donkey-jacketed/duffle-coated figure of Michael Foot laying his wreath "'with all the reverend dignity of a tramp bending down to inspect a cigarette end'" (The 'Daily Telegraph, 9/11/1982; Wright, 1985, p.135). It was the anti-traditionalist technicist alignment that led Walter Johnson, the Labour M.P. for Derby, to accuse Foot of looking like an out-of-work-navvy on the way to a demo. This sense of the past which Foot represented, Johnson implied, was discontinuous with modern social reality and most certainly out of touch with working class ideals and values.

The problem that the British labour movement faces, Wright argues, is that of negotiating the loaded interpretations of the past which are instituted within the public field of meaning. There are also difficulties because of the apparently unequivocal presence of the 'national past'. To cope with this Wright introduces a fourth past-present alignment - what he calls "the marching proletariat alignment" (1985, p.153).

This alignment sees historical development as a slow but continuous process of struggle through which the working class 'wins' the present. It is the sort of alignment present in the 'Forward March of Labour' type ideology. Such an alignment has faced many difficulties in recent years when it has become associated with the grey, bureaucratic imagery of the Welfare State in contrast to the grander images of War and Nation so successfully appropriated by the Tories.

Recent Labour governments have, Wright argues, been disappointing, but this has not been the only problem facing socialist claims to the 'national past' and historical development. For, as Wright
argues, there is a problem here of a fairly formal kind:

Because socialism does not conceive of historical development as a process which is in any full sense achieved or accomplished in the present as we know it, it cannot work up an easy public presence for its sense of history (1985, pp.153-154).

Labour's relation to the past then is still one of critical challenge. Coupled with this it still exists as an idea and one which is increasingly difficult to define in traditional class terms. As such it cannot match Conservative claims to the 'national past' and tradition.

The British labour movement, Wright argues, has tended to respond to these difficulties "in ways that appear only to reinforce the accusations which are made against it." It has tended to do two things. Firstly, it has attempted to claim for itself the institutions, ceremonies and customs, "which exist in such apparently easy allegiance to the dominant interests" (1985, p.155). Secondly, it has tended to:

... fall back onto the historical style - the gestures and vocabulary - of a time when solidarity and progress did seem intact, a time when the presence of socialism seemed positive and growing, and when the road did indeed seem to stretch out in front of the marchers (1985, pp.155-156).

Thus words like 'solidarity' and 'fraternity', and "hackneyed images like the Forward March of Labour are trotted out in comfortable accordance with historical memory" (1985, p.156).

As an example of the first tendency, Wright takes Michael Foot's outrage at the appearance of Peter Tatchell as Labour candidate in the once rotten borough of Bermondsey. Ostensibly, Wright argues:

... this argument concerned Tatchell's supposed allegiance to 'extra-Parliamentary' activity. It was also significant, however, for what it revealed about Foot's relation to the institutions of Parliament. In true constitutionalist style, Foot laid claim to Parliament as the institution through which democracy had been accomplished and through which further political change should be secured. He identified the Labour

The problem, however, "is that it is not possible just to 'lay claim' to national institutions such as Parliament unless one is prepared to accept on the recoil their overwhelmingly powerful definition of one's own cause" (1985, p.155).

This is because the institutions of Parliament are "indubitably present" which makes it difficult to identify Parliament with the struggle for democracy. But more than this "their physical presence in Westminster is encrusted with a powerful national symbolism which establishes them as fetish-objects rather than institutions of political change" (1985, p.155).

This makes for a situation in which the existence of the House of Commons "is claimed as witnessing the achieved presence of the labour movement." The logical extension of this argument is that "the struggle for democracy is over - a thing of the past, perhaps even part of the national heritage." The reality, as Wright points out, "of course, is different" (1985, p.155).

By way of a final warning to those in the labour movement who try to claim the National Heritage for themselves, Wright then goes on to argue:

... it is not possible to treat national traditions and institutions as if they were merely contested items in a claim over inheritance. They have no such singularity and come with whole philosophies of history attached (1985, p.155).

Wright's criticism is not just reserved for that tendency present within the labour movement to play the Tories at their own game. He is equally critical of the second tendency amongst the left; the tendency towards retrospective, nostalgic solidarity. Wright takes as an example of this tendency the People's March for Jobs in 1981 and 1983, and Tony Benn's attempt in 1984 to "dust off the old Chartist demand for an annual Parliament and beam it into
the nineteen eighties" (1985, p.156). This, he argues:

... is an archaic suggestion which can offer little real solution to the problems either of Parliament or of democracy in a world which (according to rumours which should certainly be investigated) has changed somewhat in the last hundred and fifty years (1985, p.156).

While Wright is critical of the two stances the British labour movement currently adopts vis-a-vis the national past he is not entirely pessimistic:

There need be no apologising for the fact that the labour movement's is a historical consciousness, or that its utopianism is counterfactual. But while some of these old values certainly remain vital, they need to be defined in relation to the present, rather than just inherited in the often archaic forms of their past expression (1985, p.156).

7.7 The Re-enchantment of Everyday Life

Wright, therefore, sees the modern past acting acts as a vehicle through which "genuine tensions and aspirations of everyday life find expression." To this end the image of the nation "works by raising a dislocated and threatened - but none the less locally experienced everyday life up into contact with what it vaunts as its own Absolute Spirit." The result is that "the rags and tatters of everyday life take on the lustre of the idealised nation when they are touched by its symbolism" (1985, p.24). Modernity brought about the disenchantment of everyday life. The 'nation' works for its re-enchantment.

This re-enchantment of everyday life is achieved via the extensive negotiation which takes place "between the austere symbolism of the idealised nation and everyday life." To provide meaning and "to involve people in a common sense of identity" the nation, while being characterised by the idealised and austere symbolism of the public world, also has to work at the level of everyday life. "Thus, for example, the attentions of everyday life have facilitated the transformation of Crown and Monarchy into the Royal Family" (1985, p.25).
Wright, as we have seen, mentions the Monarchy briefly and in passing. His statement that "the attentions of everyday life have facilitated the transformation of Crown and Monarchy into the Royal Family" (1985, p.25) is, in fact, an important point which it is worth developing further because, as Tom Nairn in The Enchanted Glass (1988) points out, the British Monarchy is the key to understanding British political culture, complete with all its paradoxes. Nairn's argument is worthy of further attention. At this point, therefore, I intend to make a digression away from Wright. It is a digression that should, ultimately, prove fruitful in deepening our understanding of the importance and the influence of the national past in contemporary Britain. It is also a digression which exposes some of the weaknesses and limitations of Wright's arguments.

Nairn argues that the British Monarchy is important at three different but related levels. Firstly, the British Monarchy is at the very centre of what Nairn calls 'Ukanian' everyday life. 'Ukania' is Nairn's term for the Geist of the United Kingdom, the 'informing spirit' which is essentially "'our way of doing things'"; what he refers to as "the poetry of national existence" compared to the foreign, the abstract and the other extreme, "the prose (or the plain clothes) of modernity" (1988, p.94). There are many similarities here with Heller, with Nairn pointing out that 'ordinary' Ukanian everyday life is traditionally rich with family symbols, some of which have been undermined by Thatcher's process of what Stuart Hall has called "regressive modernisation" (cited in Nairn, 1988, p.96). The most important of these familial symbols, and one which Thatcher has consistently sought to undermine is the Monarchy, which forms an "interface between two worlds, the mundane one and some vaster national-spiritual sphere" (Nairn, 1988, p.27).

Firstly, Nairn argues, the Monarchy is so important because it is at one and the same time at the heart of everyday life and also
outside of it. At the level of popular perception the Royals are regarded as being outside those eternally oppositional and antagonistic categories of 'us' and 'them'. By virtue of this position, the Monarchy binds the State together. It is not, however, confined to the level of the State for it 'informs, entertains and deeply influences civil society' (1988, p.89) via "a dialectic of the normal and the (utterly) extraordinary" (1988, p.27).

Secondly, because of its position at the heart of everyday life the Ukranian Monarchy is in essence, Nairn argues, "a heteronomous form of nationalism" (1988, p.127) although it strives to define itself as precisely above nationalism and nationalistic sentiments.

Nairn thus regards the Royal Family as expressing the structures of Anglo-British nationalism (he equates 'Ukrania' with Anglo-Britain). Within the British Isles there is a sharp divide between the 'Ukranians' and the 'fringe-folk'. This was particularly highlighted, he argues, by George IV's Royal Visit to Scotland in 1822 and, more recently, by the Investiture of the Prince of Wales at Caernarvon in 1969. These two events have reminded us that Britons do not live in a 'nation-state' but in a multi-national grouping of "four main tribes and some weird hangers-on like the Falklands and the Isle of Man" (1988, p.232).

The problem is that one of the four main tribes, England, has consistently failed to make a distinction between nation and state and has employed the all-British apparatus chiefly in its own interest. To this end, he argues, it has used the Crown Mystique, for example, at Caernarvon, to urge the fringe folk "to look upwards and outwards: towards Grandeur, and away from pettifogging or parochial issue" (1988, p.238).

Thirdly, and related to this, Nairn regards the "recreation and popularisation of Monarchy" as Britain's way of coming to terms with modernity. Thus the British Monarchy is important for British
nationalism and British national identity because Britain is not an ethnic or republican state-formation founded on popular sovereignty, but an old state-nation dating back before the formation of today's concepts of nation-state politics. In coming to terms with modernity, Britain has had to adapt and assume "some of the contours of the modern nation-state world, developing a curious composite simulacrum of nationality in order to do so." This has been achieved via the "recreation and popularisation of Monarchy", which was "a patrician oligarchy's unwitting (yet for long quite functional) tribute to the plebian nature of modernity." It was the only effective way of "preserving the informal authority of an elite inside the more formal and bureaucratic constraints of a quasi-industrial society" (1988, p.10). Thus Nairn argues, Britain's coming to terms with modernity has taken the form of a combination of manipulation from above and a lack of opposition from below with the latter being the most important.

An interesting angle on the debate is presented by Steve Bruce and Steven Yearley. Bruce and Yearley point out that an obsession with Monarchy in the sense of recreating and constructing it into a national myth is no new thing. In Scotland, they argue, it is an obsession that goes back to at least the twelfth century:

In Scotland's centuries-long struggle with England both sides engaged in military offence and in bargaining and hostage-taking. Both sides also devoted resources to legitimating their claims. For the Scots this took the form of an ideological defence of their right to exist as an independent monarchy. From at least the twelfth century historians were busy collecting and interpreting evidence for the traditional independence and integrity of the Scottish monarchy. They compiled detailed genealogies and chronicles listing the names, dates and deeds of their kings (and they were all kings except for Mary who was not yet on the scene). The result of these historical labours was a purported demonstration that the Scottish monarchy was established well before the birth of Christ and a shifting back of the actual date of foundation by about 800 years. Thus although Scotland was smaller than England it could claim an ancient and honourable history as an independent kingdom and not some vassal state (Bruce & Yearley, 1988, p.3).
Nairn's and Bruce and Yearley's arguments are important because they both directly and indirectly highlight the weaknesses and limitations of Wright's arguments. The weakness of Wright's argument is not so much the fact that he mentions the monarchy only in passing, but that he glosses over the importance of nationalism. He refers at one point to "the continuing tensions between the 'nations' of Britain" (1985, p.25), but dismisses this as essentially an Irish problem. He does not develop the point further. In addition, Wright at times falls into the Anglo-British trap of talking about 'Britain' when he really means England. These weaknesses are manifested and multiplied when he attempts to distinguish between 'history' and 'the past'. It is to this distinction that we must now turn.

7.9 History & the Past

Wright argues that the past does not stand 'behind' the present. Instead it exists as "an accomplished presence in public understanding" (1985, p.142). As such it cannot simply be dismissed as 'illusion' or 'ideology' for "it is an established public institution with all the historical materiality which that word implies" (1982, pp.142-143). It is written into and exists in present social reality as itself - as History, National Heritage and Tradition. Thus any attempt to develop and assert a critical historical consciousness finds itself in conflict, or at least negotiation, with the established public understanding of the 'past'.

Wright argues that it is important to differentiate between the 'past' and 'history'. He points out that the belief that 'history' is geared to the establishing of a 'higher' order of truth which cuts through the ideological mists of the past is one shared by historians of all political persuasions. In this search for a higher order of truth 'history' thus becomes venerated and 'the past' derrigated. Wright does not dispute the ambition of 'history' to achieve a higher order of truth but at the same time argues that the past should not be cast aside as mere ideology and
illusion, for while the past is an area of publicly-installed illusion and ideology it is also the domain of everyday historical consciousness:

... of stories, memory and vernacular interpretations which differ (sometimes in fully conscious opposition) from that superior, 'History' which, while it has always spoken with easily assumed authority, is distinguished not just by its laurels but also by the difficulty it experiences in achieving its gloriously neutral 'truth' (1985, p.143).

Wright suggests that it is because the past is so firmly entrenched in everyday historical consciousness that it has been able to deflect the blows of academically sanctioned 'History'. At the same time, however, the fact that there is this disjuncture between history and the past, with the past retaining its independence at the level of everyday historical consciousness, means that it exists as a source of legitimation and can be 'conscripted' for political ends. This is what Margaret Thatcher and her Government have attempted to do. It is here that we have to go beyond Wright because, while Thatcher has to a considerable extent succeeded in 'capturing' the English past in order to legitimate her governmental mission, her efforts have not been quite so successful in Scotland.

The reason Thatcher has not achieved the same measure of success north of the border has to do, it seems, with a fundamental difference between Scottish and English historical consciousness. Here we have to go back to the second lesson of my initiation process and Ascherson's point about Scottish history having many perspectives. English historians have been able to take hold of the assumption that "'our' (in quotes) history can only have one focal point, one perspective" (1988, p.153) and firmly establish it as everyday knowledge. This in turn makes for a differing relationship between 'history' and 'the past' in England and Scotland. In England the relationship between the two is much closer, while in Scotland there is more of a disjuncture. This gives the English past a 'closed' quality while the Scottish past remains relatively 'open'.
The close relationship that exists in England between 'history' and 'the past' has allowed English historians to capture 'the past' to a much greater degree and give it historical vestment. The result is that in England the past is all sewn-up and resembles a professionally-tailored and finished garment. In Scotland, however, the past has not been 'captured' by professional tailors to the same extent. There is thus a very strong sense of the past being 'unfinished'; of battles still to be fought and won.

Walter Scott, Ascherson argues, tried to play the 'Druid' and sew-up the Scottish past, organising the transformation (and corresponding deterioration) of history into heritage as he did so. Scott did not succeed, but he cannot be dismissed merely as a failed Druid. Far from it. The would-be Wizard of the North was described (along with James Fenimore Cooper), by Heller's mentor, Georg Lukacs, as the first literary expression of world historical consciousness. This description, Heller argues, is absolutely correct. It is a view shared by Marinell Ash although she does not use the Lukacsian terminology:

The romantic revolution in historical writing was born of Sir Walter Scott and Scotland. The man and the place combined a blend of past and present, uncertainties and assumptions, physical realities and philosophical ideals.... Scott's historical legacy was both personally unique and yet representative of the changing experience of his country, compounded as it was of the tensions and contradictions of a traditional Scotland merging into a great world empire (1980, p.13).

Thus while in England the past has to a considerable extent been captured and conscripted by the status quo, in Scotland it has escaped this fate. Scott had a good try but ultimately he failed. This has nothing to do with the Scots as a people being more radical. It is in fact more like their voting Labour in the General Election of 1987; a curious mixture of pragmatism and national pride, a consciousness of their role in history and in the process of history making which is deeply rooted in everyday life.
Neal Ascherson offered a timely warning, when in his 1986 lecture to the annual conference of the Scottish National Party, he argued that "national pride grown in a pot of fraud is just a weed" (1988, p.62). He quotes the opening of the Irish Declaration of Independence which starts with the words: "In the Name of God and of the dead generations..." and warns:

Do not let the dead bind the living, for all the love and respect you have for them. That has been an Irish problem, and it remains the sickness of the English, so lost in contemplation of 'heritage' and pageant spectacle that they have no sight of their own national condition (Ascherson, 1988, p.62).

In recent years Scottish history has again been close to national pride, as the growth of a Scottish Borders' 'heritage industry' testifies. To what extent is this Scottish Borders' heritage industry guilty of cultivating weeds? This will be the subject of Part IV.
PART IV

Explanatory Remarks

In the introduction to Part III I mentioned how a Scottish Borders' 'heritage industry' started to develop on a considerable scale in the late 1970s, following the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974. One of the major forms this took was Border lairds such as the Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe opening their stately/ancestral homes to the public during the summer months upon payment of an entry fee. Perhaps this was, in part, an attempt to ease the lairds' financial situation, a way of raising the huge amounts of cash necessary for the maintenance of a stately pile. I suggested, however, that there was another logic to these lairds' activities, a logic which is other than purely financial.

In Part II I talked about how the power of the Border landowners has changed over time. I argued that initially, the basis of the lairds' power was military strength. Over time the use of force became rationalised, bureaucratised, and centralised, and eventually ceased to be the basis of their power. The Agricultural Revolution in the eighteenth century was the perfect opportunity for the lairds to turn military power into economic power by "beating their swords into ploughshares" (Fergusson, 1949, p.18). From this firm foothold the lairds concentrated on developing a political basis to this power which they managed to sustain, in terms of parliamentary politics until 1950, and at the level of local politics, right up until 1974. I suggested, in Part II, that by opening their stately homes to the public, along with easing their financial situation, the Border lairds were really securing new ways of making their presence felt. The growth of a privately owned and commercially-run 'heritage industry' in the Scottish Borders, therefore, represents a shift in the power of the Border lairds from the realm of politics to that of ideology.
Accusations of whistling in the dark are, at this point, not out of order. After all, as anyone with a little knowledge of the Borders and its history could tell me, Neidpath Castle, a mile west of Peebles, on the banks of the Tweed, has been open to the public, daily, during the summer season, "from Maundy Thursday until the Second Sunday in October" (Neidpath Castle pamphlet) since 1810. In fact one could have visited this castle before the great Parliamentary Reform Act of 1833, let alone before the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974. Twenty three years later, the year after his death, Sir Walter Scott's Abbotsford was opened to the public. In its first year of opening it admitted 1,500 visitors, including twenty from the United States! More recently, but still just over twenty years before the last reorganisation of Scottish local government, the punters started to be admitted to Scotland's oldest inhabited house, the famous House of Traquair. There is thus, it seems, plenty of evidence to back up the accusations.

I do not dispute the accusation that the opening of castles and ancestral homes in the Scottish Borders is no new thing. It was, after all, before I could even spell the word 'laird', that I was taken to Abbotsford and shown Neidpath Castle. My defence, however, for arguing that a Scottish Borders' 'heritage industry' took off in the mid 1970s rests on the argument that there is in fact a whole world of difference between what Neidpath Castle, Abbotsford, and Traquair House on the one hand, and Bowhill, Drumlanrig, and Floors Castle on the other, represent. The differences are most easily understood in terms of the crucial distinction between 'history' and 'heritage' which I have referred to in previous chapters and intend to develop more fully in Chapters Eight and Nine.

Neidpath Castle is an ancient monument rather than a stately home, Abbotsford, although not ancient, is a monument to Scottish history and Traquair House is a celebration of a Scottish past which is not yet over. In light of the history/heritage distinction, they represent 'history'. The highly commercial
enterprises such as Bowhill, Drumlanrig and Floors Castle, meanwhile, represent the 'heritage' side of the equation.

Chapters Eight and Nine represent an attempt to explore and explode the history/heritage distinction further. I have already made the point that in England 'history' has to a large extent deteriorated into 'heritage', with all its corresponding commercial, political and ideological implications. I have somewhat tentatively suggested that in Scotland this has not been the case because of a fundamental difference in English and Scottish historical consciousness. I argued that English historians have been able to take hold of the assumption that "'our' (in quotes) history can only have one focal point, one perspective" (Ascherson, 1988, p.153), and firmly establish it as everyday knowledge. It is this assumption and its embodiment in everyday life which makes for a differing relationship between 'history' and 'the past' in England and Scotland. In England the relationship between 'history' and 'the past' is a close one, while in Scotland there is more of a disjunction. The result is that the English past has a 'closed' quality while the Scottish past remains relatively 'open'.

Sir Walter Scott tried to sew-up the Scottish past because "Scottish history was only safe for the historian or novelist to approach and touch when it was certain that the beast's limbs, the Cameronian tradition, for example had finally lost the power of movement" (Ascherson, 1988, p.64). The corollary of such an attempt, although one Scott had not intended, was the deterioration of history into heritage. Scott's attempt and its corollary both failed. The new breed of entrepreneurial Border lairds, the 'working' dukes, such as Roxburghe and Buccleuch, have attempted to take over where Scott left off; to slay the beast once and for all. Either the Scottish past has nine lives or they have not succeeded. The result is that here, in Scotland, the equation is more balanced and the past remains more open.
In Chapter Eight I discuss the problems of defining 'heritage'. I point out that 'heritage', although a word which is difficult to define, is a word which, since 1945, has gained parliamentary approval. To this end three pieces of government legislation have been passed which have facilitated the growth of a 'heritage industry', not just in the Scottish Borders but throughout the British Isles. While purportedly being concerned with the British National Heritage, the 'geist' of the heritage legislation is essentially Anglo-British heritage. In view of this it is important to look at these three pieces of legislation.

In addition to looking at the various pieces of 'heritage' legislation that have been passed since World War Two, I look at the agencies involved in the protection of heritage and through which this heritage legislation is implemented. I spend a considerable amount of time looking at the institutions of the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland, partly because these are the two most important voluntary bodies involved in heritage issues and also because they illustrate two different definitions of 'the nation' at work in the same geographical space.

In Chapter Nine the subject of my analysis is the privately-owned, commercially-run, stately-home 'industry' which exists in the Scottish Borders, alongside and in addition to, both State and voluntary heritage/conservation bodies. I make four major points. The first of these is that the Border stately-home industry represents an attempt by Border lairds to make their presence felt in the everyday life of the Borders, following the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974 which saw the end of their direct involvement in local politics. Secondly, that the privately-owned and commercially-run Border stately-home industry represents an attempt by Border lairds to exercise traditional authority in a world dominated by legal/rational authority. My third point is that a useful way of looking at these issues is provided by Michael Bommes and Patrick Wright's concept of 'micro heritage', but that this concept has to be modified if it is to...
work for Scotland. My fourth and final point concerns the crucial, but problematic, distinction between 'history' and 'heritage'; which in many ways is the key issue of this thesis.
CHAPTER EIGHT

The Heritage Industry

8.1 The Problems of Defining 'Heritage'

Although Sir Walter Scott failed to sew-up the Scottish past he caused a major revolution in the writing of history. Along with James Fenimore Cooper, Scott was described by Lukacs as the first literary expression of world historical consciousness. The legacy of Scott's revolution was that it gave birth to a whole new set of ideas about how we think about the past which in turn produced the distinction between 'history' and 'heritage'. For until Scott's historical revolution the past was considered to be much like the present. Afterwards it came to be conceived, to quote David Lowenthal, as a "foreign country":

This new past gradually came to be cherished as a heritage that validated and exalted the present. And the new role heightened concern to save relics and restore monuments as emblems of communal identity, continuity and aspiration (1985, p.xvi).

Lowenthal's idea of the past as a foreign country is useful up to a point. His argument is, however, more useful if one turns it on its head. For what seems to have happened in recent years is not so much that the past is conceived of as a heritage which validates and legitimates the present, but that the present validates and exalts images of the past which cluster around the word 'heritage'. As Robert Hewison in The Heritage Industry argues, "as the past begins to loom above the present and darken the paths to the future, one word in particular suggests an image around which ideas of the past cluster: the heritage" (1987, p.31).

Great problems are experienced when one attempts to define the word 'heritage' for it appears to be a word without definition.
Hewison argues that the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983 reinforce this indefinable quality of the National Heritage. To this end he quotes a passage from Patrick Cormack, the Conservative M.P. for Southwest Staffordshire's Heritage in Danger:

When I am asked to define our heritage I do not think in dictionary terms, but instead reflect on certain sights and sounds. I think of a morning mist on the Tweed at Dryburgh where the magic of Turner and the romance of Scott both come fleetingly to life; of a celebration of the Eucharist in a quiet Norfolk Church with the mediaeval glass filtering the colours, and the early noise of harvesting coming through the open door; or of standing at any time before the Wilton Diptych. Each scene recalls aspects of an indivisible heritage, and is part of the fabric and expression of our civilisation (Cormack, 1976, p.14).

Patrick Wright in On Living in an Old Country also cites this same passage by Cormack and points out that Cormack's style with its interpretative stress on sensory experience, reliance upon vague and evocative gestures and deep incommunicable meanings, is part of "a well established and broadly Conservative tradition" (1985, p.82). Other examples of this tradition can, he argues, be found in the writings of Stanley Baldwin, G.K. Chesterton, H.A.L. Fisher and even Ramsay MacDonald (who of course wrote the 'Preface' to Tom Johnston's Our Scots Noble Families). Wright argues that common to all such writings is the theme of the celebration of an 'indivisible heritage' "as a kind of sacrament encountered only in fleeting if well remembered experiences which go without saying to exactly the extent they are taken for granted by initiates, by true members of the ancestral nation" (1985, p.83). Here Wright identifies a movement, if not into racism then at least into ethnocentrism; a movement which is intensified by the experience of war. He points to a similarity with war-time France:

There is certainly some similarity between this England and the incommunicable France which Sartre traced out in his investigation of war-time anti-Semitism. Here is another deep nation founded on an imagined participation immemorial rather than any mere legality, and demonisation or exclusion can indeed be as intrinsic to Deep England as it was to Sartre's France (1985, p.83).
It seems as if the power and persuasiveness of the National Heritage is contingent, therefore, upon this very vagueness and indefinability which lends itself easily to racism and ethnocentrism.

The latter is an important point. It is important because the ethnocentrism into which the National Heritage as a public structuring of consciousness slips so easily, is English or Anglo-British ethnocentrism. It is not, however, just the National Heritage legislation which is ethnocentric and exclusive, for the authors of the two most important works about heritage and heritage-related issues, Patrick Wright and Robert Hewison, both fall into the trap themselves. The definition of 'the nation' with which Wright and Hewison operate is the Ukania-Britain of the National Trust.

'Heritage' then is a word which, by its own self-definition, cannot be defined. It is, however, a word which as the movement into racism/ethnocentrism illustrates, is ideologically-loaded. It is also a word which, Hewison points out, has in recent years fast gained parliamentary approval. This process began with the establishing of the National Land Fund in 1946 and was consolidated by the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983. These three pieces of government legislation have between them helped facilitate the growth of a 'heritage industry', not just in the Scottish Borders, but throughout the British Isles. They have been responsible for giving 'heritage' its elevated status in Anglo-British national consciousness and mythology. While purportedly being concerned with British National Heritage, the 'geist' of this heritage legislation is Nairn's Anglo-British informing spirit. In view of this it is important to look at these three pieces of legislation in some detail.
8.2 The Legislation

(a) The National Land Fund

The National Land Fund was established in 1946 by Labour Chancellor Hugh Dalton. It was set up with £50 million which came into the Exchequer from the sale of surplus war materials. Dalton's original idea was for the fund to be a 'thanks-offering and war memorial' for those Britons who died for their ancestral nation during World War Two. Wright cites N. Hodgkinson writing on the 'Alice-in-Wonderland-World of the National Land Fund' in The Times, 22 April 1977. Here the Anglo-British geist is blatantly obvious: "'the beauty of England, the famous historical houses, the wonderful stretches of still unspoilt open country, surely it would be a fitting memorial that these might become part of the heritage of all of us'" (Wright, 1985, p.45). But, Wright argues, "while the words were undoubtedly fine the reality was rather less forthcoming" (1985, p.45). Not once in its lifetime was the National Land Fund ever used as an emergency or contingency fund to protect the heritage it claimed to represent. It seemed to exist in theory only, and in 1957 when Enoch Powell was a junior minister in the Tory government, he reduced it to £10 million, claiming that the Exchequer had in 1946 merely lent itself £50 million.

(b) The National Heritage Act (1980)

The National Heritage Act (1980) is the classic example that 'heritage' cannot simply be dismissed as right-wing rhetoric; for the legislative reform regarding the National Heritage Bill was planned under the Callaghan administration. When the Tories took over in 1979 they took hold of the basic legislation which had been planned under Labour, modified it slightly and presented it as the National Heritage Bill which became the National Heritage Act (1980). It is important to stress that the Bill had come forward with all-party support. Patrick Cormack is quoted by Wright as saying "it is vital for the preservation of our heritage
that it should never become a political football," while Labour's Andrew Faulds publicly praised Lady Birk and Lord Donaldson because they "took up cudgels" for the heritage (Wright, 1985, p.43).

The National Heritage Act (1980) is concerned with the preservation of 'the heritage' which it does not define, preferring it to define itself, as this extract from the first annual report of the National Heritage Memorial Fund for 1980-1981 makes clear:

We could no more define the national heritage than we could define, say, beauty or art. Clearly, certain works of art created by people born in this country were part of the national heritage - paintings by Turner and Constable, for instance, or sculptures by Henry Moore or Barbara Hepworth - as were buildings such as Chatsworth or Edinburgh Castle. But, beyond that, there was less assurance. So we decided to let the national heritage define itself. We awaited requests for assistance from those who believed they had a part of the national heritage worth saving.... The national heritage of this country is remarkably broad and rich. It is simultaneously a representation of the development of aesthetic expression and a testimony to the role played by the nation in world history. The national heritage also includes the natural riches of Britain - the great scenic areas, the fauna and flora - which could so easily be lost by thoughtless development. Its potential for enjoyment must be maintained, its educational value in attracting tourists to this country must be appreciated and developed, but this national heritage is constantly under threat (A. Jones, (1985), Britain's Heritage: The Creation of the National Heritage Memorial Fund, Weidenfield, pp.206-207, cited in Hewison, 1987, pp.136-137).

One of the aims of the National Heritage Act (1980) was to secure public access to the places it designated as places of historic value or national beauty; as long as the public that wanted access was of an acceptable sort. A convoy of hippies at Stonehenge in 1985 did not satisfy the acceptability criteria and was smartly moved on. The National Heritage Act (1980) also sought to ensure, Wright argues, that 'the heritage' is available for cultural consumption and that it is displayed as such.

These then were the aims and intentions of the National Heritage Act (1980). Patrick Wright regards this Act as basically a
three-fold measure. Firstly, he argues, it eases the means whereby property can be transferred to the State in lieu of Capital Transfer Tax and estate duty. Secondly, it provides indemnity to museums which might otherwise be unable to afford the cost of insuring objects loaned to other exhibitions. Thirdly, and most importantly, it established the National Heritage Memorial Fund.

(c) The National Heritage Memorial Fund

The National Heritage Memorial Fund is particularly important because it was grafted on to what remained of the National Land Fund by the National Heritage Act (1980), but reversed the intentions of the earlier legislation. In 1980 when the National Heritage Memorial Fund was established the National Land Fund stood at £16.6 million. The National Heritage Memorial Fund was established on the basis that it would take over this £16.6 million and that each subsequent year it would receive an additional income of £5.5 million. It was portrayed as an attempt to redress earlier breaches of promise regarding those who had fallen for the nation during World War Two. In this way, Wright argues, the National Heritage Memorial Fund:

... represents one of the Thatcher government's first (and perhaps less than fully conscious) attempts to revive the spirit of the Second World War and to set up its own patriotic measure against that long-drawn out betrayal known in more polite circles as the post-war settlement. For in Conservative rhetoric the Second World War has been redeclared - not against Hitler this time, but against the kind of peace which followed it: if Spitfires and Lancasters are in the skies again, they now fly against 'socialism' and the 'overweening state' (1985, p.46).

I have already, in Chapter Seven, outlined Wright's argument that the National Heritage Memorial Fund, by taking over the memorial function of Dalton's National Land Fund, also transformed it. His argument, however, is worth reiterating here because it shows how the Thatcher Government reversed the intentions of the original legislation while, at the same time, paying them lip service. The essence of Wright's argument is that, whereas Dalton's National
Land Fund had a specific hortatory intention - to honour the men who fell in World War Two:

There is nothing hortatory about the National Heritage Memorial Fund; all it indicates is a generalised and everyday sense of the way things used to be, and in this respect it stands as an early engagement with that anxious and vernacular sense of historical existence which Thatcher has deliberately gone on to make the ground of so many spuriously 'historical' gestures and pleas (1985, p.46).

Hewison makes a similar point. He argues that while the first annual report of the National Heritage Memorial Fund for 1980-1981 refuses to define the national heritage, it makes it clear that the national heritage is above all something which is under threat. The threats are vague but multiple - decay, decline, change, etc., and they are the same threats that are at the very heart of Thatcher's more overtly political rhetoric.

(d) The National Heritage Act (1983)

The National Heritage Act (1983) is important for two related reasons. Firstly, it established the body English Heritage which is similar to the National Trust in that it holds properties in its care, but with the important difference that it is funded by the government and sponsored by sponsored Gateway Food Markets. English Heritage is headed by Lord Montagu, author of the book How to Live in a Stately Home and Make Money, and is the living proof that it is possible to do so. English Heritage makes its money by putting on historical and military displays at the properties in its care, and these have proved so popular that six years after its inception English Heritage has a membership of over 45,000. Secondly, and more importantly, the very idea of creating a body called 'English Heritage' under a National Heritage Act illustrates very nicely the usurpation and equation of the term 'National Heritage' with English or Anglo-British heritage. In Scotland there is a state body, the Historic Buildings & Monuments Directorate of the Scottish Development Department, which is concerned with protecting and preserving Scotland's architectural and archaeological heritage, but it is not called 'Scottish
Heritage'. No attempt has been made even to include, let alone equate, Scottish heritage with the National Heritage.

In this section I have made two general points. Firstly, that today there is a consensus, bordering on an obsession, among individuals of all political persuasions, that old buildings, ancient monuments and landscapes should all be preserved, not so much because of architectural merit or worth but simply because they are old and, therefore, represent a continuity with the past. This obsession had its beginnings in the ideas which led to the establishing of the National Land Fund in 1946. It is further reinforced by, and reflected in, the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983. I have also made the further point that what is so commonly referred to as the 'National Heritage' is essentially the English or Anglo-British heritage. In Chapter Nine I develop these points further.

Before attempting to answer the question of 'whose heritage is it?' it is first of all necessary to spend some time looking at the agencies through which heritage legislation and heritage concerns are implemented. This is a particularly necessary exercise as the agencies and institutions, both state and voluntary, are different north and south of the Border. A comparative exercise such as this should, in theory, have been easy. In practice it has proved to be an extremely difficult task. This is because literature about 'heritage' is mainly about heritage in England. As I have already pointed out, the two main works in this area, Patrick Wright's On Living in an Old Country, and Robert Hewison's The Heritage Industry are both written from an Anglo-British perspective. Consequently when Wright or Hewison are talking about 'heritage' legislation or heritage agencies one is continually asking the questions 'what about Scotland?' and 'how far does this apply to "us"?' As a result it was relatively easy to compile the section outlining the various agencies of protection, preservation and conservation, both State and voluntary, in England. It was much more difficult to do the same for Scotland. In fact compiling the Scottish section involved a
good deal of detective work. I had to sift through countless pamphlets published by the various heritage agencies, make numerous phone calls, both to voluntary conservation/heritage bodies and to the Scottish Office, and visit the Head Quarters of the National Trust For Scotland on more than one occasion. In addition to finding-out something about the structure of conservation in Scotland and the workings of the various heritage agencies, I became quite skilled at feigning interest without being persuaded to part with hard cash!

The next step, therefore, is to look at the agencies concerned with 'heritage', protection, preservation and conservation in England and see how this compares with the situation here in Scotland. I have started with England for the simple reason that the literature which deals with heritage/conservation issues, most notably On Living in an Old Country and The Heritage Industry, are essentially about the structure and system in England. There is thus a stronger basis from which to start work. Having identified the basic structure for England I compare and contrast this with the Scottish pattern.

8.3 The State Agencies of Protection, Preservation and Conservation

(a) England

(i) The Department of the Environment

In England the principal government agency involved in protecting and enlarging land and buildings is the Department of the Environment. It was formed in 1970 to reconcile the conflicting interests of the former Ministries of Housing and Local Government, Public Buildings and Works, Transport and Planning. The Department's Directorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings maintains the Royal Parks, and the occupied and unoccupied royal palaces.
The Department of the Environment is responsible for listing buildings, the principle of which was introduced in 1908 by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments. Its aim was to make "an inventory of the Ancient and Historical Monuments and constructions connected with or illustrative of the contemporary culture, civilization and conditions of life of the people of England" (Hewison, 1987, p. 24). In 1947 the principle of listing buildings was introduced in order to inhibit their demolition or abolition.

The number of listed buildings has increased significantly in recent years. This is partly because of changes in the system which has meant that any building over thirty years old may apply for protection.

Robert Hewison says that in 1982 there were 1/4 million listed buildings, and by 1988 this figure had nearly doubled.

The Department's Directorate is also responsible for scheduling monuments. The scheduling of monuments is older than the listing of occupied buildings. The first Ancient Monuments Act was passed in 1882 and identified 68 sites. The number has now reached 12,800. In 1979 the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act was passed. This Act extended archaeological protection by allowing the designation of an 'area of archaeological importance' where archaeological studies must be carried out before development takes place. So far five have been declared; in Canterbury, York, Chester, Exeter and Hereford.

The Department of the Environment also sponsors five 'heritage' agencies. These are the Historic Buildings & Monuments Commission (which goes by the name English Heritage); the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments; the National Heritage Memorial Fund; the Redundant Churches Fund; and the Royal Armouries.

The Department of the Environment empowers the Countryside Commission (England & Wales) to designate, for confirmation by the
appropriate minister, National Parks. There are ten National Parks administered by the Countryside Commission (England & Wales).

The estimated expenditure of the Department of the Environment for 1986/1987 was £96 million. The Historic Buildings & Monuments Commission received over half of this.

(iii) The Office of Arts & Libraries

This is the principle ministry concerned with museums and art galleries in England. It makes an equal contribution with the Department of the Environment to the National Heritage Memorial Fund.

(iv) The Department of Employment

The Department of Employment sponsors the English Tourist Board. Under the Development of Tourism Act (1969) the Department of Employment grants the English Tourist Board money to invest in heritage projects. The Manpower Services Commission is a significant supplier of labour. Funds are also obtained from the E.E.C.

(iv) Local Authorities

In 1985/1986 the English authorities were estimated to be spending £44.9 million on environment enhancement and conservation.

The 1982 Derelict Land Act made central government grants available to local authorities and other public bodies, the private sector and nationalised industries, for the reclamation of derelict land in order to bring it into improved or beneficial use.

In England and Wales rights of way rest with the county councils. There is no automatic right of public access to open country but many landowners allow free access, and sometimes agreements are
sought with local authorities. In England and Wales there are 1.5 million acres of common land, a large proportion of which is open to the public.

(b) Scotland

The picture of conservation, protection and preservation in Scotland is somewhat different to the English pattern. Here state conservation, preservation and protection are discharged through the various departments and directorates of the Scottish Office.

(i) Scottish Development Department (S.D.D.)

The S.D.D. is responsible for policy and functions affecting the physical development of Scotland, including town and country planning; housing; roads and transport; water supplies and sewerage; control of air and river pollution and building control; conservation; historic buildings and ancient monuments. It is also responsible for the general policy on local government administration.


There are no national parks in Scotland. A Scottish National Parks Committee recommended in 1947 that several areas, including the Cairngorms, Glencoe, Torridon, and Loch Lomond be taken over, but this never happened because there was not, it was felt, the population pressure on these areas that existed in England and Wales. Because the Countryside Commission (Scotland) does not have the power to designate national parks, liaison between the Countryside Commission (Scotland) and the Rural Environment & Nature Conservation Division is particularly important. While
there are no national parks, there are, however, two regional parks and forty 'national scenic areas', covering 2.5 million acres. These are subject to consultation with the Countryside Commission (Scotland) with regards to certain kinds of development and in the event of a disagreement with the Secretary of State for Scotland.

In February 1989 the Countryside Commission (Scotland) announced, with the backing of the Scottish Office, the setting up of a panel to look once again at the issue of national parks. This was partly in response to Prince Charles's call, late in 1988, for English-style national parks to be created in Scotland. The Prince's rationale was that the establishment of such parks would safeguard the beauty and exploit the tourist potential of the Highlands. It was also partly a result of Mrs Thatcher's recent interest in 'green' issues.

The national parks issue is a highly-emotive and sensitive one. It is also extremely complex, with conflicting theories on what national parks would, or should, achieve. Winnie Ewing, the Euro M.P. for the Highlands & Islands, for example, described Prince Charles's call for English style national parks as "well meaning but very dangerous" in that it would result in restrictions on ramblers and hill walkers (there is no law of trespass in Scotland) and would line the pockets of already rich landowners. Even among people who support the idea there is little agreement about how the scheme should be put into practice. Some, for example, believe that recreational facilities should be created and developed while others are wholly opposed to this. Either way, any developments in this area are certain to promote a great deal of debate.

The S.D.D. has two other main functions. It gives grants under the 1982 Derelict Land Act to local authorities for the reclamation of derelict land in order to bring it into beneficial use or to improve its appearance.
The S.D.D. is also responsible for historic buildings and ancient monuments. It is responsible for listing buildings of special architectural or historical interest. The Historic Buildings and Monuments Directorate of the S.D.D. is the Scottish equivalent of English Heritage, in that it is chartered with protecting and conserving Scotland's architectural and archaeological heritage. In Scotland in 1988 the total number of listed buildings was 35,000.

(11) The Scottish Education Department (S.E.D.)

There is no body in the Scottish Office comparable to the English Office of Arts & Libraries. These functions, however, are taken over by a division within the S.E.D.. The Secretary of State for Scotland, via the S.E.D., funds Scottish 'national' institutions; that is, 'national' museums, the national galleries and the National Library, plus a handful of other, autonomous, bodies. Other museums are not funded by the S.E.D. but do, however, come under the auspices of the Scottish Office via the Scottish Museums Council which is funded by the Scottish Office. Museums also receive help from the district councils and the Manpower Services Commission. All in all the increase in direct government funding has led to the number of museums in Scotland rising from c.350 in 1981-1982 to c.400 in 1986. There are around 12 million visitors a year to Scottish museums; which is four times the number attending football league matches and over twenty times the number attending national opera, ballet or orchestra.

(111) The Industry Department for Scotland

While the English Tourist Board is sponsored by the Department of Employment, the Scottish Tourist Board (S.T.B.) receives 80% of its funding from the Scottish Office via the Industry Department for Scotland. The remaining 20% is raised by various commercial activities. In 1988-89 the total budget of the S.T.B. was £9.9 million. The provisional budget for 1989-1990 is £11 million.
With regards to conservation issues the Scottish local authorities have two main functions. Under the 1982 Derelict Land Award they can qualify for central government grants from the S.D.D. for the reclamation of derelict land if this will bring it into beneficial use, or if it will improve the quality of its appearance. Secondly, the responsibility for public rights of way and access to open country rests with the regional councils. In Scotland there is very little common land and no automatic public right of access which means that this is a responsibility of considerable importance. What usually happens is that the regional councils and private landowners arrive at various footpath and access agreements concerning the establishment of nature trails, picnic and scenic areas, etc.

8.4 The Voluntary Organisations of Protection and conservation in England and Scotland

(a) Voluntary Conservation: General Background

Few countries in the world rely to a greater extent than Britain on voluntary societies to take care of the environment. To this end there is a very close relationship between independent voluntary organisations and state agencies of conservation.

The most important voluntary organisations constitute the Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies, which meets every two months. The Committee is made up of the Ancient Monuments Society; the Civic Trust/Scottish Civic Trust; the Council for British Archaeology; the Council for the Protection of Rural England; the Georgian Group/Scottish Georgian Society (now the Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland); the National Trust/National Trust for Scotland; the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings; and the Victorian Society.
The Victorian Society; the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings; the Georgian Group/Scottish Georgian Group; the Ancient Monuments Society and the Council for British Archaeology are all involved in the statutory planning process, in that they have to be notified about applications to alter or demolish ancient buildings. They each receive £10,000 a year from the government for carrying out these functions.

The two most important voluntary institutions, both of which have their position recognised by Acts of Parliament, are the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland. In the next section I focus specifically on the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland. I attempt to outline their origins, aims and intentions in order to see whether the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland represent two sides of the same coin or are fundamentally different currencies.

(b) The National Trust and the National Trust For Scotland

(1) Introductory Remarks

The most important voluntary conservation body in England is the National Trust. In Scotland it is the National Trust for Scotland. The National Trust is also the largest private (institutional) landowner in the United Kingdom owning, according to the Annual Report for 1988, 554,000 acres (224,000 ha); much of it coastline and open country. In addition the National Trust has "more than 200 historic buildings in its care" (Annual Report, 1988, p.9). These range from the 87 large houses it owns, such as Waddesden Manor and Castle Drogo, to the "small houses of architectural distinction" in its 'Small Houses of South Wales' scheme, to odd farm buildings and isolated barns which are "vital ingredients of the rural landscape" (Annual Report, 1988, p.10). The National Trust also owns 130 gardens which include "important examples of every style from the sixteenth century onwards" (Annual Report, 1988, p.11).
In contrast to the National Trust, the National Trust for Scotland is not Scotland's biggest private landowner. In fact the National Trust for Scotland only owns 100,000 acres, which is just under one third of MacEwen's 1977 figure for what the Duke of Buccleuch owns. The National Trust for Scotland owns and/or manages 97 properties which are open to the public. These are similar but more diverse than those belonging to the National Trust. There are 19 castles and historic houses; 21 countryside reserves; 20 gardens; 4 historic sites; 8 islands; a handful of burghs - Dysart; Pitterweem; St Monans; Anstruther; Crail; Culross and Dunkeld - in the Little House Improvement Scheme; 6 famous Scots' birthplaces; 3 museums; 3 items of 'social and industrial heritage', such as Polton Mill. There are 10 properties owned by the Trust under guardianship of others, and 3 properties managed, but not owned, by the National Trust for Scotland.

In view of their positions as the most important voluntary conservation bodies in England and Scotland, and by virtue of the fact that the National Trust is the largest private (institutional) landowner in the U.K., it is important to say something about these bodies, their origins and aims, and about the way they are organised.

The easiest way of doing this would be to give historical accounts of the development of the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland. Easy as this would be, I do not want to approach the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland via neat little histories for two reasons. Firstly, because I would encounter the same problems that I experienced in trying to write a section on the great families; that is, that of regurgitating biased, propagandist accounts with legitimising intentions. Secondly, such an exercise would be of limited use, as what I am essentially interested in is not 'the history' of the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland, but in how the two Trusts define themselves in relation to 'the nation'. Thus I intend to compare and contrast the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland in terms of the individuals who run the two Trusts, and
how they define themselves in relation to 'the nation'. Having
said that giving a historical account of the National Trust and
the National Trust for Scotland is of limited value, it is
necessary, by way of introduction, to say something briefly about
their origins.

(ii) The Foundation of the National Trust and the National Trust
for Scotland

The National Trust was formed in 1895, but the impetus for its
formation began in the 1880s as a result of the experience of the
Commons Preservation Society (C.P.S.). The C.P.S. was legally
barred from acquiring land, and therefore could not purchase
common rights because it did not have corporate status. To rectify
this, the solicitor with the C.P.S., Robert Hunter, proposed, in
1884, the creation of a body which would be incorporated under the
Joint Stock Companies Act, and was, therefore, able to buy and
hold land and buildings "for the benefit of the nation" (Wright,
1985, p.50). Hunter's idea was "of a Land Company formed... with
a view to the protection of the public interest in the open spaces
of the country" (Wright, 1985, p.50).

There were two other important persons involved in the formation
of the National Trust. One was Octavia Hill, who suggested that
the name include the word 'Trust' rather than 'Company' so that
the benevolent side of the operation would be stressed. The other
was Hardwicke Rawnsley, a friend of Ruskin's, and Canon of
Carlisle.

The constitution of the National Trust was drafted in 1894 and at
a meeting it was resolved that:

... it is desirable to provide means whereby landowners and
others may be enabled to dedicate to the nation places of
historic interest or natural beauty, and to this purpose it is
expedient to form a corporate body, capable of holding land,
and representative of national institutions and interests
(Wright, 1985, p.51).
In 1895 'The National Trust for Places of Historic Interest and Natural Beauty' was registered under the Companies Act. As a non-profit making body the Trust was not obliged to include the word 'Limited' in its title.

In 1907 an Act of Parliament made the Trust a statutory body, giving it the right to hold land 'inalienably'; that is, it was protected so that no one could acquire Trust property without permission from Parliament.

The National Trust for Scotland is a separate institution founded later and independently of the National Trust; although there is now, and has been since 1943, a policy of mutual representation between the two. The initiative for the foundation of the National Trust for Scotland came from the Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland. A special committee was formed to explore the possibility of establishing a Trust based in Scotland, independent of Government but capable of working in concert with statutory authorities. By 4 October 1929 they were in consultation with the Labour Secretary of State for Scotland, William Adamson. Adamson is described by Prentice as "a Minister beset like all his colleagues by the lamentable economic, social and industrial problems of the time yet sympathetic to a project which so plainly touched the public good" (Prentice). The National Trust for Scotland was to be relieved of any immediate financial worry over administrative expenses during the first three years of its existence by means of a £500 grant from the Pilgrim Trust.

The foundations of the National Trust for Scotland were laid amidst a background of economic insecurity, unemployment and hunger marches. The individuals who brought the National Trust for Scotland into being, however, were not socially-conscious intellectuals, like Octavia Hill and Hardwicke Rawnsley, but a handful of Scottish lairds— the Duke of Atholl; Sir Ian Colquhoun; the Earl of Crawford & Balcarres; Sir John Stirling Maxwell, and Arthur Russell. These men felt that the National
Trust's definition of 'the Nation' did not include Scotland:

The National Trust for Scotland was founded on 1 May 1931, for much the same reason that the National Trust had been constituted in London in 1895. Minds were moving on such matters as the preservation of historic buildings and domestic architecture, access to the countryside for recreation, protection of landscape and wildlife, and neglect of the remnants of such ancient natural features as the Caledonian Forest. No body existed in Scotland which could accept or acquire property and hold it 'for the benefit of the nation' (Prentice).

(iii) Individuals Involved in the Running of the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland

The National Trust, as we have seen, was founded by socially-aware nineteenth-century English intellectuals who were concerned with preventing the destruction and despoiling of the countryside; enjoyment of which was regarded as a right. Today the President of the National Trust is H.M. Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, and the individuals involved in the actual running of the Trust tend to be public figures, many from the world of government. It is here important to point out that there is no easy, direct and simple relationship between the Tory, or any other political party and the National Trust. The individuals who run the National Trust come from politically-diverse backgrounds.

The National Trust has voluntary status, but because of the high proportion of individuals from the public world who hold office within the Trust, the National Trust has, as Hewison argues, "access to the government through that complex network of interlocking relationships and connections that make up the self-selected aristocracy of the Great and the Good" (1987, p.55). In addition, he argues, "the formal links through its constitution with other amenity bodies are doubled by personal cross memberships and common backgrounds in the field of public service" (1987, p.55). A classic example, and one which Hewison himself uses is provided by the current Chairman Dame Jenifer Jenkins. Dame Jenifer Jenkins, who is married to the politician Roy Jenkins, is a former chairman of the Consumers' Association, and
of the Historic Buildings Council for England and has served on a variety of other committees in related areas. The Trust's Director-General, Angus Stirling, also has a finger in many pies. He is a former deputy secretary-general of the Arts Council, assistant director of the Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art, a director of the Royal Opera House and Chairman of the Friends of Covent Garden. It is such close, intersecting networks of connections that led one of the former chairmen of the National Trust, Lord Antrim, to describe the National Trust as "a self-perpetuating oligarchy" consisting of "the amenity earls" (Hewison, 1987, p. 55); that is, people who do not actually live in stately homes but for whom the country house and its accompanying lifestyle remain an ideal to aspire to.

While the National Trust was founded by socially-conscious and politically-aware intellectuals, the National Trust for Scotland was founded by a bunch of socially-aware Scottish lairds. Today it is still mainly lairds who hold office within the National Trust for Scotland. The President is the Earl of Wemyss & March and their are five Vice Presidents, two of whom are lairds. These are the Duke of Atholl and the Marquess of Bute. The other three Vice Presidents are Mrs Edward Dennys O.B.E., D.L.; A.S. Roger, M.B.E., J.P.; and Mrs B.S. Mackie.

There is, and always has been, considerable cross membership between the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland. Before the National Trust for Scotland was established the Marquis of Lothian was involved in the National Trust, and even during the early years of the National Trust for Scotland's existence his involvement in the National Trust continued. In 1934, for example, the Marquess of Lothian helped initiate a scheme arguing for the National Trust to acquire country houses and pressing the government to create a fiscal scheme that would ensure their survival. The Marquess of Zetland also continued to be involved in the National Trust after the foundation of the National Trust for Scotland. He was appointed Chairman of the National Trust in 1932.
Since 1943 there has been a formal policy of mutual representation with the National Trust. In this year Sir Ian Colquhoun, a man who "personified the romantic notion of the Scottish laird and soldier" (Prentice), was Chairman of Council of the National Trust for Scotland. He took his place as a member of Council on the National Trust. Lady Charles Trevelyan of the National Trust was appointed to represent the National Trust on the Council of the National Trust for Scotland.

(iv) Aims of the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland

Hewison makes the point that "it is not generally realised, that as it approaches its centenary, the National Trust is a quite different organisation to that which its founders intended" (1987, p.56). The National Trust has its origins in the Commons, Open Spaces and Footpaths Preservation Society which was founded in 1865. The primary purpose of the National Trust was not, Hewison stresses, the protection of buildings or private property but public access to the countryside. It was Cannon Hardwicke Rawnsley, one of its founder-members, who spoke out in 1900 for unrestricted access to Stonehenge - a place where "men's feet all up the ages have been as free as air to come and go" (Wright, 1986, p.32). As Wright points out, the ghost of Cannon Rawnsley must surely have raised its eyebrows when a hippy convoy was routed from Stonehenge in 1985!

Thus it was the natural landscape rather than the man-made environment which the founder-members of the National Trust were concerned to protect. Both Rawnsley and Octavia Hill had connections with John Ruskin; and it was his ideal of a wild, beautiful and untamed nature that was the inspiration behind their work. However, as Hewison argues, "memory too, had a capacity for moral change, by acting as a reminder of former greatness and the landscape could not be seen without its human associations" (1987, p.36). Thus when the Trust was finally registered with the Board
of Trade in January 1895 it was registered as 'The National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty'.

Over time the human associations came to dominate and the National Trust became increasingly tied-up with the cult of the country house. Why should this have been the case? In order to understand "the peculiarly strong hold such places have on the British - though for once it seems more appropriate to say English - imagination" (Hewison, 1987, pp.51-52) we have to look at what the country house represents and symbolises. Essentially, and most importantly, Hewison argues, the country house symbolises an unbroken continuity with the past:

Because there has been no foreign invasion, civil war or revolution since the seventeenth century these houses both great and small represent a physical continuity which enables the same adaptability to change within a respect for precedent and tradition that has shaped the common law. With a garden, a park and a greater or lesser estate they enshrine the rural values that persist in a population that has been predominantly urban for more than a century.... As the great celebration of the country house at the National Gallery of Art in Washington in 1985-86 sought to demonstrate 'they have become as it were vessels of civilization' (1987, p.52).

In addition to symbolising a continuity with the past and being 'vessels of civilization' there was a more pragmatic reason for the National Trust to become increasingly interested in the country house and to campaign on its behalf. The process started in the 1920s when the National Trust found itself short of funds and unable to cope with the upkeep and maintenance of the country houses taken into its care. In 1923 the Trust formally begged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to grant tax concessions to owners of important country houses so that they could keep their properties in good repair. It was the first of a succession of pleas which has continued to the present day - but without success.

In 1931 the Treasury conceded an important change in the tax laws as an incentive to landowners to give property to the Trust. This was the 1931 Finance Act. Under this Act, land or buildings given to the Trust could escape death duties. This made for a happy
compromise whereby the National Trust gained considerable amounts of land or buildings but owners or their heirs could keep the rest of the estate intact. In 1937 the Act was extended to cases where the donor retained a life interest in the property.

The 1937 Act marks the turning point in the National Trust's concerns, for as a result of the Act the National Trust was able to formally launch its Country House Scheme. The essence of the scheme was that wherever possible the Trust arranged for the owners to continue living in the house, either as tenants on a long lease, or under the terms of a 'memorandum of wishes'; an agreement which is not legally enforcable, but which gives the owner long-term security for himself and his heirs. As Wright points out, the National Trust's "emphasis on continuity of place takes on an ancestral dimension.... an already closed definition of the nation and history is linked to the present through an idea of genetic continuity" (1986, p.34).

The National Trust's interest in the welfare of English aristocrats is a far cry from the old ideal of unlimited access. As Hewison argues, "in exchange for often quite limited rights of access to the public, the owner has been able to continue his life very much as before, without the financial burden of maintaining the house in which he lived" (1987, p.59).

The National Trust for Scotland was founded in 1931, thirty six years after the National Trust. The fact that the foundation of the National Trust for Scotland was timed to coincide with the Finance Act of 1931, which made National Trust property exempt from death duties, meant that from the very beginning the National Trust for Scotland was to be equally concerned with preserving and protecting the countryside and private property. In this respect its interests were, and still are, much the same as those of the National Trust post-1920. There were, and are, however, differences in emphasis, most importantly the greater stress placed by the National Trust for Scotland on the idea that conservation policy must apply to the whole environment. The
National Trust for Scotland's work, therefore, has always been concerned not only with castles and great houses but with little houses also. In the Royal Burgh of Culross, for example, the National Trust for Scotland has campaigned to save Culross Palace, alongside the 'little houses' which were originally the homes of the merchants, burgesses and artisans and which were "built in the vernacular style peculiar to the region in which they stand, and were as comely and native to Scotland as the towers and great houses built for the barons and lairds" (Prentice).

Likewise the National Trust for Scotland is keen to stress that whilst in the conservation of old buildings historic or architectural worth is important, it is not necessarily the most important consideration. For example, Lamb's House in Leith was restored in association with Edinburgh and Leith's Old People's Welfare Council to be used by the Council as a day centre for old people.

In addition to being concerned with the conservation of old buildings the other major area of National Trust for Scotland conservation policy is, of course, land. Every year more and more land is added to the inventory, but once again the practical use to which the land can be put is often, the National Trust for Scotland stresses, as important as its historical or aesthetic value. Thus while the National Trust for Scotland has worked to conserve the Borestone section of the battlefield at Bannockburn it accepted the island of Fair Isle in order to assure a permanent base for the Fair Isle Bird Observatory Trust.

Two Acts were passed in 1935 which were to have a profound and lasting effect on the future of the National Trust for Scotland. The first was the National Trust for Scotland Order of Confirmation Act (1935) which defined the purpose of the Trust as:

... promoting the permanent preservation for the benefit of the nation of lands and buildings in Scotland of historic or national interest or natural beauty and also of articles and objects of historic or national interest and as regards lands for the preservation (so far as practicable) of their natural
aspect and features and animal and plant life and as regards buildings for the preservation (so far as practicable) of their architectural or historic features and contents so far as of national or historic interest (Prentice).

The Act thus gave the National Trust for Scotland a constitution which allowed great freedom of action, including the power to "maintain and manage or assist in the maintenance and management of lands as open spaces or places of public resort" and to "make all such provision as may be beneficial for the management of the property or desirable for the comfort or convenience of persons resorting to or using such property" (Prentice).

The other Act which had a profound effect upon the development of the National Trust for Scotland was the 1935 Housing (Scotland) Act. To societies concerned with conservation this Act seemed to have the intention of putting a premium on the destruction of old property. The Cockburn Association convened a conference in January 1935 and asked the Trust to try to resolve the problem of bringing 'improvements' (that is, demolition and new buildings) and the conservation of old architecture into balance.

Lord Bute was important in this respect. He conceived the idea of listing buildings of historical or architectural interest and provided the funds with which the National Trust for Scotland commissioned the architect Ian Lindsay to make a national survey. Lindsay's lists and annotated maps were made available to the Department of Health, enabling the Department to call to the attention of local authorities houses of merit in their district. In 1937 the Secretary of State for Scotland announced that he was prepared to consider giving assistance in housing schemes to ensure the reconditioning of any houses which the Department advised were worth preserving. After World War Two the Scottish Office took over the task of listing buildings. The Bute lists therefore became the basis of the official Buildings Record for Scotland.
(v) How the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland define themselves in relation to 'the Nation'

In order to understand how the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland arrive at their definitions of 'the nation' and define themselves in relation to it, it is necessary to go back to Wright's point about the existence in everyday life of a vernacular and informal sense of history which is often expressed through the powerful symbolism of the public world, but which is certainly not totally swamped or rendered impotent by it. He argues that the National Trust appeals to this vernacular, heterogeneous and everyday sense of history, selects aspects of it, refines them and incorporates them into its own "well-kept representation of the national identity" (1986, p.34).

This vernacular sense of history can be all things to all people. It can be "variously internationalist and frankly chauvinistic, complacent and critical, inclusive and fiercely exclusive, credulous and unbelieving, nostalgic and anti-sentimental, backward and forward-looking" (Wright, 1986, p.34). In its early days the National Trust was open to a considerable range of the interests represented in this everyday historical consciousness. Over time it became closed to more and more. By the end of the 1920s the range of its interests had shifted away from public access to the countryside and towards a concern with preserving the man-made landscape; most notably the great country houses. This change in emphasis of the National Trust's concerns was paralleled by a redefinition of the physical nation to which it appealed. In Scotland it came to be felt more and more that the 'nation' the National Trust defined itself in relation to was England, and that Scotland was constantly excluded from the picture: "no body existed in Scotland which could accept or acquire property and hold it 'for the benefit of the nation'" (Prentice).

By their very existence the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland illustrate two very different definitions of 'the
nation' at work within the U.K.. The difference is that the National Trust has in its definition failed to make the fundamental distinction between England and Britain. The National Trust for Scotland, however, takes this distinction as its starting point. Having said this, the point has to be made that the definitions of 'the nation' employed by the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland are not so much competing as coexisting definitions. The National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland have similar aims and concerns. In addition, both are run by earls, amenity and otherwise, who make up the self-selected aristocracies of 'the Great and the Good' and there is a good deal of interaction, formal and informal, between the Great and the Good from both camps.

8.5 Conclusion

The National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland are particularly important because they crystallise many of the issues raised, not only in this chapter, but in the thesis as a whole. They reflect how within Ukania-Britain Nairn's 'four main tribes' and the 'weird hangers on' coexist, side-by-side, usually in a state of relative peace. They also reflect, however, the annoyance of one tribe (Scotland) when a bullying, bigger tribe (England) consistently fails to make a distinction between England and Britain and equates itself with the wider integration.

Wright has said that the National Trust forms its definition of "the nation" via a process of "ghoulish collusion with the rulers of old" (1986, p.34). This is also true of the National Trust for Scotland. There is, however, an important difference here, and one which should not be forgotten. This is the fact that the National Trust for Scotland has two sets of rulers with whom it has to engage in ghoulish collusion. In addition to the rulers it has since 1603 shared with England, the National Trust for Scotland has had to consult another set of rulers; those from an older, and fundamentally-different, Scottish past. The relationship between the the two sets of rulers has so far been one of harmony. But
while a coup d'etat has never happened, the possibility of conflict, even if only of a mild sort, has always been on the cards.
Stately Homes in the Scottish Borders

9.1 Micro Heritage in the Scottish Borders

In the explanatory remarks for Part IV I pointed to the existence in the Scottish Borders of a thriving and diverse, privately-owned and commercially-run heritage industry, in which various Border lairs open their stately homes to the public upon payment of an entry fee. I suggested that there was more to this than an attempt by the lairs to ease their financial situation "in an age of penal taxation" (Bowhill, 1981, p.23). I then went on to argue that the private stately home-based 'heritage industry' in the Borders came about partly as a response to the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974 which, on the whole, saw the end of the direct involvement of Border lairs in local politics.

Having established the major themes and issues of Part IV I began in Chapter Eight by discussing the problems of defining 'heritage'. I then went on to examine the three pieces of government legislation since World War II which have facilitated the growth of the 'heritage industry' throughout the British Isles. Finally, in Chapter Eight I looked at the structure of the conservation movement in terms of the agencies and organisations concerned with the promotion, protection and perpetuation of 'heritage' and 'heritage' issues. Particular attention was paid to the origins, aims and intentions of the National Trust and the National Trust for Scotland, and to how they represent contrasting, but coexisting, definitions of 'the nation' at work within the same geographical space.

In this chapter I am essentially and explicitly concerned with how the privately-owned, commercially-run, stately home-based 'heritage industry' which exists in the Scottish Borders
219

represents an attempt by modern day Border lairds, in a world dominated by legal/rational authority, to achieve legitimation by tradition. Before these issues can be looked at in detail it is important to see them in terms of the wider hegemonic processes at work in contemporary Britain. The most useful angle of vision is provided by the idea of 'micro heritage' as expounded by Bommes and Wright in an essay entitled 'Charms of Residence: the Public and the Past' (1982). Bommes and Wright's concept of 'micro heritage' is so useful because it allows one to understand the privately-owned, commercially-run stately-home industry in terms of the cultural policies at work within contemporary Britain and to locate it in terms of the wider 'heritage' debate. Some words of explanation and clarification are, however, required if it is to work as well in a Scottish context as it does in an Anglo-British one.

There is, in 'Charms of Residence', considerable overlap with some of the issues Wright was later to develop further in On Living in an Old Country. In 'Charms of Residence', for example, Bommes and Wright stress that Gramsci's concept of hegemony is absolutely central to an understanding of the cultural policies at work in contemporary Britain. Hegemony, they argue, represents a major advance in Marxist theory in that it recognises that class contradictions, while always present, are not always immediately obvious. In complex capitalist societies, such as contemporary Britain, this is particularly important because in such societies the ruling class alliance cannot achieve domination by securing the means of force alone. In order to rule such a class has to obtain political, intellectual and moral leadership as well. This is achieved by articulating the interests of the dominated classes in hegemonic terms via mechanisms of transformation, inclusion and exclusion.

Within the hegemonic processes at work within contemporary Britain, Bommes and Wright argue that the distinction between public and private is crucial. The public/private distinction, they argue, has developed both in relation to and against, the
absolutist State and has played a major part in securing the domination of the bourgeois classes. The aspect of the public/private distinction with which Bommes and Wright are primarily concerned is the public institution of 'the past'.

Bommes and Wright go on to argue that in contemporary Britain the most common public staging of the past is in terms of 'the national heritage'. The 'national heritage' is omnipresent and takes many different forms. It is invoked everywhere; through the press, on television, in political speeches (from all sides of the political spectrum), in cultural policies, etc. The 'national heritage' is also "closely connected to the impulses of contemporary conservatism" (1982, p.264) but it cannot be simply and directly equated with Tory-Party, or any other party, political rhetoric. It must always, they stress, be remembered that while the 'national heritage' is politically-active, it is not directly controlled by one class, one party or by the State. Neither can it be dismissed as a distortion in opposition to a 'true' account of history:

Our point here is that the national heritage is not history at all, and that it needs to be analysed in its character as a publicly instituted structuring of consciousness. As such national heritage can be as significantly indifferent to truth as to falsity. The contestation of definitions imposed as national heritage involves a much wider social practice than history-writing customarily occupies (1982, p.266).

Bommes and Wright argue that there are tensions between articulations working at the 'national' and 'local' levels, between:

... the macro-heritage - framed as it is by the large and overriding unity of the 'nation' - coexists with a more molecular diversity of locally based micro heritages which are at work in the local scene rather than the capital city; in sayings, ballads and dialects rather than in great literary works and the mother tongue; in classically undistinctive but still irreplaceable 'artisans' dwellings rather than stately piles of 'national' significance; in collective craft and production skills rather than the greater acts or discoveries of heroes and leaders; in curious and particular factory buildings rather than 'nationally' significant battlefields and prison cells (1982, p.268).
Before discussing the implications of the idea of 'micro heritage' further, it is necessary to stress that Bommes and Wright are referring essentially to the situation in Anglo-Britain. My point is that the idea of 'micro' heritage is an extremely valid and useful one, but that it needs to be developed further if it is to be fruitfully applied to the situation in Scotland. Here there are, at the local level, a diversity of micro-heritages, all representing different things. In England Bommes and Wright see these micro-heritages as representing tensions between the 'local' and 'national' levels. In Scotland the tensions are not so much tensions between the 'local' and 'national' levels as tensions between the Scottish and Anglo-British 'national' levels.

Bommes and Wright argue that the tensions they identify between the 'local' and 'national' levels of Anglo-Britain represent cracks in the hegemonic fortress but never anything more. The political contradictions which exploded hegemony in the first place are diluted as they become buried under a celebratory display of local diversity.

Extending their argument to Scotland and to tensions between the Scottish and Anglo-British 'national' levels, a classic example of these processes in operation, and one which I have experienced first-hand, is provided by the various Border Festivals which take place every year in the early summer. Each Border town has its own Festival - the Common Ridings in Hawick and Selkirk, Riding the Marches in Jedburgh, the Beltane Festival in Peebles and the Braw Lads Gathering in Galashiels. All of these Festivals have been the subject of, and subject to, much romantic reconstruction but none more so than the Galashiels Braw Lads Gathering. The Braw Lads Gathering started in 1930 and is, therefore, less than sixty years old:

... but, it celebrates an event of centuries ago: a defeat of English soldiers. They had stopped by Galafoot to pluck and eat wild plums, and were there set upon by the Foresters of Galashiels and put to rout. The place, still surrounded by wild plum trees is marked by the Raid Stone. The town coat of
arms has two foxes looking at a tree with the motto 'Sour Plums'; sour indeed they proved to those English' (Lochhead, 1976, p.116).

At this point I wish to temporarily abandon academic analysis and lapse intentionally into anecdote.

On holiday in the Borders in June 1980, staying with Scottish relatives, I was taken to some of the 50th Galashiels Braw Lads Gathering celebrations. I was dragged out of bed at some unearthly hour on the Saturday morning in time for the Raid Stane Ceremony. Perhaps it was just the cold and wet, combined with lack of sleep and breakfast, but I do not deny that I experienced a peculiarly uneasy sensation in the pit of my stomach as I read the following section in the 'Souvenir Brochure', which I have kept to this day:

In the year 1337, a party of English raiders returning over the Border rested in a grove of wild plum trees near Gala. The men of Gala attacked and killed this party of Englishmen and it is said the syke or stream ran red with blood for three days. It is now known as the Englishmen's Syke, and each year the three Lads receive sprigs of the wild plum trees, pinned to their jackets by their Braw Lass, in commemoration of this first recorded mention of the Braw Lads (Braw Lads, 1980).

The fact that this event had taken place over five hundred years ago did absolutely nothing to settle my stomach.

Later that morning, after breakfast and after donning an extra sweater, I was taken to the Old Town Cross Ceremony. The rain ceased, the sun came out and my stomach settled as I read in the Souvenir Brochure an account of the first ceremony at the Old Town Cross, on Braw Lads Day 1930:

There was the Cross, a remnant of feudalism, with its vane signifying its age. There was the proclamation again specifying all that was meant in that old-world deed, which was fraught with so much significance to Galashiels, to the Country of Scotland, to the neighbouring country of England, and to the world, for in the union that was memorialised today there was another union of lands and crowns, of parliaments and people; of far-reaching effect, for in that same union lay the elements of the greatness to which the vast British Empire has attained. The sod and stone signified that the lands and heritages of the great and awesome Ettrick Forest of four
hundred years ago had become a queen's dower, and that queen, an English princess, had been married to a Scottish King, and that of their issue came the future King who was to unite in his person the crowns of Scotland and England and make for the peace and prosperity of the kingdoms and of lands then unthought of far beyond the seas. It was, therefore, fitting that bouquets of Red and White Roses representing the once-time embittered houses of Lancaster and York should be offered, and that they should be laid on the Cross in unison (Braw Lads, 1980, p. 75).

By this time I was in a much more relaxed frame of mind, and 1337 began to feel nearer six hundred years away. Feeling more confident that my English accent would not get me into difficulties I could not handle, I started asking what the Braw Lads Gathering was 'really' about. Nobody seemed to know but I was assured that it was better than the Festivals in Selkirk, Peebles and Jedburgh, and far outshone the Hawick Common Riding! Although I did not know it at the time, this was in fact the key to the whole puzzle. The various Border Festivals do express anti-English sentiments but these have come second to feelings of local pride. As Bommes and Wright argue, the more radical implications of micro-heritage become diluted when, as so often happens, the reappropriation of local traditions becomes an end in itself, "unless clearly linked with a more broadly conceived oppositional practice, community history can reproduce those representations of the community's past already present and active in the public sphere" (1982, p. 299).

It was eight years after that cold June morning that I read Bommes and Wright's 'Charms of Residence'. After I had done so I read the Souvenir Brochure afresh. These words of Ex-Provost Hayward leapt at me from off the page:

It was a great morning, full of episode, full of suggestiveness, full of memories; and fuller of the fact that Galashiels had at last met as GALASHIELS should meet - in communal life - and observed certain incidents on the history of the town which deserve to be memorialised, and will be now while time shall last (Braw Lads, 1980, p. 77).
That Saturday in June was indeed for me a morning full of suggestiveness and full of episode. It was a morning the meaning of which it had taken me eight years to understand.

Thus what seems to have happened in recent years, Bommes and Wright argue, and one which the Border festivals such as the Galashiels Braw Lads Gathering represent, is that the whole idea of 'heritage' has become an increasingly important part of everyday life; as witnessed by the shift in emphasis from macro to micro. In connection with this they refer to Philippe Hoyau's point about how in France 'heritage' is no longer organised by an academic or aesthetic model but around three models from everyday life: namely, the family, conviviality (that is, aspects of community life such as local festivals and gatherings), and the country, which ranges from architecture and ecology to languages and cultural identities. This is an important point because they are also the models around which the privately-owned, commercially-run, Border stately-home industry is organised.

Hoyau's is an important point because these three models can, as we have seen, be found to be at work in the Braw Lads Gathering celebrations. They are also the models around which the privately-owned and commercially-run stately-home industry is organised. In the case of the stately-home industry, however, it is not enough to say that a shift in emphasis from macro to micro has occurred for the stately-home industry works at both levels. It takes the models of the family, conviviality and the country from everyday life and attempts to give them meaning at the macro-level, while continuing to stress their everydayness. In order to show how this is achieved I am now going to focus explicitly on some of these Border stately homes.

9.2 Stately Homes in the Scottish Borders

In this section I focus on the privately-owned, commercially-run, stately-home 'industry' which exists in the Scottish Borders, alongside the other heritage bodies; both state and voluntary. The
privately-owned, commercially-run stately-home industry is important for two reasons. Firstly, these homes are owned by the Border lairds who have been the subject of this thesis. Secondly, the privately-owned, commercially-run stately-home industry provides a striking example of Weber's category of traditional authority which, as Bruce and Yearley point out, has received relatively little attention from sociologists; largely because of the widespread disappearance of traditional societies.

While the social sciences have been primarily concerned with the categories of charismatic and legal/rational authority, traditional authority has not, however, been entirely neglected. Marxist writers have recognised that tradition is still an important source of legitimation and to this end have been concerned with "the ideological and obfuscatory role of traditions" and "how traditions are constructed for particular legitimatory or rhetorical purposes" (Bruce & Yearley, 1988, p.2). Consequently "their interest has been more in laying bare what they believe the myths conceal than in studying the construction of the traditions themselves" (Bruce & Yearley, 1988, p.3). Throughout this thesis I have been concerned with what the myths surrounding the Borders, the lairds and the land conceal. Having established that the myths attempt to legitimate the enormous amount of power and influence which the great families have exercised throughout history, I am in this chapter concerned with the rather more difficult question of how this is achieved, with what Bruce and Yearley call "the performance of 'being traditional'" (1988, p.3).

My attempt to analyse "the performance of 'being traditional'" in the main takes the form of analysing the guidebooks which are published by the various stately homes. These guidebooks are in part intended to be a guide to the house, pointing out the various objects of interest in each of the rooms. They also, however, contain sections on the families which are essentially attempts to legitimate the family's power, property and privileges by emphasising their indispensable role in the history of the
Borders, of Scotland and of the wider British State, I do not confine my analysis of "the performance of 'being traditional'" entirely to stately-home guidebooks. With regards to Bowhill, Nellerstain, Kanderston and Traquair, this is the case. In my analysis of Floors Castle, however, I make extensive use of a magazine article and, in addition, draw upon an interview I had with the Assistant Factor of the Estate. My account of Gosford House is yet again different in that it is highly-coloured by the personal tour my supervisors and I were given by the owner, the Earl of Wemyss, and our subsequent talk with him over lunch in the Edinburgh University Staff Club.

Bruce and Yearley warn that any attempt to analyse "the performance of 'being traditional'" is likely to "produce answers which are little more than banalities" (1988, p.3). At the same time, however and by the same token, there are good grounds for having a go. The fact is that the answer to the 'how they do it' question is found at the level of everyday life. The guidebooks are mass-produced and are aimed at the average punter, not the academic specialist. Thus it is to everyday life that the exercise in legitimation appeals and it is from the perspective of everyday life that it has to be answered.

I spent a lot of time wondering how I should analyse the guidebooks, whether I should analyse them in terms of common themes, images, styles of presentation, or whether I should simply offer an interpretive account of each guidebook in turn. The latter option, while seeming the least ambitious turned out to be the only suitable one. Opting to analyse each guidebook separately would enable me to stand on firmer ground than if I analysed them in terms of common themes for three reasons. Firstly, because I do not confine myself entirely to analysing guidebooks, a straightforward comparison would not really be possible. Secondly, by offering something which is an interpretation and does not pretend to be anything more, I am hopefully avoiding making erroneous claims based on what are essentially shaky and subjective foundations. Thirdly, while there are obvious
similarities between these guidebooks there are also enormous
differences; not only in terms of contents, style and
presentation, but in terms of what they represent. It is these
differences which are the key to understanding, not only the
privately-owned and commercially-run stately-home industry in the
Scottish Borders, but the whole ambivalence of 'heritage' and the
'heritage industry' in Scotland.

I have selected six stately homes/great houses to look at in some
detail. Five of these, Bowhill, Floors Castle, Mellerstain,
Manderston and Traquair are in the Scottish Borders. Gosford
House, my other choice, is not in the Borders but in East Lothian.
Bowhill, Floors Castle, Mellerstain, Gosford House and Traquair
are all ancestral homes. Their owners are all descendants of
Scotland's noble families and the houses have been in these
families for many generations.

Manderston can not really be called a stately home at all. It is
rather, a large country house built by a wealthy businessman and
politician at the end of the nineteenth century. I have chosen it
because it makes for an interesting comparison.

Gosford House, as I have pointed out, is not in the Borders, but
in East Lothian. There is, however, a good (if not slightly
nostalgic!) reason for choosing to include it. This is because my
supervisors and I were given a personal, out-of-season and
behind-the-scenes, tour by the owner, the Earl of Wemyss himself.
In addition, the Earl of Wemyss does own what he describes as "a
small but stately home" called Neidpath Castle in Peeblesshire;
where the Wemyss family, today represented by the Countess of
Dysart, has a history of owning land. Neidpath Castle is actually
an ancient monument rather than a stately home and for this reason
I have not included it in this section.

Finally, I look at Traquair House which on the surface has much in
common with Bowhill, Floors Castle and Mellerstain in terms of the
way it is run as a business, with glossy guidebooks, tea shops and
souvenirs. It is, however, fundamentally different in that it tells the story of a once noble family who, quite simply, by remaining Catholics and Jacobites, took the wrong side in both religion and politics and consequently lost most of their lands. It is a story which the present descendants of the House of Traquair are keen to make sure will never ever be forgotten.

Having said something in general about the five stately homes I have selected it is now time to begin looking at them individually, starting with Bowhill.

(a) Bowhill

Until Prince Andrew proposed to Sarah Ferguson at Floors Castle in the Spring of 1986, Bowhill, Selkirk, Scotland "Border home of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry, K.T." (Bowhill, 1981, p.1) was the most famous of the privately-owned Border stately homes which the punter could pay to visit. It forms a part of the 227,000 acre Buccleuch Estates (MacEwen, 1977), a figure which makes the Duke of Buccleuch the biggest private (individual) landowner in Britain.

The guidebook for Bowhill is glossy and professionally-produced. It does not deal with the issue of how much land the Duke owns. Instead it is more keen to project an image of Bowhill as a 'home' in the beautiful Selkirkshire countryside; a home which is a safe-keeping place for many objets d'art and at the same a model of "dynamic, efficient and progressive rural land management" (Bowhill, 1981, p.23).

The first image, that of Bowhill as a private 'home' in the beautiful Selkirkshire countryside, and the associated themes of family, ancestral continuity, and a longstanding relationship with the land are evoked on the front and back covers, the back inside cover and the first page. The front cover is a photograph of 'Sweet Bowhill' against a background of lush countryside and the back a close up of the house. The back inside cover is taken
Illustration 1

BOWHILL
up with the very long and extended family tree of the
Montagu-Douglas-Scotts. The first page is a colourful reproduction
of the family coat of arms.

We are told how the land surrounding Bowhill has been in the
possession of the Scott family since 1322. The 'myth of the buck'
is evoked here in order to explain two things; the origin of the
name Buccleuch and how the Scott family came to acquire the lands
surrounding Ettrick Forest:

Ancient Ettrick Forest, embracing today's Bowhill Estate, was
granted by Robert the Bruce to the Douglas family in 1322 as a
reward for their services. It reverted to the Crown in 1450
and for a hundred years was a favourite hunting ground for the
Kings of Scotland who used Newark Castle, two miles North of
Bowhill, as a hunting box. Various Scotts had been active
Rangers from the twelfth century and, according to legend, it
was in a deep 'Cleuch' or ravine in the Rankil Burn, in the
heart of the forest that a certain young Scott seized a
cornered buck by the antlers, after it had turned on the
king's hands, and threw it over his shoulder: hence the origin
of the name Buccleuch (Buck-Cleuch) (Bowhill, 1981, p.2).

The guidebook then goes on to inform us that from the middle of
the sixteenth century and until 1720 the Scott family alone owned
the whole of Ettrick Forest. In this year a marriage with the
Douglasses took place which restored the old Douglas connection
with the lands surrounding the Forest.

It was this marriage between the Scotts and Douglasses which led to
the building of a house in 1708, of which today there is no trace.
What is now known as Bowhill dates mainly from 1812. Many
additions were made during the nineteenth century by William
Atkinson (1773-1839); William Burns (1789-1870) and David Bryce
(1803-1876,) which made it a more attractive place to live. A
large part of the house's attraction, however, is its setting for
"the house stands in beautiful scenery with mixed woodland and
farmland between two of the Tweed tributaries, the Ettrick and the
Yarrow, a mile above their confluence, while heathery hills rise
gently between their picturesque valleys to the west" (Bowhill,
The theme of Bowhill as a safe-keeping place for works of art which 'are part of 'our', in this case British, endangered national heritage is developed on the inside front cover with a reproduction of the painting (the original being one of the extensive Buccleuch collection) of Lady Caroline Scott by Sir Joshua Reynolds, entitled 'Winter'. There are also paintings by Canaletto, Reynolds, Claude Lorrain, Raeburn and Holbein. Pride of place, however, must go to Leonardo da Vinci's 'The Madonna with the Yarn Winder' which hangs on the wall to the right of the east fireplace in the Drawing Room. It is the only privately-owned Leonard da Vinci in Britain.

The bulk of the guidebook takes the form of a guide to the public rooms, furniture and numerous objets d'art. The visitor is led step-by-step through the Entrance Hall, Gallery Hall, the Dalkeith Rooms and Corridor, the Monmouth Room, the Italian Room, the Dining Room, the Morning Room, the Drawing Room, the Library, the Study, the Victorian Wing and Boudoir, the Victorian Corridors and Miniature Room and the Stair Hall. The artistic opulence of these very 'public' rooms is overwhelming. Bowhill might be the Border 'home' of the Duke of Buccleuch & Queensbury but one gets the feeling that it is more of an art collection than a 'home' in the world. The private and intimate, while alluded to, are not depicted. It is a very different style of presentation from, for example, Manderston, which as we shall see later, really does appear to be the 'home' of Mr and Mrs Adrian Palmer.

After this 'guide' to the house and its many treasures, there is a whole page about 'The Scotts of Buccleuch' which stresses the long standing connection of the Scotts with Border history and public affairs in general, right up to the present day.

This prepares the way for the next section on 'The Estate'. This section is most interesting in that it deals with issues which are overtly ideological. This section is worth quoting in full, hence the inclusion of a photocopy.
THE ESTATE

Bowhill is much more than a great family home, with a unique art collection in the setting with which it is historically associated; it is also a focal point of an organisation that is widely acknowledged as being a model of dynamic, efficient and progressive rural land management.

Successive Dukes of Buccleuch, even before 1763, when the 3rd Duke enjoyed the tutorship of the celebrated economist, Adam Smith, author of The Wealth of Nations, have traditionally regarded the care and productivity of the land, together with the well-being of everyone upon it, as a primary duty. The 5th Duke, Walter Francis, who was in charge for 65 years in the 19th century, was an outstanding example of an enlightened landowner: but none has excelled the late Duke Walter, who died in 1973.

The present 9th Duke is no exception: trained from an early age by a father who was recognised as a leading exponent of practical land management and a forester of international renown he has the benefit of a sound technical and scientific University grounding. He has combined many active years in the House of Commons with the task of demonstrating that it is on a private agricultural estate, such as this, that the conflict of interests between farming, forestry, conservation, amenity and sport can most successfully be reconciled to the local and national advantage.

The countryside is no playground: it is the nation’s larder and supplier of one of its most essential raw materials – fresh food of the world’s top quality, and timber – the only renewable natural resource in the British Isles. The secret of success lies mainly in recognising the immensely long term nature of land improvement and growing crops that take anything up to 150 years to mature; and then in ensuring the continuity of policies that transcend generations in terms of time and individual farm boundaries in terms of geography. A good landowner sees himself as a life trustee dedicated to the constant improvement of a vital asset to the benefit of everyone concerned, as well as further generations of his own family, on whom the responsibility for future progress rests. Once the links in the chain of continuity are broken, through the irreversible process of the break-up of estates, the merits of multiple land use are lost for ever. The advantage of continuity spanning many generations apply just as much to the families of those who occupy let farms and estate employees. On Buccleuch estates some family partnerships between landlord and tenant go back possibly as far as the 12th century.

In no other industry is long term planning more crucial than in forestry. Even a short rotation of softwoods will give little economic return in less than fifty years; and hardwoods planted in 1980 will hardly reach their best before 2100. The landscape would indeed be desolate today if it were not for the act of faith in the future shown by our forebears. It would be a tragedy for all country lovers henceforth if the present generation is forced to abandon the degree of hope necessary for tree planting; still worse would be the effect on the nation’s finances, for even in 1980 timber, in all forms including pulp and paper, is the second largest single import item costing £1 million every three hours.

Without such financial support as can come from a viable and thriving rural estate, an historic home with its associated art treasures has little hope of surviving intact in an age of penal taxation; but with the record of resilience over the past 900 years of the Scotts of Buccleuch it is to be hoped that Bowhill will not become a dead museum, but be a part of living history with a future.
The Bowhill guidebook is, therefore, very interesting in that it combines several of the themes and illustrates various points made by Wright in On Living in an Old Country, and Bommes and Wright in 'Charms of Residence'. At the centre we can see Heller's extremely ambivalent image of 'home' combined with the equally ambivalent concepts of 'ownership' and 'stewardship'. Bowhill is the private Border 'home' of the Duke of Buccleuch but is also a collection of objets d'art which are of an essentially public nature, in that they are part of 'our' (in this case British) national heritage. However, for the privilege of going to look at these works of art which 'we' 'own' and of which the Duke of Buccleuch is only the 'steward' or 'custodian' we have to part with £1.80! The same principles apply to Buccleuch's relationship with the land. The Duke of Buccleuch 'owns' the lands surrounding Ettrick Forest because they were bestowed upon his ancestors in return for their services to Robert the Bruce in the fourteenth century. At the same time the Duke of Buccleuch is in fact only "a life trustee dedicated to the improvement of a vital asset to the benefit of everyone concerned." The ideology of land and landownership is, therefore, intricately-connected and interwoven with a theory of history in a vernacular and informal sense and with a theory of everyday life.

There is, a dimension to the Bowhill guidebook which Wright's On Living in an Old Country and Bommes and Wright's 'Charms of Residence' fails to take into account. This is the ambivalence in this context of the word 'nation'. While the works of art are part of the British 'national' heritage, the Scotts of Buccleuch obtained the lands surrounding Bowhill as a result of their services to the Norman English-basher, and popular Scottish hero, Robert the Bruce. This is mentioned in the passage I quoted from the Bowhill guidebook in connection with the myth of the buck and the origin of the name Buccleuch. In the guidebook to another of the Scott family's ancestral homes, Drumlanrig Castle in Dumfriesshire, it is raised much more explicitly. We are told how the Douglas motto of 'Forward' honours a death bed wish of Robert the Bruce. Bruce died in 1329 with the unfulfilled wish of
crusading in the Holy Land. Sir James Douglas 'The Good' or 'Black Douglas', was entrusted as bearer of the royal heart on the next crusade. While fighting the Moors in Spain he fell mortally wounded and hurled the silver cabinet containing the heart before him with the cry 'Forward, brave heart'. Thus, "to this day the Douglas motto is 'Forward', and the striking crest of a winged heart surmounted by Bruce's crown is emblazoned all over Drumlanrig in stone, lead, iron, wood and leather" (Drumlanrig Castle, 1984, p.12).

While the present generation of the Scotts of Buccleuch have no intentions of restaging Robert the Bruce's battles in the twentieth century they are certainly not adverse to cashing in on his memory.

(b) Floors Castle

In many ways the guidebook for Floors Castle is similar to that for Bowhill. Slightly larger, it is also glossy and professionally-produced. The front cover is, not surprisingly, an aerial view of Floors against a backcloth of fertile Border countryside. A photograph of Floors Castle in Springtime, when the daffodils are out, forms the inside front cover and first page. Beside the photograph is the family coat of arms and the motto 'Pro Christo Et Patria Duice Pericuum Be Traist' ('Sweet the danger for Christ and country'), although what country the danger is sweet for is not explicitly stated! There is also a paragraph introducing Floors Castle and the Innes Ker family, "situated overlooking the Tweed just outside the town of Kelso, Floors occupies one of the most beautiful sites in Scotland. Very much a family home, it is occupied by the present Duke and Duchess of Roxburghe and their family" (Floors Castle, 1984, inside front cover).

Thus once again we see the emergence of the interrelated themes of the countryside/land; family; and 'home'.
FLOORS CASTLE

Illustration 3
Underneath the photograph of Floors and daffodils (pun unintentional!) is a section about the rather confused history of the building of Floors Castle. Floors Castle was designed and built in 1721 by the architect and Master Builder, William Adam, as a plain Georgian country house. It had no wings and certainly did not resemble the castellated fantasy it is today. This was due to the 6th Duke who, aged 21 and just married, called in the architect W.H. Playfair (1790-1857) to enlarge and embellish the castle. Playfair let his imagination run riot with the result that subsequent generations thought that because of its grand theatrical approach, its wings and castellations, that Sir John Vanburgh had to be the architect. Recent research has shown otherwise, but the ghost of William Adam for many years must have turned in its grave.

Since the time of the 6th Duke, the guidebook stresses that there have been no major external alterations of any note except for the addition of the lodges and main gates in 1929. These were built to the designs of the late Reginald Fairlie (1833-1952). There have, however, been many internal alterations with the 8th Duchess completely remodelling many of the rooms during the first quarter of this century.

We are then taken on a tour of the castle. We are led through the various 'public' rooms - the Entrance Hall, the Ante Room, the Sitting Room, the Drawing Room, the Needle Room, the Ballroom, the Bird Room, the Gallery, the Dining Room and the Basement. One's attention is directed towards the various paintings, including works by Reynolds, Sir Godfrey Kneller, Ramsay, Hogarth and Gainsborough, and other objets d'art. It is an impressive collection, though not quite to the same extent as that at Bowhill.

On display in the Basement are the various documents and letters of the Roxburghe family. These include the Charter of Charles II which vested the estate in the hands of the 1st Earl of Roxburghe, a fascimilie of the Kelso Abbey Charter which granted extensive
areas of land at Kelso to a group of Benedictine monks which in the sixteenth century passed to Sir Robert Ker of Cessford, and a letter written by Mary Queen of Scots. This letter, written by Mary, and dated the 25 September 1566, is a summons to the Laird of Cessford to discuss her forthcoming visit to Jedburgh.

Also on display in the Basement, and forming an interesting contrast to these 'nationally' important historical documents, are a selection of parasols belonging to Duchess May with handles designed and made by Carl Faberge, maker of jewellery for the last Czar of Russia. This juxtaposition of the essentially private and intimate, the frivolous and the decadent, alongside the public and official, the historically-important and the austere, is characteristic of the style in which Floors Castle is presented and portrayed to the public.

Following the guide to the house, there is a section on 'the Garden' with its famous carnations. This stresses how Floors has been famous for its gardens for many years and points out how all the flowers, fruits and vegetables, including asparagus, melons, grapes, peaches and nectarines are produced there. Many plants, etc., are for sale to the visitor all year round.

The final three pages are taken up with a section entitled 'The Earls & Dukes of Roxburghe'. This is a much more 'straight' sort of history than the corresponding section in the Bowhill guidebook, in that it is anecdotal rather than overtly ideological. It takes as its main theme the 'fighting' family past of the Innes Kers. "They were a fighting family and their history is as stirring and romantic as any Scott novel.... The family regularly pushed out the boundaries of their lands and did well out of the dissolution of the abbeys, acquiring Floors at that time" (Floors Castle, p.14).

There are, in the section on 'The Earls & Dukes of Roxburghe', reproductions of the portraits of the various Earls and Dukes of Roxburghe and a photograph of the present Duke and Duchess. The
current Duke is Guy David, who is 10th Duke of Roxburghe and 30th Chief of the Clan Innes. The current Duchess, before her marriage, was Lady Jane Grosvenor, younger daughter of the 5th Duke of Westminster. (Her brother, the 6th Duke of Westminster, is reputedly the richest man in Britain). The back inside cover, like that of Bowhill guidebook, is also taken up with an equally impressive and extended family tree.

The guidebook for Floors Castle, therefore, like the guidebook for Bowhill, does say certain things, both explicitly and implicitly, about Floors Castle and its owners. By means of its mass circulation it firmly establishes them at the level of everyday life. Other mediums such as newspapers and magazine articles, television documentaries, etc., reinforce and develop the themes contained in the guidebooks. An article which appeared in Woman's Own magazine on July 26 1986, when Royal Wedding fever was rampant in England, entitled 'And this is where it all started... ' illustrates this point precisely. To this end it is worth looking at, alongside and in addition to, the guidebook.

The Woman's Own article takes the form of an 'at home' with the Roxburghes and covers three pages. Spread across two is a photograph of "the amazing Floors Castle in Scotland, home to the Duke of Roxburghe and his family. Impressive enough in its own right, its also where Andy went down on bended knee to propose" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p.54). In front of the Castle sit the Duke and Duchess with four dogs. There are also photographs of the Duke and Duchess with their children; one of the Duchess with "seven-year-old Lady Rosanagh Viola Alexandra Innes-Ker (Rosie to practically everyone)," (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p.54) who was to be one of the bridesmaids at the wedding of Prince Andrew and Sarah Ferguson; one of the family at lunch; and one of the family outside. The article describes the Duke and Duchess as "two of the most charming people you could wish to meet" and using the language of everyday life stresses the 'normal' and everyday, underneath the grandness of Floors - the Duke "hurrying between
In 1985 60,000 people visited Floors Castle. This was partly, the Assistant Factor told me when I went to talk to people in the Estate Office, because the Duke of Roxburghe had spent a considerable amount of time encouraging travel companies to include Kelso on their tours. Floors, he explained, is now one of a group of Scottish stately homes known as 'The Grand Tour of Scotland'; which is aimed primarily at overseas tourists. On the Grand Tour of Scotland they are able to take a specially-guided coach tour around some of Scotland's most famous houses, including Floors Castle and Bowhill. This helped swell visitor numbers substantially; from 39,000 in 1984 to 60,000 in 1985. In 1986 the numbers fell to 55,000, due mainly to the reduction in American tourists to Britain. However, the Assistant Factor assured me, this is still a very much higher number than a few years ago.

The guidebook, the Woman's Own article and the interview I had with the Assistant Factor all make the point that, the Duke of Roxburghe is a 'working duke'. The Bowhill guidebook was keen to make the same point about the Duke of Buccleuch. With all the various Roxburghe enterprises, it is stressed that the Duke has a full-time job. In addition to actually opening the Castle to the public, there are the Floors Castle gift shop, garden centre and what is regarded as the best stately-home restaurant in Britain to run, plus the stud farm and hiring out river and moor for fishing and shooting parties. In addition, the Duke owns a first-rate country hole, 'Sunlaws', near Kelso at which King Hussein and Queen Noor of Jordan spent a holiday in 1985 and where, every six months, the Duke treats his fifty farm tenants to a 'rent lunch'. Incidentally, the Assistant Factor thought that the Duke of Roxburghe was the only local landowner who kept up this tradition. In his spare time, the Duke, as Chairman of the Scottish Wildlife Appeal, is also busy trying to protect wildlife and particular areas 'under threat'. Apparently the Duke of Roxburghe does not even hanker for the old days when the Castle doors were opened
just once a year for charity. In the Woman's Own article he is, for example, quoted as saying:

You've got to have a purpose in life, and running this estate, and whatever projects I get involved in is mine. The role of the working Duke is much more important than the one of the Duke who sits in the sun. I would find that sort of life much more difficult to justify, or even exist in (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p. 56).

He does, however, concede that this is not just because he suffers from an overdose of the Protestant Ethic. "To be fair, the economic climate has forced the change from the old days as much as anything" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p. 56). Faced with the fact that Floors costs £100,000 a year just to maintain it seems as if there is more than a grain of truth in this. However, the Assistant Factor was quick to stress, when I asked him about this point, that while:

The high maintenance costs of the Castle were a primary reason for opening Floors to the public in order that the revenue from the castle opening could help to defray these costs but added to this was a willingness to allow the public access to enjoy the many treasures the castle contains.

All in all the Duke of Roxburghe accepts that annual maintenance bills of massive proportions are all part and parcel of being lucky enough to live in a place like Floors Castle. "I feel more and more that anybody lucky enough to live in a place like this, in such beautiful countryside, has an obligation to share that heritage with everyone" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p. 56). The Duchess, however, is apparently sometimes tempted by the thought of "a six-bedroomed house that doesn't leak" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p. 56).

In the Woman's Own article the ideology of stewardship is also present. The Duchess is frightened that the children will "get a bit grand if they think that life is one long castle and they imagine they're a bit more special because they don't live in a council house" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p. 56). Daughter Rosie is apparently "slightly aware already" and so has been told by her
mother that "the castle is not really our house but something we have to look after, and we're very lucky to be living here" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p.56).

The contradictions and conflicts contained within the notions of ownership and stewardship become obvious when, having been told that Floors Castle really belongs to 'us', 'we' decide to make ourselves at home. At Floors Castle this is particularly easy for the Roxburghes' living-room and dining room are adjacent to the rooms that are open to the public. The Duchess finds this rather a strain. "Most of the visitors are very considerate, though it gets a bit much when a head pops round the door to ask who's winning at Wimbledon" (Woman's Own, 26/7/86, p.56).

There are many similarities in the ways Bowhill and Floors Castle are depicted. The words 'us' and 'heritage' are, for both the Scotts of Buccleuch and the Innes-Kers of Roxburghe, ambivalent but essentially unproblematic. 'Us' as a category can be either Scottish or English, and 'heritage', likewise, can be Scottish, English or British heritage. The three are for such individuals, to a large extent, interchangeable. The Buccleuchs and the Roxburghes have, since 1603, moved equally comfortably in both Scottish and English circles and are prepared to wear whichever cap is required at the time.

There are, however, also slight differences of emphasis in terms of themes and style, and in the mode of presentation. Firstly, Bowhill, while a 'home', is presented in what are, essentially, public terms. It is portrayed as far more than just a family home. It is an art collection and a working model of "dynamic, efficient and progressive rural land management" (Bowhill, 1981, p.23). In short Bowhill is presented in a style which is rather public, impersonal and austere, while Floors Castle is presented in the more intimate and decadent terms of everyday life. Secondly, the Bowhill guidebook addresses the concepts of stewardship and ownership in an overt and explicit way, while the Floors Castle guidebook is much more anecdotal. The Scotts of Buccleuch, via the
medium of the guidebook, are also far more prepared to summon up
ghosts, such as the ghost of Robert the Bruce, from the Scottish
past.

This difference in style is also reflected in the way the two
estates deal with publicity and queries. I started-off by writing
a standard letter to all the stately homes I was interested in,
saying that I was a postgraduate student at Edinburgh University,
doing research into, amongst other things, stately homes in the
Scottish Borders. I asked if they would send me copies of their
guidebooks and any other publications. I added that I would be
happy to reimburse them if they enclosed a note informing me of
the amount owed. Floors Castle sent, along with a copy of their
guidebook and restaurant menu, a letter saying I could have it
with their compliments on the condition that I told my friends to
visit the Castle! The people in the Estate Office at Floors were
also helpful, inviting me down to talk to the Assistant Factor
over coffee, being prepared to answer my questions and expressing
a wish to read the finished product. Bowhill, on the other hand,
just sent the guidebook and a brief note saying, 'Good luck with
your research', and asking for £1.20 to cover the cost plus
postage!

(c) Mellerstain

Mellerstain - Gordon, Berwickshire, "Home of Lord and Lady
Binning" (Mellerstain, 1985, front cover) can be dealt with fairly
summarily. One of Scotland's great Adam houses it was built in two
stages - the two wings in 1725 by William Adam, the bona fide
architect of Floors Castle, and the large central block between
1770-1778 by his famous son, Robert.

In some ways the guidebook is similar to those for Bowhill, and
Floors Castle. It is professionally-produced and the front and
back covers are views of the house. On the inside front cover is a
picture of the Stone Hall and on the inside back cover a family
tree.
MELLERSTAIN
GORDON, BERWICKSHIRE

Home of Lord and Lady Binning

Illustration 4
The guidebook follows the usual pattern of being a guide to the public rooms, paintings, furniture, other objets d'art and the gardens. We are taken through the Stone Hall and Small Sitting Room, into the Library, from there to the Music Room, the Drawing Room, the Small Drawing Room and the Small Library, the West Corridor and Main Staircase, the Rose Bedroom, the Manchineel Bedroom, the Blue Bedroom, the Green Bedroom, to the Gallery Staircase and Ante-Room, into the Great Gallery and the Inner Hall and finally to the Front Hall. Once again paintings and furniture of interest and value are pointed out in each room. The list is by no means as impressive as those at Bowhill and Floors Castle but does include paintings by, amongst others, Ramsay, Raeburn, Van Dyck, Van Ruysdael and Gainsborough. Our attention is also drawn to the Gothic-style ceiling of the Small Sitting Room and its fireplace; both by Robert Adam. Adam designed pier glass and table; Queen Anne chairs; a George II mahogany reading table; a Regency rosewood card table; and a Strasburg faience turkey tureen dating from c.1755, to name but a few things.

After we have been through the Front Hall our attention is drawn to the Terrace Gardens which were laid out in 1909 and are situated on the south side of the house. They stand at 600 feet above sea level and command a glorious view across to the Cheviot Hills. In between lies the lake with its swans, Canada geese and other wildfowl. The Gardens, which were designed by Sir Reginald Bloomfield are described as "a lovely and noble composition, seemingly reaching to infinity" (Mellerstain, 1985, p.13).

There then follows a section entitled 'A Short History of Mellerstain', written by James Laver. It stresses the long, at least five hundred year, entanglement of the Baillies of Mellerstain with Scottish 'national' history. Like the Floors Castle guidebook it is anecdotal, but not obviously ideological. There is also no discussion about 'the Estate' and the role of the private landowner.
Thus the Mellerstain guidebook is like a rather watered-down version of the ones for Bowhill, Drumlanrig and Floors Castle. This could well be because the Baillies of Mellerstain are not quite as dynamic and effervescent in Border/Scottish history as the Scotts of Buccleuch and the Earls and Dukes of Roxburghe. Lord Binning, Earl of Haddington, is not for a start, in the same acreage bracket as Buccleuch and Roxburghe. He does not even appear in MacEwen's table of the top one hundred landowners in Scotland. Was it maybe out of genuine economic necessity that I was asked for 80p to cover the cost of the guidebook?

(d) Xanderston

Xanderston, as I have said, is interesting in that it is not really a stately home at all but masquerades as one. It opens to the public throughout the summer season, and produces a guidebook complete with embryonic family trees.

The Mansderston guidebook is similar to the Bowhill, Floors Castle and Mellerstain guidebooks in that it is glossy and professionally-produced, with a close-up photograph of the house on the front cover and a picture of the gardens on the back. It is, however, rather different in style, tone and themes.

On the inside front cover there is a photograph of the owner, Mr Adrian Palmer with his family and a personal 'welcome' to their home. In this respect also there are similarities with the other guidebooks, but the emphasis placed on the word 'home' is much stronger. Xanderston is not as old as the other Border stately homes but, Mr Adrian Palmer is keen to point out, it is still unique and as such worth visiting. In this respect the 'Welcome' message is worth quoting in full:

We are very pleased to welcome you to Xanderston, which is our home and in which members of our family have lived almost continually since 1855. It has been described as the finest Edwardian country house in Britain and it is perhaps remarkable that almost everything you see here is less than a hundred years old. This is also true of the pictures. Sir James Miller intended the house to be furnished with great
Manderston
works and indeed at times paid the price for such. However, it is now thought that almost all the pictures are superb reproductions.

When you have looked over the house, upstairs and downstairs in every sense of the word - the magnificent stables, the gardens and the marble dairy with its unusual tower, we hope you will agree with us that Manderston has something special to offer the visitor and that it is unique' (Manderston, undated, inside front cover).

The 'Welcome' message is followed by a series of black-and-white photographs. These are of Manderston before and during the rebuilding in Spring 1903.

Manderston, we are told, was originally a house of the 1790s, built by Dalhousie Weatherstone. In 1855, the estate was bought by Richard Miller, who died five years later. It was bought in 1864 by his elder brother, William, who was the great-great-grandfather of Adrian Palmer and who, although aspiring to the ideal of the country house, remained a Liberal in politics. William Miller made a fortune from trading with Russia in hemp and herring. He was honorary British Consul at St. Petersburg for sixteen years. When he returned he became a Liberal Member of Parliament for Leith and was later elected to represent Berwickshire. Gladstone made him a baronet in 1874 in return for his support. Thus although Adrian Palmer's family tree is much shorter than that of the Buccleuchs, Roxburghes and Binnings, and is not accompanied by heraldic crests, the way he portrays his family history is no less ideological. For the story of Adrian Palmer's family is told in such a way that it stresses another aspect of Scottish culture - the idea of the self-made man. Adrian Palmer's great-great grandfather is the personification of the democratic myth.

After the photographs of Manderston there is a black-and-white photograph of Sir James Miller, Sir William Miller's second son who became the heir when William, the eldest son, died at Eton; choking on a cherry stone. There follows a short account of Sir James's life and ambitions for improving Mellerstain. Due to his
love of entertaining, Sir James concentrated on interior comforts
and kept the exterior rather severe.

The guidebook is punctuated with witty comments, for example, the
quip about the family motto 'Omnia Borrum Superme' which is
displayed on a coat of arms above the front door. The motto means
'all good things come from above' and it is pointed out that this
is "ironic perhaps, when the family fortunes came from herrings -
from below!" (Manderston, p.2).

The Manderston guidebook, like the house itself, is rather unusual
in that, apart from being a guide to the great rooms, furniture
and objets d'art it also features the kitchen, scullery and
stables, the marble dairy and tower and the head gardener's house.
It contains photographs of the servants and points out how
Manderston was considered to be a good house to work for, not
least because of the high standard of accommodation it offered its
employees. It lists as one of its greatest achievements the fact
that it was one of the first houses to provide bedside lights
which were controllable from the bed. This is hardly the stuff out
of which the other guidebooks are made!

It is perhaps hardly surprising that Mr Adrian Palmer did not
charge me for the cost of the guidebook plus postage. Instead of
getting his secretary to reply, he wrote back himself giving
further references to Manderston in Country Life, and telling me
not to hesitate to let him know should I require any further
information.

(e) Gosford House

Gosford House, as the Earl of Wemyss did not hesitate to correct
an ill-informed Englisher, is not in the Borders but in East
Lothian. Why then, one may ask include it at all? There are
several reasons. Firstly, it belongs to the Earl of Wemyss whose
family (today represented by the Countess of Dysart) own 16,000
acres of land in Peeblesshire (MacEwen, 1977, p.73), including
GOSFORD HOUSE
East Lothian

Celebrated Marble Hall & Picture Gallery
Ornamental waters with wildfowl.

OPEN
Wednesdays, Saturdays & Sundays
JUNE and JULY, 2 p.m.–5 p.m.
(OTHER DAYS BY APPOINTMENT)

Location: On A 198 between Aberlady and Longniddry

Illustration 6
Neidpath Castle which he describes as "a small but stately home." In reality it is neither stately or homely, but that is another story. Secondly, and most importantly, my supervisors and I were given a special, informal tour by the Earl himself one bleak January day in the winter of 1987. It is a day that the three of us will never forget! Personal guided-tour apart let us consider how Gosford House is presented to the average, paying punter.

The 'guide', which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a 'guidebook', to Gosford House is basically two sheets of A4 stapled together. It is home-produced and free of charge. Consequently the Gosford House 'guide' does not take the form of a guided-tour through the house. There are no glossy photos, no great long lists of art treasures, furnishings etc. There is information on the family but no 'family tree' and heraldic shield. There is certainly no ideological spiel about the role of the landowner, and certainly no attempt to 'sell' the house to the visitor. This is reflected also by the number of days Gosford House is open - Wednesdays, Saturdays and Sundays during June and July, 2 p.m. - 5 p.m. and on other days by appointment. In contrast, the other stately homes such as Bowhill and Floors are open most days, and for much longer hours, between Easter and October.

The first sheet of paper is entitled 'Brief History and Description'. It tells us that the Wemyss-Charteris family were already established in East Lothian at Amisfield, just east of Haddington, when they acquired "the small estate of Gosford (Goose-ford) in 1781, allegedly to come close to good golfing grounds" (Gosford House, undated, p.1). Here they set about building the present house to the design of Robert Adam.

The young Duke of Rutland approved of the design of the house but not its location. Writing in 1796, when only the shell of the house was completed, he commented, "its situation is objectionable in the highest degree: a barren rabbit warren on a sandy shore
stretching on all sides and the country around being totally destitute of wood or fertilisation" (Gosford House, p.1).

Lady Louisa Stuart, daughter of the 3rd Earl of Bute, (a former Prime Minister), was not even happy with the plan. Writing in 1799 she had this to say:

... there is a Corps-de-logis and two great paritions, all with domes, so at a distance it looks like three great ovens but the front is really a very pretty one. They say the plan is absurd: three rooms in the middle of fifty feet long, each lighted with one huge Venetian window and unconnected with the rest (Gosford House, p.1).

By 1808 the trees, planted at the time the Duke of Rutland was writing, had grown and "Ainslie's map showing the house and pleasure grounds in 1808 certainly no longer suggest desolation" (Gosford House, p.1). Robert Adam's original plan of the house was eventually altered. The three great west windows were enlarged in order to give better light for the 7th Earl's great collection of pictures.

In addition to the Duke of Rutland loathing the location and Lady Louisa Stuart criticising the plan, Gosford House does not appear to have been particularly liked by the Earls. It was completed in 1800 but the 7th Earl never lived in it because he found it too damp. This is quite likely, because as the current Earl points out, "the Craigie Quarry west of Dundee, from which it seems likely the stone was bought, is today largely filled with sea-water" (Gosford House, p.1).

The 8th Earl succeeded his grandfather in 1808. He did not like the house either, "preferring to live at Amisfield or Old Gosford House which had been built in the 17th Century." Such was this Earl's dislike of Gosford House that "he used the main rooms in the new house to hang his pictures, and pulled down the wings, or pavillons, at each end, leaving the centre block unsupported for more than fifty years" (Gosford House, p.1).
In 1853 he was succeeded by Francis, 'the Hunting Earl', who was prepared to go to the extent of demolishing the house. He was dissuaded from doing so by his son, who succeeded to the title in 1883. Here at last Gosford House found favour with an Earl. The 10th Earl restored the missing wings to a design by William Young. He was not prepared to settle for second best and only accepted the designs after the third plan had been submitted to him. In 1890, the 10th Earl and his large family moved into Gosford House.

In addition to loving Gosford, the 10th Earl had a passion for art. He collected many paintings and had a particular love of the Italian Renaissance. He is described as 'a genuine collector', who purchased pictures which he admired, regardless of the vagaries of fashion. He did not employ agents, disapproving of any collector who "bought through other men's eyes and paid through his own nose" (Gosford House, p.2).

The 10th Earl died in 1914 and until 1951 the house was only used intermittently. At one point it was run as a hotel. During World War Two it was requisitioned by the Army. Part of the central block was gutted by fire in 1940. In 1948 the roof of the north wing was largely taken-off when extensive dry rot was discovered.

The family returned to Gosford in 1951 (the 12th Earl having inherited from his grandfather in 1937) and it was decided to make the undamaged south wing into the inhabited part of the house. Fortunately nearly all the contents of the house had been stored there during the war. The south part of the house which is still the inhabited part of the house, has "its own entrance front and courtyard and containing unusually proportioned rooms" (Gosford House, p.2).

There then follows more than half a side on the architectural features of the house. These include the Marble Hall three storeys high, with its elaborate fireplace and use of palaster colonnades. The Marble Hall reflects "the strong Italianate taste of the 10th Earl" (Gosford House, p.2). A Palladian screen of Venetian windows
and a magnificent double staircase separates the gallery to which it rises from the hall. The plaster work by Jackson is Italianate in style also.

The Marble Hall at Gosford House is firmly fixed in my mind not so much because of its architectural merit but because of a dying lemon tree and my supervisor. Let me explain.

Our own misguided tour took place one January afternoon during the winter of 1987. My supervisors and I arrived at Gosford House and foolhardily left our coats in the car. By the time we were shown the Marble Hall I was seriously concerned about the health of my one supervisor who, in addition to suffering from a heavy cold, was beginning to turn a most unnatural shade of blue. The Earl of Wemyss, however, appeared to be oblivious to the man changing colour in front of him. Perhaps he simply thought that my supervisor had blue blood. He was in any case far more concerned with the welfare of a sorry-looking lemon tree which stood dying at the foot of the celebrated marble staircase. "I just don't know why," he exclaimed, "but it doesn't seem to like it in here!"

That visit to Gosford House is firmly engrained in all of our memories. The Earl obviously enjoyed it because he was very keen to show us around Neidpath Castle the following week. When he suggested it we made polite noises and asked if we could possibly have a look at the pleasure gardens. During an emergency circulatory revival jog around the stately grounds a student/supervisors' conference was held. We decided that it would be in our own best, if not the 'national', interests to change tactics and invite him up to Edinburgh instead. In future we decided that we would interview lairds over lunch in the Staff Club and save stately-home visiting for the proper season.

The Earl was initially rather disappointed that we would not be going to Neidpath Castle. He brightened up, however, when we invited him up to Edinburgh talk to us about it. Over lunch in the Staff Club I asked the Earl why there was not a glossy guidebook
for Gosford House and why he did not try to 'sell it' to the public. I also asked if he had considered giving it to the National Trust for Scotland of which he is President. The Earl's answers were very interesting for they reveal a clear understanding of the difference between 'history' and 'heritage' and an intense dislike of the superficiality and commerciality of the latter.

As President of the National Trust for Scotland, 'history' and 'heritage' are both words which are very important to the Earl of Wemyss. The Earl does not think that we pay too much attention to history or heritage in the form of 'the past' because, he argued, the past directly shapes and influences the present. He is particularly conscious of this in relation to the land and is quick to point out that the National Trust for Scotland is not just concerned with country houses but with the land; for example, encouraging people in the north of Scotland to go back to the land. It is also, he stressed concerned with protecting and preserving the coastline in the form of the 'Operation Neptune' project. He also argued that, if possible, a stately home/estate should remain in the hands of the original, private owners rather than be taken over by the National Trust for Scotland. This is due to his firmly held belief that the traditional nobleman/aristocratic landowner, because of his 'traditional' education, his wider outlook, and his continuity with the past and previous generations, is in a better position than anyone else to protect and preserve it for the benefit of future generations.

One of the most interesting points to emerge from our discussion was the fact that the Earl of Wemyss expressed a dislike of the way in which many of the privately-owned stately homes are run as commercial enterprises. He regards the entrepreneurial lairds as rather insincere, playing lip service to what he regards as a genuine 'heritage' when all they are really interested in are the economic advantages. This was reinforced when I asked him about his attitude to politics. The Earl said that in the House of Lords he still sits on the Tory benches, but that this is out of habit
rather than anything else. He expressed an intense dislike of Mrs Thatcher on the grounds that she is 'too dogmatic, capitalistic and commercially-minded, and has no sense of noblesse oblige. Following this, he added that he was at the time working with Judy Steel, wife of David Steel, in connection with Neidpath Castle and 'The Ballad of Tam Linn'. He did not, however, add that this was where his political sympathies now lay. It was not, we felt, our place to ask!

(f) Traquair

The Traquair guidebook is about the same size as the guidebook for Bowhill, Floors Castle, Mellerstain and Kanderston, and it is like these in that there is a picture of Traquair House on the front, on a sunny spring day with a view of the hills beyond, and a close-up of the famous Bear Gates on the back. It soon becomes obvious, however, that the Traquair guidebook is different in style, theme and contents from the other guidebooks. For a start the inside back cover contains, not the usual family tree, (this forms a double page centre spread), but two photographs, one of the "author, brewer and Laird Peter Maxwell Stuart" in the Traquair Brewhouse, and the other a photograph of the Old Laundry. More importantly, however, is the photograph on the inside front cover of the carved oak door at the bottom of the stairs with its Scottish unicorn and English lion locked in combat.

It is immediately apparent that Traquair is different. Its selling point is not an art collection, nor the fact that it is a family 'home'. Rather it is a monument to, and a celebration of, its own history, a history which has not been purged of political tensions, and a history which, the 20th Laird would like us to believe, is not yet over. The guidebook which is described as an 'historical survey', written by the Laird himself, is "not intended to be a room-by-room guide to the house and its contents but a glimpse into its history, tracing year by year, century by century, the life and times of the people who lived there" (Traquair House, 1981).
THE OLDEST INHABITED HOUSE IN SCOTLAND

Illustration 7
Thus while we are led through the house room by room (and in this way Traquair follows the pattern of the other Border stately homes), the objects of interest we are told to look at are not objets d'art but totems of Catholicism and Jacobitism. They include such things as the rosary, crucifix and purse belonging to Mary Queen of Scots; the cradle in which she nursed her infant son James VI of Scotland and I of England; the silk quilt which she and her 'Four Maryes' worked; letters bearing her signature; and the armorial in oak with the Queen's cipher honouring her visit to Traquair in 1566. We are shown the secret staircase which was used as an escape route for Catholic priests, and later for Jacobite refugees, and told the story of the famous Bear Gates which "were closed one late autumn day in 1745 by the fifth Earl after wishing his guest - Prince Charles Edward Stuart, a safe journey, with the promise that the Gates would not be reopened until the Stuarts were returned to the Throne" (Traquair House, 1981).

The Traquair guidebook is, therefore, rather different to the other guidebooks with the exception of Manderston. Adrian Palmer 'welcomes' the visitor to Manderston and one gets the feeling, from the tone of the guidebook, that he had at least a hand in the writing of it. This is not so for the Bowhill, Floors and Mellerstain guidebooks. These appear to have been written by agents employed by the various families. On the other hand the 'guide' for Gosford House, is written in a fairly impersonal style and even though it does not say that the author is the Earl of Wemyss, because of its home-made character it is obvious that it was written by the Earl of Wemyss himself. The guidebook/historical survey for Traquair, however, combines a personal tone, reflected by the 'welcome' on the second page and photos of the Laird and his wife and daughter Catherine, celebrating her 21st birthday with a bottle of 'Catherine's Brew', with being a professionally-produced product. The commerciality is also there with the Laird's invitation to try Traquair Ale and sample the restaurant food which is, of course, home-made! There is also a well-stocked gift shop where one can buy, along with Traquair Ale, postcards condemning the sinking of the Belgrano.
The history of Traquair as told by the Laird is very detailed. One wonders just how much of it the average punter is able to take in. There are in fact two 'histories'. It is interesting that the first history he wrote in 1966 ended at 1745. In 1981 he goes beyond the Forty-Five. His reasons for ending the first history at 1745 were because 1745, "marks the end of an era in Scottish history and the final shattering of hopes for a lost Stuart dynasty." It is almost as if nothing that has happened since matters much.

The substance of his history before 1745 is very different to his account after this date. This, he says, is because:

It was all very different from earlier times when, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the house was a centre of political power and influence, and Traquair played host to Royalty and the influential men and women of the time. Its lands which in the seventeenth century extended over three Border counties had shrunk to a small fraction of their former size by 1800. The reason was not difficult to determine, the family had simply taken the wrong side both in religion and politics. They were Catholics and Jacobites, thus the house became a living symbol in stone and mortar of lost causes (Traquair House, 1981).

Peter Maxwell Stuart's history of Traquair up until 1745 is as detailed and comprehensive as anything one would find in a school history book. There is far too much to digest during a visit to Traquair. It is, rather the type of thing one takes away to read at a later date.

Amidst all the historical detail two key themes can be picked out. The first of these is the fact that the House of Traquair was always a victim of changing political circumstances. When the Scotts of Buccleuch were being given their lands as a result of their services to Robert the Bruce, Traquair was returned to the Crown. For the next one hundred and fifty years it passed through a number of families, reverting to the Crown at various intervals. When James III of Scotland succeeded in 1460 he gave Traquair to Robert Lord Boyd and then to his 'Master of Music', William Rogers. Rogers sold Traquair and all its lands to the king's uncle.
the (Stuart) Earl of Buchan, 'Hearty James', in 1478 for the paltry sum of 70 Scots Merks. The deeds of sale are exhibited in the Museum Room. They were to be paid in two installments. Four years later the Earl of Buchan was to be one of the group of nobles who hung Rogers and several others from Lauder Bridge. Thus, "as swiftly as the political, climate changed so did the ownership of Traquair."

The second and related theme is the idea of the rightful king, as represented by the 'lost Stuart dynasty'. Peter Maxwell Stuart is proud of the fact that he is descended from James Stuart, the 1st Laird of Traquair who fell alongside King James IV on Flodden Field in 1513 because:

Through his parents there was a close, indeed double relationship with the Crown. His grandfather was Sir James Stuart 'The Black Knight of Lorn', descended from the hereditary Lord High Stuart of Scotland and his grandmother was Joanna Beaufort the widowed Queen of James I (Traquair House, 1981).

The Jacobite Rising of 1745 marks the end of Peter Maxwell Stuart's 1966 history. In 1981, he extended the history past this date and concentrates on "the other story behind the list of names and dates" and offers "just a few glimpses, a series of historical snapshots as it were, into the life of this great house and the people who lived there." In other words there is a movement away from major historical issues and into the more mundane world of everyday life.

Peter Maxwell Stuart's 'snapshots' include "a link between the Old World and the New" in the form of an elopement between the 6th Earl's daughter, Lady Christina and a young American law student, Cyrus Griffin, who went on to play an important part in the events leading up to the Declaration of Independence. Another 'historical snapshot' is an entry in the diary of Mary Ravenscroft, wife of the 7th Earl. On attending a County ball in Peebles Lady Traquair commented on what the other ladies wore and then wrote "Lady Traquair in her green riding habit, no riding dress but Lady T's
there." As she mentions wearing this particular habit on many social occasions it suggests she was, the 20th Laird argues, a lady of rather limited personal means. Yet another 'snapshot' is of "the rather curious, somewhat eccentric and shy character of Charles, the eighth and last Earl." This particular Earl was a confirmed bachelor and "he grew so tired of his family's efforts at matchmaking that he deterred likely female suitors by placing stinging nettles in their beds!"

Of his two-part 'historical survey' Peter Maxwell-Stuart says:

This is the story of a house and of the people who lived there, moulded it and gave it character, a story that can only be told here in brief, for to tell it all would mean at least one volume, perhaps many more. And the reason for this is that it covers eight centuries; centuries of blood, strife and intrigue but also of peaceful progress and quiet family life, eight centuries in fact of Scottish political and domestic history (Traquair House, 1981).

In other words the history of Traquair covers both the official, 'nationally' important public world and the private, intimate world of everyday life.

Traquair House, as a monument to the lost causes of Catholicism and Jacobitism, is on the surface the epitome of Neal Ascherson's past that is not yet over, a past that does not reek of intellectual formaldehyde but is instead constantly being rearticulated. It is tempting to see Traquair as such, and indeed it would make a convenient end to this chapter if it was. The 20th Laird's own words, however, give the game away. "Causes in history especially ones that failed, carry with them a certain air of mystery and romance and this is certainly preserved at Traquair." This sense of mystery and romance will in fact be commercially exploited until, in the words of W.H. Ogilvie, the rightful King
TILL THE KING RETURNS

The wild rose twines on the gateway there,
The green weed grows and the bramble clings,
Barring the road to thy hearth, Traquair,
With the loyal hands of the earth's green things;
The wind through the rusted iron sings,
The sun on the self-sown tangle burns,
But never a hoof on the roadway rings -
The gate is shut till the King returns.

I had a lover, gallant and fair -
Ah! nought but sorrow the memory brings! -
I opened my heart to him, everywhere
He was my guest, and his right a king's;
But lightly his love at the last took wings
Flying away with the hawks and the herons,
And a gate no more on its hinges swings -
My heart is shut till my king returns.

W.H. Ogilvie.
Four major points emerge from my analysis of the privately-owned and commercially-run Border stately-home industry. Firstly, the stately-home industry I have described and analysed represents an attempt by Border lairds to make their presence felt in the everyday life of the Borders, following the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974; which saw the end of their direct involvement in local politics. Secondly, and closely related to this, the stately-home industry represents an attempt by modern-day Border lairds, in a world dominated by legal/rational authority to achieve legitimation by tradition. Thirdly, the concept of 'micro-heritage' as expounded by Bommes and Wright provides a useful way of looking at these issues. It does, however, have to be modified in order to take into account the fact that in Scotland there are a diversity of 'micro-heritages' operating at the local level, but that these do not so much represent tensions between the 'local' and the 'national' level, as tensions between the Scottish and Anglo-British 'national' levels.

The fourth and final point to emerge is that the history/heritage distinction which is complicated in an English context is far more complex when applied to Scotland. For in Scotland there are always the questions 'whose history?' and 'whose heritage?'. Bowhill, Floors Castle and Mellerstain perhaps most clearly represent the deterioration of history into heritage, along the lines of the English model. This is partly because since 1603 these Scottish aristocrats have been peers of the British realm. Manderston aspires to the Bowhill, Floors Castle and Mellerstain model. It fails, however, to stink of 'heritage' because it has no 'history' to bastardise. The Earl of Wemyss and the 20th Laird of Traquair see themselves as champions of 'history' rather than as captains of the heritage industry. The Earl of Wemyss is actively opposed to the commercialisation of history that Bowhill, Floors Castle and Mellerstain represent. Peter Maxwell Stuart, meanwhile,
considers himself a historian of lost causes. By running Traquair House as a business, along the same lines as Bowhill, Floors Castle and Mellerstain, the 20th Laird is, however, determined that these lost causes will pay for themselves.

"What we call the beginning," T.S. Eliot informs us. "Is often the end" while "to make an end is to make a beginning" ('Little Giding'). It is at this point that we have to go back to the Introduction and to the figure of Sir Walter Scott. Scott is T.S. Eliot's 'objective correlative', the central feeling observer who sees and suffers all. He is one of Gramsci's 'organic intellectuals'. He is in fact the key to this thesis.

Scott is so crucially important because he was ultimately responsible for the whole history/heritage distinction upon which, not only Chapter Nine, but the entire thesis hangs. Scott strove to make Scottish history a serious academic discipline. Instead he succeeded in making the emotional trappings and wrappings of the Scottish past, what we today call 'the heritage industry', into big business. To this end Abbotsford, Scott's house on the banks of the Tweed, just outside Galashiels, which has been open to the fee-paying public since 1833, is both a monument to Scottish history and a profitable part of the Scottish heritage industry.

Marinell Ash's final words in The Strange Death of Scottish History are, "what Scott had hoped for was to propagate and foster an historical consciousness with which all parts of Scotland could identify. What the Scots grew and planted for themselves from Scott's plantation was a succession of historical kailyards" (1980, p.152). This plantation it seems, is bearing fruit in the Scottish Borders in the last quarter of the twentieth century, in the form of the privately-owned and commercially-run stately-home industry.

Ash's critique is penetrating and perceptive. It is, however, unduly pessimistic. The very fact that Scott failed "to propagate and foster an historical consciousness with which all parts of
Scotland could identify" (1980, p.152) has turned out to be a blessing. It means that Scotland's past has not been usurped by Druids, captured and conscripted into servility and senility, but retains a sense of energy and vitality and the potential for change. "Scottish history", Ascherson informs us, "was only safe for the historian or novelist to approach and touch when it was certain that the beast's limbs, the Cameronian tradition, for example, had finally lost the power of movement" (1988, p.64). Scott failed to slay the beast and left a wounded, angry, but very much alive, monster lurking around in the dark. By doing so he has possibly ensured Scotland's release from the iron cage of Thatcherism. For "live Scottish history was to be feared. People might act upon it, imperilling the stable order of the present" (Ascherson, 1988, p.64).
Appendices

Explanatory Remarks

These appendices are compiled from a variety of different sources and are the result of a considerable amount of detective work. While it was relatively easy to obtain information for the parliamentary section, it proved much more difficult to do the same for local politics/local government. Thus the appendices pertaining to county government (1, 2, 3, 5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b) in which I focus on either one county, (1, 2, 3) or one year (5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b), are not as complete or as comprehensive as I would have liked. They do, however, illustrate the general point that until the reorganisation of Scottish local government in 1974 Border landowners were directly involved in local politics/government.
APPENDIX 1

The Sheriffs of the County of Selkirk

(a) Hereditary sheriffs prior to 1745

The Murrays of Philiphaugh.

(b) The Sheriff Deputies of Selkirkshire 1748-1886

"On the 25th March, 1748, the office of sheriff merged in the Crown, which was empowered to appoint a Sheriff Depute for each county, who was to be an advocate of at least three years standing" (Craig-Brown, 1886, p.233).

From 1748 until the reforms of 1877, which bestowed upon the Sheriff Substitute most of the local duties that had been assigned to the Sheriff Depute in 1748, the Sheriff Depute was the most important individual in Scottish county government. He was the link between the county and the government. The Sheriff Deputies of the County of Selkirk for this period were:

1748 George Sinclair, advocate
1751 Andrew Pringle, afterwards Lord Alemoor
1755 William Scott of Woll, on Mr Pringle's appointment as Solicitor-General
1785 Andrew Plummer of Middlestead, on Mr Scott's decease
1799 Walter Scott, Advocate, afterwards Sir Walter Scott of Abbotsford, Baronet
1832 Thomas Hamilton Miller, appointed (10th August) "to act as Sheriff during the incapacity of Sir Walter Scott, or until his resignation" (Craig-Brown, 1886, p.234).
1843 James Miller, Advocate
1844 George Dundas, appointed Judge of Session, 1868
1868 William Oliver Rutherford, Sheriff of Roxburgh, became
Sheriff of Selkirkshire

1868 (December) George Handasyde Patterson, Advocate, became Sheriff of Selkirk, Roxburgh, and Berwick

1886 John Cheyne, B.A., advocate, became Sheriff of the three counties

*This was a response to the reforms of 1877 which had made the Sheriff Substitute the official in charge of the day to day running of county affairs. From then on the Sheriff Deputes' role became much more honorific.

(c) The Sheriff's Substitutes of Selkirkshire 1847-1989

After the reforms of 1877, involving the office of Sheriff Substitute, it was the Sheriff Substitute who became the most important individual in county affairs. It is interesting to note that, thirty years before these reforms took place, the County of Selkirk had qualified advocates as Sheriff Substitutes.

1847 F. Somerville, advocate
1862 J.S. Milne, advocate
1885 Charles Grey Spittal, advocate
1892 Ebenezer Erskine Harper, advocate
1900 Patrick Smith, LL.B., advocate
1930 W. Mitchell, K.C.
1937 K.D. Cullen
1942 A.G. Walker
1945 Joseph Smart
1952 J. Aikman Smith
1957 Donald McLeod
1968 Isobel Sinclair
1976- James Patterson

APPENDIX 2

The Commissioners of Supply for the County of Roxburgh, 1858-1921

The Borders Region Library H.Q. has the Commissioners of Supply Records for the County of Roxburgh from 1858-1921. The appearance of a number in brackets at random points in the lists denotes the number of commissioners in that particular year. In this way it is possible to see how the Commissions declined in size. In 1858, for example, there were 238 commissioners. By 1921, thirty two years after the 1889 reform of local government had assigned to the new county councils many of the important duties of the Commissions of Supply, there were less than 75. In compiling this appendix I have extracted from the lists only the names of commissioners with titles, and in the order that they appear on the lists. As can be seen the traditional pecking order of duke, marquess and earl are observed.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

D of B = Duke of Buccleuch; D of R = Duke of Roxburghe; M of L = Marquis of Lothian; M of T = Marquis of Tweeddale; E Bu = Earl of Buchan; E of La = Earl of Lauderdale; L Ca = Lord Campbell; L Pw = Lord Polwarth; L Som = Lord Somerville; L Va = Lord Ward; L JS = Lord John Scott; E of D = Earl of Dalkeith; E of Gif = Earl of Gifford; L HK = Lord Henry Ker; V Mel = Viscount Melgund; L Car = Lord Cardroes; L HS = Lord Henry Scott; E of Ha = Earl of Haddington; L Bin = Lord Binning; L Sch K = Lord Schomberg Ker; L Dngl = Lord Dunglass; L Sinc = Lord Sinclair; M of Bow = Marquis of Bowmont; Ba R = Baron Reay; E of Ho = Earl of Home; M of P = Master of Polwarth; E of E = Earl of Ellesmere.
1858 (238) D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; L JS; E of D; E of Gif; L HK; V Mel; L Car.

1859 (234) D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; L C; L Pw; L Wa; L JS; E of D; E of Gif; L HK.

1860 (214) D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of G; L HS.

1861 (213) D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of Gif; L HS; L Bin.

1862 D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of Gif; L HK; L Bin.

1863 D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of Gif; L Bin.

1864 D of B; D of R; K of L; M of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of Gif; L HS; L Bin.

1865 D of B; D of R; K of L; M of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; V Mel; L HS; L Bin.

1866 D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of Gif; V Mel; L HK; L Bin.

1867 (215) D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of Bu; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; E of Gif; V Mel; L HK; L Bin; L Sch K.

1868 D of B; D of R; M of L; K of T; E of M; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; V Mel; L HK; L Bin; L Dngl; L Sch K.
1869 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of L; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Som; L Wa; E of D; V Mel; L HK; L Bin; L Dngl; L Sch K.

1870 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of L; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1871 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; M of Bow; E of M; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1872 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; M of Bow; E of M; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl.

1873 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; M of Bow; E of M; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1874 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; M of Bow; E of M; E of L; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1875 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; M of Bow; E of M; E of L; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1876 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of Bow; E of M; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1877 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of Bow; E of M; E of La; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D.

1878 D of B; D of R; M of L; E of M; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl.

1879 D of B; D of R; M of L; E of M; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; L Sinc; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1880 D of B; D of R; M of L; E of M; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Wa; E of D; L Dngl; V Mel; L HK.
1881 D of B; D of R; M of L; E of M; B of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Va; E of D; V Mel; L Dngl; L HK.

1882 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Va; E of D; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; V Mel; E of Ho.

1883 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of H; L Ca; L Pw; L Va; E of D; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; V Mel; E of Ho.

1884 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; L Va; E of D; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; V Mel; E of Ho.

1885 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; E of D; L Bin; V Mel; E of Ho; M of P.

1886 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of Ha; L Ca; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; V Mel; E of Ho; M of P.

1887 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; L Ca; L Pw; Ba E; L Bin; B Sinc; V Mel; E of Ho; M of P.

1888 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of L; L Ca; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; V Mel; E of Ho; M of P.

1889 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of H; E of L; L Ca; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; V Mel; E of Ho; M of P.

1890 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; L Ca; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; E of Ho; M of P.

1891 D of B; D of R; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; L Ca; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc.

1892 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc.
1893 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1894 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1895 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1896 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1897 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1898 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1899 D of B; M of L; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; L Sinc; M of P;

1900 D of B; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; B Sinc; M of P;

1901 D of B; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; M of P;

1902 D of B; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; M of P;

1903 D of B; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; M of P;

1904 D of B; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; Ba R; L Bin; B Sinc; M of P;
1905 D of B; D of R; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; M of P.

1906 D of B; D of R; M of T; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P.

1907 D of B; D of R; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P.

1908 D of B; D of R; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; Ba R; M of P.

1909 D of B; D of R; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; L Som; Ba R; M of P.

1910 (79) D of B; D of R; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P

1911 (No list) Present at a meeting - L Pw and D of R.

1912 (75) D of B; D of R; M of T; E of M; E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; Ba R; M of P.

1913 D of B (died); E of M (died); E of D; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P.

1914 D of B; D of R; E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P.

1915 D of B; D of R (Convener); E of Ha; E of La; E of Ho; L Pw; L Bin; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P.

1916 D of B; D of R (Convener); E of Ha (died); E of La; E of Ho; E of D; L Pw; B Sinc; Ba R; M of P.

1917 D of B; D of R (Convener); E of Ho (died); E of D; E of E; L Pw; B Sinc; M of P.
1918 D of B; D of R (Convener); E of D; E of E; L Pw; S Sinc; M of P.

1919 D of B; D of R (Convener); E of D; E of E; L Pw; B Sinc; M of P.

1920 D of B; D of R (Convener); E of D; E of E; B Sinc; L Pw.

1921 D of B; D of R; E of D; E of E; B Sinc; L Pw.

In this appendix I have extracted from the various sources available, such as the Roxburgh County Directories; the County Council of Roxburgh Minute Books and the Municipal Yearbooks, the names of the great Border landowners who were members of Roxburgh County Council between the years 1900 and 1975. I have chosen to focus on Roxburgh County Council, rather than on Selkirk County Council because of the direct involvement of the great Border landowners such as the Duke of Buccleuch, the Duke of Roxburghe, the Marquis of Lothian and the Earl of Minto. The Duke of Buccleuch and the Duke of Roxburghe between them held the Convenership of Roxburgh County Council for a period of forty three years between 1900 and 1975. Selkirk County Council, on the other hand, while having ex officio members such as the Earl of Dalkeith, Lord Polwarth, and Lord Napier & Ettrick was mainly the preserve of farmers and manufacturers.

1900: Lord Polwarth (Convener)

1901: Lord Polwarth (Convener)

1902: Lord Polwarth (Convener)

1903: Lord Polwarth (Convener)

1904: Lord Polwarth (Convener)

1905: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Earl of Minto

1906: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Earl of Dalkeith
1907: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Earl of Dalkeith

1908: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Earl of Dalkeith

1909: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Earl of Dalkeith

1910: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Earl of Dalkeith

1911: Lord Polwarth (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe

1912: the Earl of Minto (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe

1913: the Earl of Minto (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Earl of Dalkeith

1914: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener)

1915: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener)

1916: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener)

1917: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener)

1918: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener); Lord Ellesmere

1919: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener); the Earl of Ellesmere

1920: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Earl of Ellesmere
1921: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener)

1922: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener); the Earl of Ellesmere

1923: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch; the Earl of Ellesmere; the Earl of Dalkeith

1924: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch; the Earl of Ellesmere

1925: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch; the Earl of Ellesmere; the Earl of Dalkeith

1926: the Duke of Roxburghe; the Duke of Buccleuch; the Earl of Ellesmere; the Earl of Minto

1927: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Earl of Minto; the Earl of Ellesmere; the Earl of Dalkeith; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1928: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener); the Earl of Minto; the Master of Polwarth; the Earl of Dalkeith; the Earl of Ellesmere

1929: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); the Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener); the Earl of Minto; the Earl of Dalkeith; the Master of Polwarth; the Earl of Ellesmere

1930: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); Duke of Buccleuch (Vice-Convener)

1931: the Duke of Roxburghe; Earl of Dalkeith; The Master of Polwarth; The Duke of Buccleuch
1932: the Duke of Roxburghe; The Earl of Dalkeith; The Master of Polwarth; The Duke of Buccleuch

1933: Bertram Talbot (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Earl of Dalkeith

1934: B. Talbot (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1935: the Earl of Minto; the Master of Polwarth; the Earl of Dalkeith

1936: B. Talbot (Convener); Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1937: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1938: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Master of Harden; the Duke of Buccleuch

1939: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Master of Harden; the Duke of Buccleuch

1940: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1941: the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1942: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Master of Polwarth; the Duke of Buccleuch

1943: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch
1944: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1945: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1946: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); Lady I. Scott; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1947: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); Lady I. Scott; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1948: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1949: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Earl of Minto; Lady I. Scott; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1950: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1951: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1952: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1953: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1954: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); Lord Stratheden and Campbell; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1955: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch
1956: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1957: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1958: the Duke of Buccleuch (Convener); Lord Lothian; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Duke of Buccleuch

1959: J.E.S. Nisbet (Convener); Lord Lothian; Lord Stratheden & Campbell; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Earl of Dalkeith

1960: J.E.S. Nisbet (Convener); Lord Lothian; Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott; the Earl of Dalkeith

1961: (No Convener); Lord Lothian; Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott

1962: (No Convener); Lord Lothian; Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Baroness Elliot of Harwood; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott

1963: (No Convener); Lord Lothian; Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott

1964: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs Scott

1965: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Mrs M.E. Smiley

1966: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Robert M.C. Biddulph
1967: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe; the Hon. Robert M.C. Biddulph

1968: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe

1969: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden & Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Hon. Robert M.C. Biddulph; the Duke of Roxburghe; Lady Polwarth

1970: (No Convener); Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Baroness Elliot; the Hon. Robert M.C. Biddulph; the Duke of Roxburghe; Lady Polwarth

1971: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); Baroness Elliot; the Hon. Robert M.C. Biddulph

1972: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); Baroness Elliot

1973: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); Baroness Elliot

1974: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe

1975: the Duke of Roxburghe (Convener); Baroness Elliot; the Duke of Roxburghe

Sources: Roxburgh County Directory, (1900-1904); County Council of Roxburgh Minute Book, No. 3, (1904-1919); County of Roxburgh Minutes, (1920-1929); Municipal Yearbook, (1930-1975).
The Members of the New Regional and District Councils

The first elections to the new local authorities, following the passing of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, took place in 1974. As can be seen, the absence of the great Border landowners, with the exception of the Earl of Minto, is striking. I have given the names of all members of both Borders Regional Council and the four district councils, who were elected in 1974, as they appear in the 1976 edition of the Municipal Yearbook.

Borders Regional Council Members, 1976


Vice Convener: S. M. Roberts, O.B.E., J.P.,


Berwickshire District Council Members, 1976

Chairman: J.R. Ford.

Vice-Chairman: Cmdr. J. Evans.

Councillors: J.C. Balfour; D.A.J. Burns; M.B. Burns-Greig; P. Fishbourne; J. Guthrie; J.D.H. Home-Robertson; J.A. Inglis; G.B. Millican; D.K. Swan.
Ettrick and Lauderdale District Council Members, 1976

Chairman: G.R. Johnston.
Vice-Chairman: J. Burke.

Councillors: C. Cassidy; Rev. J.H. Duncan; R. Effingham; D. Fisher; W. Hardie; T.W. Henderson; D.V. Mackenzie; H. McMorran; T.L. Mitchell; V.H.V. Muir; J.A. Roden; A. Scott; A.L. Tulley; A.T. Turnbull.

Roxburgh District Council Members, 1976

Chairman: D. Atkinson, M.B.E., J.P.
Vice-Chairman: J. Leishman.


Tweeddale District Council Members, 1976

Chairman: T. Blyth.
Vice-Chairman: A.A. Walker.

Councillors: J.S.R. Aitken; F. Ballantyne; J.P. Campbell; A. Melrose; W.M. Rose; R.P.D. Runciman; D.W. Taylor; N.S. Thorburn.

In this appendix I give the political composition of Borders Regional Council and the four district councils (Berwickshire, Ettrick & Lauderdale, Roxburgh, and Tweeddale) which comprise the Borders Region for the years 1977-1989. Out of the great, titled landowners who were represented on the former Roxburgh County Council, the only one to be represented on Borders Regional Council is the Earl of Kinto. He has been a member consistently from 1976. No titled landowners have been represented on any of the district councils.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

ALL = Lib/SD Alliance; C = Conservative; IND = Independent; LAB = Labour; L = Liberal; M = Moderate; NP = Non Political/Non Party; O = Other; SD = Social Democrat; SLD = Social & Liberal Democrat; SNP = Scottish National Party; V = vacancy.

The Political Composition of Borders Regional Council 1976
(seats won based on the May 1974 local election results)

REGIONAL SUMMARY TABLE

23 seats - C 7; L 3; IND 13.

DISTRICT SUMMARY TABLE

54 seats - C 9; LAB 1; IND 44.

N.B. These figures represent the combined totals for the four districts (Berwickshire, Ettrick & Lauderdale, Roxburgh, and Tweeddale) which make up the Borders Region.

Political Composition of Borders Regional Council & Berwickshire, Ettrick & Lauderdale, Roxburgh and Tweeddale District Councils, 1977-1989

1977

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 8; C 6; L 3; O 6.
Berwickshire (12): IND 1; C 8; O 3.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 16.
Roxburgh (16): IND 16.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1978

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 8; C 6; L 3; O 6.
Berwickshire (12): C 11; IND 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 14; C 1; L 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 6; SNP 6; C 1; LAB 1; L 2.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1979

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 10; C 9; L 1; O 3.
Berwickshire (12): C 11; IND 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): NP 14; C 1; L 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 11; C 2; L 2; LAB 1.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1980

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 11; C 10; L 1; SNP 1.
Berwickshire (12): C 12.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): NP 14; C 1; LAB 1.
Roxburgh (16): C 2; LAB 1; L 1; SNP 1; O 10.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.
1981

Borders Regional Council (23): NP 1; IND 10; C 10; L 1; SNP 1.
Berwickshire (12): C 11; LAB 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 8; NP 6; C 1; V 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 10; C 5; O 1 (Border Independent).
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1982

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 12; C 9; L 1; SNP 1.
Berwickshire (12): C 11; LAB 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 8; NP 6; C 1; LAB 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 7; C 5; O 3; V 1.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1983

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 12; C 8; ALL 3.
Berwickshire (12): C 11; ALL 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 7; NP 6; C 1; LAB 1; V 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 9; C 5; L 1; O 1.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1984

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 14; C 7; ALL 2.
Berwickshire (12): C 9; IND 2; SD 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 7; NP 6; C 2; LAB 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 9; C 5; ALL 1; L 1.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1985

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 13; C 8; ALL 2.
Berwickshire (12): C 8; ALL 1; NP 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 13; LAB 2; C 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 6; C 5; ALL 4; O 1.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1986

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 12; C 8; ALL 2; NP 1.
Berwickshire (12): C 8; IND 3; ALL 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 8; LAB 2; C 1; O 5.
Roxburgh (16): IND 6; C 5; ALL 3; O 2.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1987

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 11; C 6; ALL 2; SNP 1; NP 1.
Berwickshire (12): C 8; IND 3; ALL 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 13; C 1; LAB 1; SNP 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 7; C 5; SD 2; NP 2.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1988

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 11; C 6; ALL 2; SNP 1; NP 3.
Berwickshire (12): C 8; IND 3; ALL 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 13; C 1; LAB 1; SNP 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 7; C 5; L 2; NP 2.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

1989

Borders Regional Council (23): IND 11; C 6; ALL 2; SNP 1; NP 3.
Berwickshire (12): C 9; IND 1; SLD 1; O 1.
Ettrick & Lauderdale (16): IND 13; C 1; LAB 1; SNP 1.
Roxburgh (16): IND 7; C 1; MOD 1; SLD 3; SNP 2; O 1.
Tweeddale (10): IND 10.

Source: Municipal Yearbooks, (1976-1988). The figures for 1989 were obtained from the Regional and the District Councils themselves.
In this appendix I have extracted from The Southern Counties Register & Directory: Counties of Roxburgh, Berwick and Selkirk for 1866, the names of titled Border landowners, in the order they appear, who were Justices of the Peace in the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk. I have used the year 1886 simply because it was the only year in the nineteenth century that I have been able to obtain comprehensive information for.

Titled Border Landowners who were Justices in the Commission of the Peace in the County of Roxburgh in 1866

Walter Francis, Duke of Buccleuch
James, Duke of Roxburghe
George, Marquis of Tweeddale
William, Marquis of Lothian
Henry, Earl of Dalkeith
Jas, Marquis of Bowmont
William, Earl of Minto
George, Earl of Haddington
Anthony, Earl of Lauderdale
George, Earl of Gifford
Henry Francis, Lord Polwarth
William Fred, Lord Campbell
Walter, Master of Polwarth
Lord Henry John Scott
Lord Walter Scott
George, Lord Binning
Lord Schomberg Henry Kerr
Kenelin, Lord Somerville
James, Master of Sinclair
the Hon. Francis Scott

N.B. The Commission of the Peace for the County of Roxburgh, consisted of a total of 139 members in 1866.
Titled Border Landowners who were Justices in the
Commission of the Peace in the County of Selkirk in 1866

The Duke of Buccleuch
The Earl of Dalkeith
The Earl of Minto
Lord Napier
Lord Elibank
Lord Polwarth
Sir John Murray of Philiphaugh, Baronet

N.B. The Commission of the Peace for the County of Selkirk in
1866 consisted of a total of 34 members.

Source: Borders Regional Council Members' Handbook, (1987-88),
pp.2-3.
In this appendix I have taken the names of the members of Borders Regional Council who, in 1988, were Justices of the Peace. Out of the six members of the Regional Council who are J.P.s, three are landowners. Major N.P. Thompson and J.M. Askew are, however, very minor landowners. The Earl of Minto is the only representative of the names of the great families which appeared on the lists of 1866. The Duke of Buccleuch, however, as Lord-Lieutenant of Roxburgh, Ettrick & Lauderdale is responsible for advising and recommending to the Crown, suitable individuals to be added to the Commissions of the Peace.

Members of Borders Regional Council who in 1988 were Justices of the Peace


Leonard G.V. Thompson, J.P., D.L., 6 Ladyschaw Drive, Selkirk.

George B. Dorward, F.S.A. (Scot), Edes Isle, Blair Avenue, Jedburgh.

the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Minto, O.B.E., J.P., Minto Home Farm, Minto, Hawick.


In this appendix I have taken the names of the Lord-Lieutenant, the Vice-Lieutenant and the Deputy-Lieutenants for the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk, from the Southern Counties' Register & Directory: Counties of Roxburgh, Berwick and Selkirk, for 1866. The dates after the names are the dates these individuals assumed office.

The Roxburghshire Lieutenancy 1866

Lord-Lieutenant
The Duke of Buccleuch, 1841

Vice-Lieutenant
Sir John Pringle, Bart, 1812

Deputy Lieutenants
R.K. Elliot of Harwood & Clifton, 1848
Sir W.F. Elliott of Stobs & Wells, Bart, 1817
W.S. Kerr of Chatto, 1848
A.E. Lockhart of Borthwickbrae, 1848
W.M. Ogilvie of Chesters, 1827
Lord Polwarth, 1826
W.O. Rutherfurd of Edgerston, 1848
Sir W.M. Scott of Ancrum, Bart, M.P
Mark Sprot of Riddell, 1848
T. Tod of Drygrange, 1848
J. Waldie of Hendersyde, 1831.

The Selkirkshire Lieutenancy 1866

Lord-Lieutenant
Lord Polwarth
Deputy Lieutenants

J. Ballantyne of Holylee, 1829
Earl of Dalkeith, 1853
J. Johnston of Alva, 1824
A.E. Lockhart of Borthwickbrae, 1824
Lord Napier, 1848
Sir J. Murray of Philiphaugh, 1848
H. Scott of Gala, 1848
W.S. Walker of Bowland, 1843.

Source: The Southern Counties' Register & Directory: Counties of Roxburgh, Berwick & Selkirk, (1866)
In this appendix I give the names of the Lord-Lieutenants for the counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk for the years 1909, 1929, 1959, and 1989. I had originally intended to present a more detailed picture of the Roxburghshire and Selkirkshire lieutenancies but experienced considerable difficulties in collecting the information and compiling it in a systematic way. The Municipal Yearbooks, for example, list the Lord-Lieutenants in Scotland but do not state when they took office. Finding an accessible library with all the relevant editions of the Municipal Yearbooks, Whitakers' Almanac and the New Edinburgh Almanac was a problem I had not bargained for! There are so many question marks and blank spaces which I have been unable to fill in, that in the end I decided to start with the present year and look back at thirty and twenty year intervals. In this way I hope, if not to give a comprehensive picture of the Roxburghshire and Selkirkshire lieutenancies over time, to at least show that some importance is still attached to the office of Lord-Lieutenant by landowners such as the Duke of Buccleuch.

Her Majesty's Lord-Lieutenants

1989  Roxburgh, Ettrick & Lauderdale (since 1974)  
    the Duke of Buccleuch & Queensbury  
1959  Roxburghshire: the Duke of Buccleuch & Queensbury  
1959  Selkirkshire: Vice-Admr. Sir Connoly Abel Smith  
1929  Roxburghshire: the Duke of Roxburghe  
1929  Selkirkshire: Maj. C.H. Scott-Plummer  
1909  Roxburghshire: Lord Reay.  
1909  Selkirkshire: Lord Polwarth.

Source: Whitakers' Almanac.
Members of Parliament for the Royal Burgh of Selkirk, 1707-1833

1701-1832 Selkirk was a member of a division of royal burghs which also included Peebles, Lanark and Linlithgow.

1707 Mungo Graham of Gorthie
1708 Col. George Douglas
1713 Sir Jas. Carmichael of Bonytown, Bart
1715 Col. George Douglas
1722 Daniel Weir of Stoneybyres, Lanarkshire
1725 John Murray of Philiphaugh
1734 Hon. Jas. Carmichael
1741 John McKie of Palgowan
1747 Hon. Jas. Carmichael
1754 John Murray of Philiphaugh
1761 Admr. Sir John Ross of Balnagowan
1768 James Dickson of Broughton and Kilbucho
1772 Sir James Cockburn of Langton
1784 Capt. John Moore
1790 William Grieve of London
1796 Viscount Stopford
1802 Lieut-Col. Dickson of Kilbucho
1806 Sir Charles Ross of Balnagowan
1807 William Maxwell of Carriden
1812 Sir John Riddel of Haining
1818 John Pringle of Haining
1820 Henry Monteith of Carstairs
1826 Adam Hay
1830 Henry Monteith of Carstairs
1831 William D. Gillon of Wallhouse
1833-1868 The burgh of Selkirk was included with the county of Selkirk in a single constituency.

APPENDIX 8

Members of Parliament for Roxburgh, Selkirk, Berwickshire and Peebles, 1715-1820

ROXBURGHSHIRE

1715 William Douglas
1722 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto
1726 Sir Gilbert Eliott of Stobs
1727 William Douglas
1728 William Douglas
1734 John Rutherford
1741 John Rutherford
1742 William Douglas
1747 Walter Scott
1754 Walter Scott
1761 Walter Scott
1765 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 3rd Baronet
1767 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 3rd Baronet
1768 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 3rd Baronet
1770 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 3rd Baronet
1774 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 3rd Baronet
1777 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 4th Baronet (Sir Gilbert Elliot, 3rd Bt, deceased)
1780 Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, 4th Baronet
1784 George Douglas
1790 Sir George Douglas, Baronet
1796 Sir George Douglas, Baronet
1802 Sir George Douglas, Baronet
1806 John Rutherfurd
1807 John Rutherfurd
1812 Hon. Gilbert Elliot
1814 Alexander Don
1818 Sir Alexander Don, Baronet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td>James Rutherford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>John Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>John Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>John Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Gilbert Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Gilbert Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Gilbert Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761</td>
<td>Gilbert Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762</td>
<td>Gilbert Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>John Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Mark Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>Mark Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Mark Pringle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>John Rutherfurd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>William Eliott Lockhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>William Eliott Lockhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>William Eliott Lockhart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>William Eliott Lockhart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>George Baillie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>George Baillie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1722</td>
<td>George Baillie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>George Baillie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Alexander Hume Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Alexander Hume Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Alexander Hume Campbell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1754  Alexander Hume Campbell
1756  Alexander Hume Campbell
1761  James Pringle
1761  James Pringle
1768  James Pringle
1774  James Pringle
1779  Sir John Paterson
1780  Hugh Scott
1781  Hugh Scott
1784  Patrick Hume
1790  Patrick Hume
1796  George Baillie
1802  George Baillie
1806  George Baillie
1807  George Baillie
1812  George Baillie
1818  Sir John Marjoribanks, Baronet.

PEEBLES

1715  Alexander Murray
1722  John Douglas
1727  John Douglas
1732  Sir J. Nasmyth
1741  Alexander Murray
1747  John Dickson
1754  John Dickson
1761  John Dickson
1767  Adam Hay
1768  James Montgomery
1774  James Montgomery
1775  Adam Hay
1775  Sir Robert Murray Keith
1780  Alexander Murray of Murrayfield
1783  Alexander Murray of Blackbarony
1784  David Murray
1790  William Montgomery
1796  William Montgomery
1800  James Montgomery
1802  James Montgomery
1805  James Montgomery (Now Sir James Montgomery, Baronet)
1806  Sir James Montgomery, Baronet
1807  Sir James Montgomery, Baronet
1812  Sir James Montgomery, Baronet
1818  Sir James Montgomery, Baronet

Parliamentary Representation in the Counties of Selkirk and Roxburgh, 1830-1868

**ROXBURGH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Henry Francis Scott of Harden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Henry Francis Scott of Harden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Hon. Capt. George Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Lord John-Douglas Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Hon. John-Edmund Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Hon. Francis Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Hon. Francis Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>John Edmund Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Scott now representing Berwickshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Hon. J.E. Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Sir William Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Sir William Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Sir William Scott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELKIRK

1830  Alexander Pringle of Whitebank
1831  Alexander Pringle
1833  Capt. Robert Pringle
      (from this date the County of Selkirkshire
      became included with the Royal Burgh of
      Selkirk in a single constituency).
1835  Alexander Pringle
1837  Alexander Pringle
1842  Alexander Pringle
1847  Allan Eliott Lockhart
1848  Allan Eliott Lockhart
1854  Allan Eliott Lockhart
1859  Allan Eliott Lockhart
1861  Lord Henry-John Scott
1868  Lord Henry-John Scott

Sources: Thorne, (1986); Oliver & Boyd's, New Edinburgh Almanac.
Parliamentary Representation in the Royal Burgh and the County of Selkirk, 1833-1868

From 1833-1868 the Royal Burgh of Selkirk was included with the County of Selkirk in a single constituency.

1833    Robert Pringle of Haining
1835    Alexander Pringle of Whytbank
1846    Allan Elliott Lockhart of Borthwickbrae
1861    Lord Henry Scott.

APPENDIX 11

Parliamentary Representation in the Borders, 1868-1988

1868

Hawick District - G. O. Trevelyan, (L)
Peebles & Selkirk - Sir G. G. Montgomery, (C)
Roxburghshire - Sir W. Scott, (L)

1874

Hawick District - G. O. Trevelyan, (L)
Peebles & Selkirk - Sir G. G. Montgomery, Bart, (C)
Roxburghshire - Sir G. Douglas, (C)

1880

Hawick District - G. O. Trevelyan, (L)
Peebles & Selkirk - C. Tennant, (L)
Roxburghshire - Hon. A. D. Elliot, (L)
This was the first General Election following the Radical Reform Bill of 1885. From this date, the population of the constituency, the number of electors, the names of all candidates and the total of votes are given. The successful candidate is listed first and his total of votes printed in bold.

Hawick District (electors 5,679)

Rt. Hon. G.O. Trevelyan, (L), unopposed

Peebles & Selkirk (3,250)

Sir Charles Tennant, Bart, (L), 1,746
Sir G.G. Montgomery, (C), 1,038

Roxburghshire (6,180)

Hon. Arthur R.D. Elliott, (L), 3,419
C.B. Balfour, (C), 1,945

1886

Hawick District (5,679)

Alexander Laing Brown, (GL), 2,523
Rt. Hon. Sir G.O. Trevelyan, Bart, (L), 2,493

Peebles & Selkirk (3,250)

Walter Thorburn, (L) 1,375
Sir Charles Tennant, Bart, (GL) 1,325
Roxburghshire (6,180)

Hon. Arthur R.D. Elliott, (L), 2,570
Hon. Mark F. Napier, (GL) 2,142

Hawick District (6,302)
(By-Election, 26 March 1894)

T. Shaw, Q.C., (Sol-Gen), (L), 3,203
R. McLeod Fullarton, (U), 2,556

Peebles & Selkirk (3,466)

W. Thorburn, (U), 1,603
Sir. T.D. Carmichael, Bart, (L), 1,367

Roxburghshire (5,990)

Hon. Mark F. Napier, (L), 2,672
Hon. Arthur R.D. Elliot, (U), 2,514

Hawick District (6,318)

T. Shaw, Q.C., (L), 3,033
J. Sanderson, (C), 2,531

1892

1895
Peebles & Selkirk (3,578)

W. Thorburn, (U), 1,563
Master of Elibank, (L), 1,509

Roxburghshire (6,036)

Earl of Dalkeith, (C), 2,929
Hon. Mark F. Napier, (L), 2,368

1900

Hawick District (5,845)

T. Shaw, K.C., (L), 2,611
J. Sanderson, (C), 2,386

Peebles & Selkirk (3,591)

W. Thorburn, (U), 1,563
Master of Elibank, (L), 1,509

Roxburghshire (5,944)

Earl of Dalkeith, (C), 2,929
Hon. Mark F. Napier, (L), 2,368

1906

Hawick District (6,053)

Rt. Hon. T. Shaw, K.C., (L), 3,125
Sir A. Conan Doyle, (C), 2,444
Peebles & Selkirk (3,830)

Master of Elibank, (L), 1,955
Sir Walter Thorburn, (C), 1,549

Roxburghshire (5,884)

Sir J. Jardine, K.C.L.E., (L), 2,829
Sir R.J. Waldie-Griffith, (C), 2,514

1910

Hawick District (6,030)

Sir J.N. Barron, Bart, (L), unopposed

Peebles & Selkirk (4,032)

Rt. Hon. Sir D. MacLean, (L), 1,965
Sir S. Steel, (U), 1,764

Roxburghshire (6,025)

Sir J. Jardine, K.C.L.E., (L), 2,908
N.K. Cochran-Patrick, (U), 2,704

1918

Constituency change. Now the constituency of Roxburgh & Selkirk.

Roxburgh & Selkirk (34,173)

Rt. Hon. Robert Munro, (Co.L.), 13,043
1922

T. Hamilton, (Lab), 5,574

Roxburgh & Selkirk
(M = Male Voters; F = Female Voters)
M = 18,921; W = 14,150

Sir Thomas Henderson, (NL), 10,356
Sir A.H. Grant, K.C.L.E., C.S.L., (L), 9,698

1924

Roxburgh & Selkirk
M = 19,816; W = 25,439

Earl of Dalkeith, (C), 13,1510
A.R. McDougal, (L), 12,232
R. Gibson, (Lab), 9,803

1931

Roxburgh & Selkirk
M = 20,049; W = 25,926

Earl of Dalkeith, (C), 21,394
D.E. Keir, (L), 1,742
309
1935

Roxburgh & Selkirk
$M = 20,655; \ W = 26,381$

Lord William Montagu-Douglas-Scott, M.C., (C), 18,342
Capt. A.R. McDougal, (L), 12,264
J.A.C. Thompson, (Lab), 6,000

1945

Roxburgh & Selkirk (47,407)

Lt-Col. Lord William Montagu-Douglas-Scott, M.C., (C) 13,232
A.J.F. MacDonald, (L), 11,604
L.P. Thomas, (Lab), 10,017

1950

(Redistribution of constituencies)

Roxburgh & Selkirk (47,430)

A.J.F. MacDonald, (L), 15,347
Lord W. Scott, M.C., (C), 14,191
L.P. Thomas, (Lab), 9,413

1951

Roxburgh & Selkirk (47,614)

Cmdr. C.E.M. Donaldson, (C), 16,438
A. J. F. MacDonald, (L), 15,609
T. White, (Lab), 8,395

1955

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (56,907)

Cmdr. C. E. M. Donaldson, (C), 21,925
S. E. Graham, (L), 14,755
L. A. Morrison, (Lab), 9,296

1959

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (55,459)

Cmdr. C. E. M. Donaldson, (C), 22,275
Dr. J. M. MacCormick, (L), 12,762
T. Dalyell, (Lab), 9,336

1964

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (53,753)

Cmdr. C. E. M. Donaldson, (C), 18,924
D. Steel, (L), 17,183
R. King-Murray, (Lab), 7,007
A. J. C. Kerr, (S.N.P.), 1,903
1966

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (53,615)

D. Steel, (L), 21,549
R. McEwan, (C), 16,942
R. King-Murray, (Lab), 4,936
A.J.C. Kerr, (Independent S.N.P.), 411

1970

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (57,646)

D. Steel, (L), 19,524
R. Fairgrieve, (C), 18,974
L. Griffiths, (Lab), 4,454
H. Hastie, (S.I.P.), 3,147
W. Cassell, (Independent Anti-Abortion), 103

1974 (Feb)

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (58,132)

D. Steel, (L), 25,707
J.S. Thom, (C), 16,690
D. Purves, (S.N.P.), 3,953
D.A. Graham, (Lab), 3,089
Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (57,824)

D. Steel, (L), 20,006
C. M. Anderson, (C), 12,573
A. Edmonds, (S.N.P.), 9,178
D. A. Graham, (Lab), 4,076

1979

Roxburgh, Selkirk & Peebles (60,368)

D. Steel, (L), 25,993
G. P. Malone, (C), 15,303
D. Heald, (Lab), 4,150
A. Stewart, (S.N.P.), 3,502

1983

Constituency change. From 1983 the parliamentary constituencies are based on the new local authorities.

Tweeddale, Ettrick & Lauderdale (37,075)

D. Steel, (L/All), 16,868
A. Ballentine, (C), 8,329
M. Saren, (Lab), 2,200
A. MacCartney, (S.N.P.), 1,455
Roxburgh & Berwickshire (41,702)

A. J. Kirkwood, (L/All), 15,920
I. Sprout, (C), 12,524
D. Briggs, (Lab), 2,326
R. Shirley, (S.N.P.), 852

1987

Tweeddale, Ettrick & Lauderdale (37,875)

D. Steel, (L/All), 14,599
S. Finlay-Maxwell, (C), 9,657
N. Glen, (Lab), 3,320
A. Lumsden, (S.N.P.), 2,660

Roxburgh & Berwickshire (43,140)

A. J. Kirkwood, (L/All), 16,388
Dr. L. Fox, (C), 12,380
T. Luckhurst, (Lab), 2,944
M. Douglas, (S.N.P), 1,586

Source: Whitakers' Almanac.
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