



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

De-provincialising 1820

The west of Scotland general strike in the mirror of uneven and combined development (part 1)

Citation for published version:

Davidson, N & Allinson, J 2020, 'De-provincialising 1820: The west of Scotland general strike in the mirror of uneven and combined development (part 1)', *Scottish Labour History Society Journal*, no. 55, pp. 143-174.

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Scottish Labour History Society Journal

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



De-provincialising 1820: The west of Scotland general strike in the mirror of uneven and combined development (part 2)

Neil Davidson and Jamie Allinson

Introduction

‘The Devil’ wrote Sir Walter Scott to his friend and fellow Tory, JBS Morritt, just before Christmas 1819, ‘seems to have come up amongst us unchained and bellowing for his prey.’ The diabolic incursion to which Scott referred was the outbreak of class struggle in the West of Scotland that would, by the spring, result in both the attempted insurrection of 1820 and the world’s first general strike. Scott perceived in the situation the danger of ‘civil war’ as ‘Volunteers [the anti-radical militias organised by local members of the ruling class such as Scott himself] drill by day and the Radicals by night.’ Attuned as ever to the reality of class conflict, Scott noted that ‘[t]he Master Manufacturer dare hardly trust himself among the workmen whom he feeds and pays and all seems to tend towards an open rupture.’¹

That rupture would come just four months after Scott’s letter to Morritt. In the previous part of this two-part article we outlined the uneven and combined development of capitalism in Scotland as the background condition of the ‘radical war’ and West of Scotland general strike. In that piece we sought to demonstrate that the rising and especially the strike represented not a continued struggle for Scottish nationhood but rather a break with the past on the basis of rapid processes of industrialisation, urbanisation and proletarianization in the decades prior to 1820. Unlike England before it, but in common with the global trajectory of capitalist development and class conflict to come, Scotland ‘skipped stages’ in a way that provided for an upsurge of militant labour struggle. This ‘skipping’, we argued in the previous article, was particularly embodied in the degree of industrialisation, urbanisation and proletarianization that Scotland (particularly in the West) reached in a far shorter time period than in England. The combination, we demonstrated in the previous article, of these accelerated processes with a more reactionary, repressive and exclusionary state in Scotland provided the combustible material from which the explosion of 1820 was made. We now shift our focus to the general strike itself.

We provide an account that links this history of uneven and combined development with the proximate triggers and course of events of the strike and rising of 1820. Our central case is that the events of 1820 in Scotland have been misrepresented as a proto-nationalist uprising – rather the rising and more importantly the general strike should be seen as part of a burgeoning British-wide working-class movement. This first general strike in world working-class history took place in the West of Scotland not because of any special national oppression but reflected the conditions of uneven and combined development outlined above and in the previous part of this article. We begin with the burgeoning radicalism and economic distress of the post-war years, leading up to the agitation and massacre at Peterloo. As we argue below, the West of Scotland general strike and accompanying agitation was intrinsically linked to the struggles in the North-West of England of the preceding six months. We then provide a narrative of the strike and insurrection, demonstrating that the characterisation of 1820 as a proto-nationalist uprising is an anachronism and that rather the movement represented a moment in which reformist and revolutionary forms of working-class politics, both centred on the British state, had yet to take fully separate form. Before we enter into this narrative, however, we must first return to the background of the strike and rising—what was happening before 1820?

From the Napoleonic Wars to Peterloo

in the open air. 'Major Cartwright always looked back upon his tour in Scotland with particular pleasure', recalled his niece, 'and spoke with much gratitude of the hospitality and kindness he experienced... he was greeted everywhere with the utmost affection; many persons even walking twenty or thirty miles to see him.' Cartwright wrote to his wife of one episode: '[a]t Forfar a large party were on the road last Monday evening, intending to draw my little carriage into the town'.⁹

The growth of Radicalism in Scotland after the defeat of Napoleon was not solely dependent on either the written word or visits from leaders in England. Between 1815 and the massacre at Peterloo in 1819 a series of mass meetings and local assemblies paved the way for the uprising of 1820. William Aiton, the Sheriff-Substitute at Hamilton, describes how, on 13 June 1815, a crowd of perhaps 10,000 workers and their families marched from Strathaven (in Lanarkshire) to Drumclog. Although the Sheriff reported the marchers heading for the farm of Allanton where 'they imagined Sir William Wallace had fought his first battle with the English' nationalist motives seem to have been far from their minds. Rather, according to Aiton '[e]ver since the lower orders in Scotland gave up the study of religious opinion...*too many of them have shown an inclination to notice and bring to view every occurrence, whether recent or ancient, wherein successive resistance has been opposed to any regular and established authority.*'¹⁰

The following autumn Radical activity escalated in the west of Scotland. A meeting in Paisley was held on 15 October 1816 in the West Relief Church in Canal Street to petition the Prince Regent. Resolutions were unanimously passed condemning levels of taxation passed on a restricted franchise, the Corn Bill, sinecures, the Wars, the restoration of the Pope and the crowns of Europe, and the standing army. Resolutions also called for constitutional action to deal with these grievances agreeing to petition the Prince Regent to consider their complaints.¹¹ James Parkhill, a member of the executive committee established by the meeting, described the atmosphere as 'filled to the brim' and found himself 'astonished by the oratory of my townsmen.'¹²

Such meetings led up to the mass assembly at Thrusgrove, the holding of the radical Glasgow businessman James Turner. The protest attracted a reported forty-thousand people in support of the demands of radical reform: amongst whom, according to Parkhill there 'were about thirty of us from Paisley; and returning home at midnight, we appeared, in many eyes, a party of enthusiastic Covenanters.'¹³ Throughout 1817 and 1818, according to Parkhill, 'there was a great amount of private association for political purposes' as workers and radicals established networks throughout the west of Scotland: 'unions were established and a vast number of members were enrolled.' These unions aimed at reform by force if necessary, and extended their contacts to like-minded workers in England.¹⁴ In Kilmarnock, according to James Paterson, such meetings included a faction of '*Blacknebs*... desirous of going a step farther' than parliamentary reform to seek a 'universal confiscation of property, *pro bonum publico*, that it might undergo a new division; for, as a Kilmarnock rhymer has sung, - 'This warl' is ill dividit.'¹⁵

The growth in circulation of radical ideas and publications, the founding and expansion of radical associations and the increase in private and public political meetings was not restricted to Scotland, of course. The reform movement was reaching its peak in England with the rejection of the petition for parliamentary reform in 1817 and the series of mass meetings that would culminate in the Peterloo massacre. Further demonstrating the intimate connection between radicalism on both sides of the Tweed, the Scottish events of 1820 cannot be separated from those in Manchester the preceding summer. Even before the massacre at Peterloo in 1819, however, such connections were being established: Sir John Hope, one of Wellington's generals and former adjutant-general in Scotland, warned on the 10th of August of 'agitation for a general rising' on both sides of the border.¹⁶ What transpired of course, was no such thing but rather the attack by local Yeomanry on the peaceful demonstration of tens of thousands of working-class people—killing 17— on the 16th of August at St. Peter's Field.

The aftermath of Peterloo and the approach of the General Strike

The radical uprising and general strike of 1820 must be set in this context—rather than any specifically Scottish grievance—of the response to the Peterloo massacre and subsequent repression. Within a month of Peterloo a series of mass public meetings were held across Lowland Scotland unanimously passing motions condemning the Manchester magistrates and Yeomanry, and calling for their prosecution. In Paisley a black-edged handbill issued on 30 August announced a ‘Public Meeting...of the inhabitants of Paisley and its Vicinity’ on Meikleriggs Moor the following Saturday to ‘express their Sentiments on the late proceedings at Manchester.’¹⁷

Heavy rain restricted the participants to three to four hundred who then convened an indoor meeting to agree a rescheduled demonstration on 11 September.¹⁸ The police account of this demonstration gives a rather different account of the class basis of the attendees and their attitude to authority than some of the sympathetic reports anxious to portray the movement in as respectable a light as possible. Upon reaching the ‘magistracy and constables’ the protestors ‘gave a hurrah and waved their flags’, their ‘barbarous appearance’ alarming the local shopkeepers. As they neared, the magistrates and special constables assembled outside Court Hall.¹⁹ On the way back through Paisley the protestors ‘gave a hurrah and waved their flags in the most insulting manner almost in the face of Provost Johnson.’²⁰ On Sunday the magistrates, dignitaries and other members of the middle class were again insulted and mocked on their way to church.²¹ Darkness was the sign for an outbreak of violence that Police Superintendent Brown certainly thought was premeditated: ‘a whole volley of stones were thrown, at the Cross, at the Coffee-Room windows, and a grand huzza was made when a mob ran off from the Cross to Causeyside Street’ breaking lamps and windows on the way. In the end 37 houses had their windows broken and 258 lamps.²² The army began to arrive from Glasgow and the surrounding towns. Rioting continued, with decreasing levels of violence until Wednesday 15 September, although crowds still continued to gather in diminishing numbers at the Cross until Friday 17.

The post-Peterloo protest meetings were not restricted to Paisley as Table 1 indicates.

Table 1: Scottish Protest Meetings After Peterloo

Date	Place	Numbers
11 September 1819	Meikleriggs Moor, Paisley	Unknown
25 September 1819	Newmills, Ayrshire	Unknown
November 1819	Dundee	7,000
3 November 1819	Linktown of Kirkcaldy	5,000-6,000
27 November 1819	Kilmarnock	16,000

With reportedly 16,000 people present, the November 1819 meeting was allegedly the largest ever held in Kilmarnock until the period of agitation surrounding the 1832 Reform Bill. The poet Archibald McKay later recalled the ‘sight of the numerous deputations of strangers entering the town with banners unfurled.’ The meeting was chaired by ‘Mr Archibald Craig, a respectable muslin-agent’ wearing a cap of Liberty and addressed with demands for ‘real radical reform, or, in other words, the rooting out of every political evil, and the lopping off of every diseased branch with which the tree of the constitution.’ The appearance of two dragoons led to some fear of an attack amongst the crowd but the rest of the meeting passed off peacefully.²³

Who were the participants in these demonstrations and what form of politics did they represent? The demonstrations were generally organised by local committees specifically set up for that purpose, but the issues and themes which emerged at each meeting were remarkably consistent, from Dundee to Kilmarnock. Three are of particular importance.

The first—unsurprising perhaps, given that the meetings had been called in response to events in England—was that the demonstrators responded on a political level as Britons, rather than Scots. Although the Scottish radical tradition was also drawn upon, this was by no means a Scottish national movement. At Newmills in Ayrshire on 25 September the resolutions began by declaring ‘the birthright of Britons to meet in a peaceable manner and express their sentiments upon the conduct of public men.’²⁴ The same recourse to British rights was in evidence at the subsequent meetings. At Linktown of Kirkcaldy on 3 November the meeting opened with the playing of ‘God Save the King.’ The resolutions passed by the meeting invoked ‘the spirit of the British Constitution’, specifically the right it conveyed ‘to meet and consult together’, but also called for the strengthening of that Constitution by the adoption of ‘Major Cartwright’s Bill of Rights.’²⁵

At a deeper level, other speakers suggested that the actions of the state at Peterloo were simply un-British. At Meikleriggs Moor in Paisley on 11 November one speaker said that:

...the British sword had been drawn on starving men and fainting women; has it desolated every country in the world, to be at last drawn on ourselves? and will you allow your brethren to be murdered, without raising your voice against the infernal deed? No! sooner shall the lake wash Benlomond from its elevated site than the sons of Caledonia shall lie silent!²⁶

At Dundee in November George Kinloch, ‘the radical laird’, asked of the Manchester Yeomanry: ‘Could these fellows be Britons? — Impossible!’²⁷ Illustrating one of the consistent contradictions of British radicalism, the counter-position of demands for freedom at home and abroad, one speaker at the Newmills (Ayrshire) meeting castigated middle-class reformers for focusing on the abolition of slavery: ‘Where is now the boasted Wilberforce, the champion of freedom, whose philanthropic bosom was rent by the shrieks of the enslaved sons of Africa?... Is it nothing to thee that Christians are murdered and enslaved, if heathens be protected?’²⁸

The flags on display at these meetings showed a mixture of Scottish and English symbols.²⁹ At Johnstone on the 1st of November thirty-two flags were hung in front of the hustings: for one of William Wallace, there was another of Major Cartwright holding his Bill; for one proclaiming that: ‘We are the Descendants of Wallace and Bruce’, there was another stating: ‘Shall Britons Ever be Ruled by Knaves? No, Britons Never Shall be Slaves’. Perhaps the clearest representation of the national politics which dominated these meetings was one which incorporated the Thistle, Rose and Shamrock above the slogan: ‘May the Union be Firm’.³⁰

Specifically Scottish rhetoric tended to be reserved for closing perorations. At Linktown of Kirkcaldy the demonstration ended with an invocation to ‘always bear in mind that we are the lineal descendants of those who fought under the banners of WALLACE’ and the playing of ‘Scots Wha’ Hae’.³¹ In Paisley the same song was accompanied by banners hung in front of the hustings which carried such slogans as ‘Abhor the Inhuman Butchers at Peterloo’ and ‘Magna Charta.’³² ‘Scots Wha’ Hae’ was reciprocally adopted in England for its Radical rather than nationalist associations.³³ Nor was it the case that references to Britishness confined to what we might call the Moral Force wing of the Reform movement, while the more radical Physical Force wing of the reformers embraced a Scottish identity. The moderates did indeed employ the rhetoric of Britishness. An appeal to ‘the gentlemen and Freeholders of Ayr’ produced in the wake of the demonstrations concluded, ‘we would call on you, as lovers of your country, as having a deep stake in it, as men and as Britons, to arise and exert yourselves in the cause of your country’.³⁴

The second theme underpinning the post-Peterloo activism in Scotland was that the demonstrators were concerned to present themselves in a dignified and orderly way. This extended even to the treatment of property on which they assembled: the handbill for the Paisley meeting, for example,

implored that 'no damage be done to any of the Fences.'³⁵ More seriously, however, it determined how the meetings were conducted. Business was typically begun by the chair exhorting the audience to maintain 'good order' and do nothing to promote the idea of 'disturbance and revolution.'³⁶

Nonetheless, and this represents the third consistent theme in accounts of the Radical agitation, divisions were beginning to become more open within the ranks of the reformers. On the one hand stood those whose greatest concern was not to frighten the middle class, and therefore to encourage restraint in both conduct and demands amongst the reformers. Kinloch summed up this position in his address from the chair at the Dundee meeting:

At present, in this country, there are three parties – the Tories or Ministerialists, the Whigs or Outs, and the People. As to there being a fourth party, desirous of a revolution, I know of none... *We* want no revolution: on the contrary, we want a reform to *prevent* a revolution.³⁷

As the agitation continued, loyalties—and even armed militias—congealed around class interests. The 'moderates' amongst the reformers continued to appeal in vain to the more modest elements of the propertied class. Following the meeting at Kilmarnock on 27 November they composed an address to the lesser landowners ('gentlemen and freeholders') of Ayr which defended the cause of 'of a Reform of Abuses (as notorious as the sun at noonday) 'against the charge of meaning 'nothing but a Revolution'; 'the equalisation of Rights and Privileges' against that of meaning 'an equalisation of property'; and the criticism of some clergymen as implying 'Atheism or Infidelity.' The address rejected 'all these charges with indignation.'³⁸ The *Edinburgh Review*, the chief intellectual organ of the Whigs, identified 'the foundation of discontents among the manufacturing classes...in disputes about wages.' The problem lay in the lack of parliamentary representation of the industrialising towns: a reform that, providing for a 'tolerably free election of representatives' would result in 'two interests' being formed— 'one of the masters and the other of the workmen.' Thus represented 'the complaints of the discontented would find a safe and even useful vent' and 'convince them that the rest [of their grievances] were imaginary.'³⁹ In private correspondence the editor of the *Review*, Francis Jeffrey, offered a more pessimistic opinion that 'if they [demands for reform] were 'met only with menaces and violence we shall be drenched in blood...leading ultimately perhaps to a necessary and salutary, but sanguinary revolution.' The source of 'our present radical evil' Jeffrey traced to 'the excess of our productive power'—or the capacity of 'artificial society' to produce beyond the level of demand.⁴⁰

Just as Whig authors such as Jeffrey expressed such pessimistic views of the reform movement, so the more radical sections of the latter displayed an—in the end justified—distrust of the Whigs. For example Robert Ramsay addressed one meeting from the chair with the question 'We have heard much about Union... But with who are we to unite? Are we to retrace our steps and unite with that party called the Whigs? Impossible! We have nothing to expect from them; and the only use they want to make of us is a stepping stone to get into power.'⁴¹ Middle class commentators typically took the voice of the Radicals as more representative of the reformers than that of the moderates. As one bourgeois diarist remarked, the type of 'orators' who attracted the most attention at these demonstrations 'soon spoiled these causes for which might have been successful and by their "death or liberty", annual parliaments and universal suffrage at last made enemies of both the parties [i.e. the Whigs and the Tories]'. But what truly alarmed the middle class was not what was said at these meetings, but the very fact of their existence and the social forces which they threatened to unleash. The same diarist wrote that the Kilmarnock commemorative meeting 'altho' conducted with regularity and concluded without commotion, had been received with apprehension both by the civil authorities of Glasgow and by the inhabitants.' He means inhabitants like himself, of course. Of particular concern was the fact that some of those attending were armed.⁴²

The fear of revolution and social disorder was accompanied by a class analysis—interwoven with disdain—of the social base of Radicalism. ‘The town mechanic’, wrote Hugh Miller in his memoir of the time, ‘is the rudest and most uncomplying of all Whigs.’ This Whiggism had nothing in common with the genteel variety of the *Edinburgh Review* but rather represented resistance to ‘Government itself.’ Behind the demands for reform Miller detected ‘the doctrine of Liberty and Equality...the most popular ever broached in this country...the destruction of every kind of establishment and the passing of an agrarian law.’ Of course, Miller conceded no legitimacy to such doctrines, ascribing them instead to the ‘improvidence’ of the urban manual worker which ‘while it keeps him poor gives him a taste for expensive pleasures...flattered by every anticipation of Revolution.’¹⁴³

Throughout the autumn and winter of 1819-20 this propertied class consciousness coalesced in response to the perceived Radical threat. It was a time, wrote Thomas Carlyle, of ‘great rages and absurd terrors and expectations, a very fierce Radical and anti-Radical time.’ Edinburgh and Glasgow were overrun with ‘gentry people full of zeal and foolish terror and fury, and looking disgustingly busy and important’—although Carlyle himself considered the ‘danger from these West-country Radicals...small or imaginary’ but ‘their grievances dreadfully real.’¹⁴⁴ Sir Walter Scott comforted himself with visions of quasi-feudal obedience: the ‘magnanimous John of Skye’ having apparently led public declamations of loyalty in Galashiels to ‘King and Sherriff.’¹⁴⁵ It was the proletarianized districts of the West from which Scott anticipated the danger rather than the more agrarian areas ‘for the Scottish peasantry are more attached to their lairds than is the general case in England.’¹⁴⁶ In correspondence with Robert Dundas, the 2nd Viscount Melville and then Lord of the Admiralty, Scott reiterated his case that ‘while the poor think it possible to get at the property of the rich by a general rising it will be difficult to offer any more arguments which can overcome the temptation.’ Rather, property was the secret to building an anti-Radical coalition; ‘every man who has or cultivates a furrow of land, or has a guinea in the funds or vested in stock, in trade or in mortgage, or in any other way whatsoever.’¹⁴⁷ Melville agreed that ‘artisans and persons of that description and in that state of life’ proved untrustworthy for forming a militia of anti-Radical volunteers. ‘Your Shepherds and Hill peasantry are as yet’, Melville noted with some relief, ‘of a very different description, not only physically but morally.’¹⁴⁸ Cockburn, Carlyle and *The Spirit of The Union* all remarked upon the formation and drilling of anti-Radical volunteer militias – although Cockburn was to note that ‘Edinburgh was as quiet as the grave, or even as Peebles.’¹⁴⁹

If Peebles was proverbially quiet, the same could not be said of Paisley where James Parkhill reported that ‘the street where I resided, the inhabitants were all radicals throughout. The associations...divided into sections or unions.’¹⁵⁰ These sections engaged in military training which Parkhill described as becoming ‘brisker than ever’ throughout late 1819 and early 1820 ‘[T]hroughout the country they were gathering’, most of the Radicals thus assembled being ‘below thirty years of age.’ If some of those drilling sought merely the opportunity for excitement, a ‘vast number were in downright earnest.’¹⁵¹ The political anxieties stirred by such drilling among those against whom it was directed were recorded earlier, by John Gibson Lockhart, Scott’s future son-in-law and biographer. He had reported of events ‘close by the River Kelvin’ in late March 1819: ‘A lady...saw about a hundred with pikes going thro’ all the manoeuvres. At the close of the drill they were addressed by their inspector who spoke well and audibly in “a high English accent”. He said [they knew] nothing of him except his name [and he knew] not even the name of one of them, but their course was clear and if they would be led by him he would lead them while he had a drop of blood remaining. He then shook hands with every one of them and they dispersed in the most quiet and orderly manner.’¹⁵²

As well as being alarmed by the preparations of their Radical enemies, the propertied classes were engaged in manoeuvres of their own—and not only in the West. Lord President Hope wrote to Melville on 12 December complaining that the troops in Edinburgh Castle had been moved to barracks in Glasgow in anticipation of the rising there, and had partly been replaced by volunteers. Hope had heard

that the rising had apparently been cancelled, and this meant that the return of the troops was essential: 'And while the troops are absent from this [place], I think it extremely probable, that an attempt will be made to execute a rising here - for I am sorry to say, that symptoms have appeared of which we were not at all aware' - including 'hisses and approbation language' directed by 'artisans of various kinds' towards the Yeomanry marching through the Grassmarket. James Douglas of Burnbrae reported in *The Spirit of the Union* of a Yeoman volunteer:

on returning one evening from parade... perceived before him a man of the lower orders (Daniel Morrison, millwright, Milngavie) who had the presumption to walk upright; and rightly judging from that circumstance, that he must be one of the disaffected, rode up, and with a dextrous blow, laid him in the ditch, vowing with a voice of thunder that he would not be satisfied until *his horse swam to the bridle reins in Radical blood*...proceeding to trample the inglorious carcass still deeper in the mire, ... a swarm of boys... gathered in a hostile array against the *champion*, who, fearing that his newly acquired laurels would be sullied by an overthrow, applied the spur to his foaming steed, and in a twinkling succeeded in securing an honourable retreat.⁵³

The stage was set for that open rupture Scott so dreaded. It was not long in coming.

The insurrection and the strike

The insurrection and general strike, as we have seen in the previous part of this article, began on the first of April 1820. Preparations were in hand before this date, but were often disrupted by police activity—for example the arrest of several Radical delegates meeting at tavern in the Gallowgate in Glasgow in March.⁵⁴ This pattern continued in the week before the rising, during which—according to Parkhill—'the greatest activity was displayed by the radical officers.' The greatest activity was also displayed by the state. John Neil, a member of the delegation which had negotiated arrangements with the English Radicals, was visited by the police, who seized his papers and books by Cobbett, Paine and Voltaire. Parkhill visited him as the Police were leaving, and: '[w]hen I left his house... [a] crowd had collected round the police and were pelting the poor officials...At length the police got under cover, and the mob dispersed.' Parkhill was arrested, along with another radical but was then released after 'keeping as dark as possible in reference to the seditious books.'⁵⁵

The proclamation of the rising was circulated amongst Radicals in Paisley on the 31st of March and posted throughout the town. The Radicals planned to give a letter to local ministers the next day with a warning that they should advise their flock not to resist the rising, or face the consequences.⁵⁶ By the Sunday the 2nd April, the proclamation 'increasingly produced' a 'sensation.'⁵⁷ In Glasgow in particular the 'the streets were filled with gazing crowds strolling about in complete idleness, waiting with intent expectation, for the commencement of the announced revolution, which was to be begun at a moment and by persons unknown,' albeit 'with no open violation of the peace.'⁵⁸ Alexander Hamilton—the Lord Lieutenant of Lanarkshire rather than the founding father of US federalism—reported a 'spectacle of sullen satisfaction' in the crowded streets of the city and a 'keen and lowering expectation in the face of an immense multitude.'⁵⁹ The *Annual Register* considered the proclamation was considered, accurately or not, 'of English rather than of Scotch composition'—but of co-ordinated preparations for the rising on both sides of the Tweed there can be no doubt.⁶⁰

The adequacy of those preparations was another question. Parkhill reports that in Paisley only a handful of 'our most determined warriors' were equipped with either arms or ammunition.⁶¹ Nor did every town respond with equivalently high levels of support. In Neilston near Paisley, the local minister preached a homily based on Paul's epistle to Titus: 'be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle,

showing all meekness unto all men.' According to the minister's successor, 'whilst the whole works of the same kind in Lanarkshire, Dumbartonshire, Renfrewshire and Ayrshire stood still that week, not one of all the twenty-two large public works stood idle for a moment in Neilston parish.'⁶²

On Monday the 3rd of April the full extent of the strike became clear. According to Hamilton, the proclamation was obeyed almost entirely from 'Girvan to Stirling' and 'almost all the labouring population abandoned their work at one and the same time'. Glasgow and Paisley were 'thronged to an inconceivable degree between Monday and Thursday, in expectation of hearing of a general rising of their friends in England, the signal for them to proceed to hostilities, and to rear their Provisional Government on the ruins of the altar and the throne.'⁶³ This day seems to have represented the high point of the rising, in which the general strike was solid, '[b]lacksmiths and carpenters' shops' were requisitioned to produced weapons and the declamation "'what can the great people in this country do against us'" was repeated from mouth to mouth and carried from ear to ear.'⁶⁴ At Sandayhills in Glasgow on the evening of the 3rd, 2000 people assembled to arrange drilling and elect their officers for the next—'in one village within a short distance of Glasgow, not a man was left, except an old man, a pensioner. In other villages every man was out.'⁶⁵ Groups of 'indifferently armed' radicals visited workplaces enforcing the strike.⁶⁶

Misfortune awaited the rising, however. The signal that the rising had simultaneously begun in England was to be the stopping of the London mail coach that normally arrived on Monday evening. Crowds in Kilmarnock, Paisley and Glasgow assembled eagerly awaiting the absence of the coach. Yet the coach did arrive, indicating that the rising in England had been aborted, 'and a sense of betrayal and failure spread like lightning.'⁶⁷

Nonetheless, the strikers and radicals did not give up. On Tuesday the fourth, C.H Hutchison noted that in Glasgow 'the crowd of idlers had greatly increased' as a result of the strikes in the cotton mills and public works. Sinister groups of men 'with their hands in their pockets...were to be seen in every street'. Worst of all, noises 'heard during the whole day in the neighbourhood' suggested that 'large bodies were probably drilling.'⁶⁸ In Paisley, meanwhile the 'cotton mills in and near Johnstone were stopped, and the military, along with the police, were paying visits to the suspected insurgents.'⁶⁹

By Wednesday the 5th, the ruling class was ready to regroup and counter-attack. The Sheriff of Renfrewshire issued a proclamation exhorting 'all-well-meaning persons instantly to return to their usual employments – and not to suffer themselves to be intimidated from doing so by the deluded Traitors who are at present insulting and tyrannising over their fellow-citizens.'⁷⁰ Having seen that their comrades' efforts in England had been thwarted or aborted, the Radical leadership in Scotland 'issued orders that no general rising should take place on Wednesday night.'⁷¹ Most—but not all—of the radicals observed this tactical withdrawal, leading to the skirmish at the 'Battle of Bonnymuir', the interpretation of which has done so much to imbue 1820 with the air of retrospective bathos. The 'Battle' was not as paltry as has been portrayed: 'single horsemen were everywhere attacked and the roads around Glasgow were in the hands of the Radicals for near two hours.'⁷² The Battle of Bonnymuir ensued when the Radicals met with outliers of the Yeomanry calvary on the road to Falkirk—having been thus informed, the cavalry set off in pursuit. At Bonnymuir they caught up with the radicals who nonetheless:

showed a disposition to fight rather than fly; having taken their position behind an old dyke, they allowed the Cavalry to come within thirty yards of them, when they fired a volley; the Cavalry instantly charged, firing a few shots when going over the dyke; the Radicals received the charge with their pikes and made all the resistance in their power, but they soon found themselves in a bad situation, and throwing away their arms, endeavoured to escape, when the Cavalry secured nineteen prisoners, three of whom were wounded, two remained on the

field so badly wounded as not to be able to be carried to Stirling Castle, where the prisoners are lodged. ... The whole number of the Radicals did not exceed forty or fifty.'⁷³

Notwithstanding this outcome, the following day 'it was circulated by the radicals that the troops were defeated.' Emboldened by the false news 'men, women and children' in Glasgow took hold of whatever weapons they could and paraded ready to meet their foes.⁷⁴ In Paisley and 'every village and town of any consequence' the magistrates' proclamations were torn from the walls in full view of the military—who nonetheless took it upon themselves to shoot a woman in the neck 'in self-defence.'⁷⁵ On Friday the 7th, 300 armed men were seen drilling by the yeomanry but were able to escape 'into Coalpits.'⁷⁶

Particularly alarming to the authorities and middle classes was the appearance of nakedly class demands, even of a revolutionary nature, such as those in 'several villages in Ayrshire ... Galston, Newmills, Sorn and Stewarton... At the latter place a swaggering collier, named Orr, proclaimed the Constitution, with drawn sword in his hand. Their confidence in their own prowess, and final success, was very great. Workmen demanded their wages in the middle of the preceding week, declining to their masters that, before another elapsed, cotton mills would be unknown, and that they would all be equal. If they succeeded they stated that no person would have to pay any rent. All would dwell for free'.⁷⁷

The last significant engagement of the rising took place at Greenock on Saturday the 8th of April. A substantial number—around 100—of Volunteer (i.e. anti-Radical) militiamen were taking 5 radical prisoners to the jail in the town when they discovered the shops shut and a gathering crowd that shouted in support of the prisoners and 'insulted' and 'pelted' the Volunteers 'with stones.' On attempting to leave the town, the volunteers were 'followed by a crowd, increasing in number, evil intentions and fury' who 'poured upon' them '*large* stones, brick-bats, bottles and other dangerous missile weapons.' The volunteer militia opened fire, killing six people and wounding twelve, 'several of whom were totally innocent.' Workers leaving their shift joined the crowd 'quickly overpowered, broke open the prison, and liberated the Radical prisoners.' The crowd then marched to Port Glasgow but retreated in the face of the armed middle class, who were in the process of being reinforced by the military from Glasgow and Paisley.⁷⁸ The eventual number of the wounded was fifteen, including a boy of eight, James McGilp, who was shot in the leg, and an old woman, Catherine Turner, also shot in the leg which was subsequently amputated.⁷⁹

With the failure of the expected rising in England and the arrest of many Radical leaders in the field, however, the insurrection was doomed by the second weekend of April. Scott, in London to receive his baronetcy, wrote to Lord Montague that 'bubble seems to have burst with a slighter explosion than could have been expected.'⁸⁰ Lockhart, serving with the yeomanry himself, wrote a graver assessment to Scott's daughter Sophia 'that there had been a serious and well-arranged plan on Monday last' thwarted by the arrival of so many broad-backed Yeomen, etc.'⁸¹ Displaying that bloodlust so typical of a threatened ruling class, Lockhart added in a letter to a male correspondent 'until they are all hanged there can be no tranquillity.'⁸² Another of Scott's correspondents echoed this sentiment, but also concern over the long-term implications: 'Radicalism is I may say completely put down, at least for the present, tho' the spirit which induced it, is I fear too deeply rooted and extensive to be eradicated. I hope awful examples will be made which with a vigilant magistracy and an active police will I trust keep down the base spirit, until by the gradual diminution of the vast numbers of the now worse than useless manufacturing population to which this vile spirit is chiefly confined, the causes of danger shall cease.'⁸³

The vigilance of the magistracy was demonstrated when cavalry entered Kilmarnock on the early morning of 14 April and placed a small cannon at the Cross, with the mouth pointing down King Street. At daybreak they began to search for weapons, literature and incriminating correspondence, accompanied by members of the town council and 'a few old foggies'. Comic elements

notwithstanding—including an inevitably fruitless search for ‘Geordie Chalmers, eponymous hero of *The Law in Glenbuckie* – the troops represented a real threat. James Paterson remembered that while ‘the search was going on not a single person was allowed to stir out of doors. I made an attempt to get out in order to see what was going on...but I had no sooner set my foot on the threshold than one of the troopers came galloping furiously towards me, ordering me to keep within, and brandishing his sword so near my head, that its point struck the door, leaving a mark which I believe is still there.’⁸⁴

Others escaped the interest of the authorities by diving out of windows and back doors, hiding in bedroom cupboards and so on. Those taken were questioned about their politics—‘Do you read, or have you read, the *Black Dwarf*?’—and asked if they had any pikes before being taken to the county prison at Ayr from which they were ‘all were ultimately liberated.’⁸⁵ Still others, like James Parkhill fled further still, across the Atlantic to the United States or Canada, although in Parkhill’s case meeting with misfortune in Carlisle ‘the where I was attacked by three colliers’ wives, and charged with being a runaway radical from the west country.’⁸⁶

On 20 April an Address ‘To the Deluded Operatives’ was issued on behalf of the Mauchline magistrates, over the signature of Alexander Boswell: ‘It is with the deepest sorrow that we have marked the progress of dissatisfaction, moral turpitude, and insubordination, amongst a certain class in the County of Ayr, once so honourably conspicuous by loyalty, religious habits and orderly conduct.’ Nevertheless, despite having fallen for the blandishments of the agitators, ‘to the unhappy victims of their diabolical machinations, forbearance and forgiveness ought to be extended’. Providing, of course, that they were prepared to make ‘atonement’: ‘Let them return to their duty and allegiance, and give up to punishment those who have misled and betrayed them, and learn the salutary lesson, that their existence depends on the maintenance of public tranquillity.’⁸⁷

With the Radical leadership, and much of the rank and file, in flight or in hiding, Royal Commissioners were dispatched to restore order, investigate the rising and make sanguinary examples of the kind for which Scott, Lockhart and other members of their class thirsted. James Fraser, awaiting trial for treason in Paisley for copying threatening letters, distributing the proclamation and correspondence with James Spiers, witnessed their arrival in the town on the 1st of July. ‘The Lords and High advocates...assembled...wiggled and gowned, and, guarded by cavalry’ marched towards the church. Fraser and his comrades demonstrated their contempt for this pomp by loudly singing ‘Scots Wha hae Wi’ Wallace Bled’, for which insubordination they were chained. When they eventually came to trial, however, not only those like Fraser, who had played no real organisational role, but also those like Spiers, who certainly had, were found ‘Not Guilty’ by the jury. Hearing of the release of the latter ‘the whole of Paisley burst out with cheering and exulting joy’ and ‘a social meeting, rejoicing in the happy escape, took place in one of the public halls.’⁸⁸

Others, of course, were not so fortunate—most of all the well-known executed leaders Wilson, Baird and Hardie. There is only one full eye-witness account of the last hour of Baird and Hardie, that of Edward Frier, who was seventeen at the time and who afterwards was one of those responsible for having their remains exhumed and laid in the memorial at Sighthill Cemetery in Glasgow. Unfortunately, his recollections were only recorded six decades later when he was in his seventies and through the intermediary of John Campbell, a fellow power-loom tenter. Stripped of Campbell’s melodramatic embellishments, however, and supplemented by contemporary newspaper reports, their final moments can be reconstructed.⁸⁹

An hour before their execution the two men were led into the crowded courtroom at Stirling Castle. They were first asked which hymn they would prefer to sing – they chose the fifth – then if they had any final statements to make – they both indicated that they had made their peace with their God – then (by the Governor) if they would take a glass of wine. Both accepted

the drink, offering toasts in support of the 'deliverance' and 'legitimate rights' of their countrymen. At this point the Sheriff asked if the two men intended to address the spectators from the scaffold. On being told that they did, the Sheriff said that he would not allow it, but the hostility of the crowd in the courtroom forced him to retract within minutes. The two men were then drawn on a hurdle to the place of execution with the executioner seated in front and holding his axe... The scaffold, heavily protected by troops, was a dual contraption; one on which the men were to be hanged and the other on which their corpses were to be beheaded, as the majesty of the law dictated. Both men spoke, Baird first, then Hardie. Both were interrupted by the Sheriff who was greeted by cries of 'Murder, murder, murder!' from the crowd, although no rescue attempt was made. After the speeches were complete, and their prayers said, they gave the signal for the executioner to pull the lever. It took them a mercifully brief time to die, after which Tam Young severed their heads from their bodies, cleanly in the case of Hardie, botched in the case of Baird, whose jawbone was broken in the process.

John McAdam, looking back from 1880 to when, aged 14, he had watched Wilson being executed on Glasgow Green recalled: 'I saw poor old James Wilson's head held up then, with the exclamation of: "behold the head of a traitor", and my first political impression was made by a stern response behind me: "No! It is the head of a good true Scotsman"'.⁹⁰

Conclusion

What was the actual character of the rising, which met with such a grisly ending? As we noted in the preceding part of this article, the 'Radical War' has generally been dismissed by later commentators. This trend was an early one to develop – only days after the insurgency had subsided, 'a British Subject' denounced the main liberal paper, *The Scotsman*, for playing down the danger: '...the periodical press, as is usual [are] labouring to treat the whole as ridiculous and contemptible... "A mock insurrection" – 246 Radicals only in arms – 1,500 altogether in Scotland.' His own judgement was different: 'We are not to take the thousands that actually came forward...with arms in their hands' but those 'who, under other circumstances, would have come forward, and... were ready to come forward as soon as the mischief was begun.' The author continued with the 'appalling fact, that the largest portion of Ayrshire, nearly all of Renfrewshire, the densest parts – *three-fourths* – of the population of Lanarkshire, part of Dumbartonshire, much of Stirlingshire, are deeply poisoned by the spirit of Radicalism – the spirit of rebellion and revolution. ... 150,000 are decidedly tainted with these principles; of these, we must bear in mind that the greater number are able bodied men...The actual force ready to attack us consisted of *many thousands*.' Had the rising occurred 'I fear the threat would have been realised. More than 80,000 wished well to this cause.' The threat was posed not only to the British ruling class but the imperial hegemony upon which it sat: 'it fills with dismay [sic] the Caribbean Ocean...it will be felt on the banks of the Ganges.'⁹¹ Much more than later nationalist commentators who would misinterpret the rising and strike as insurrections aimed at regaining Scottish independence, voices of the contemporary ruling class understood 1820 for what it was: a real threat to their power across the British Isles, and indeed to the wider Empire, based on the emergent working-class rather than any specifically Scottish demands.

1820 then opened up that cycle of partial incorporation of reformist elements of the working-class that characterised the 19th century—beginning with the reform act of 1832.⁹² The Whigs began to make strenuous efforts to educate the working-class out of their radicalism, proselytizing for the principles of Political Economy through such institutions as the Glasgow Mechanics' Institute and the Haddington School of Arts in East Lothian.⁹³

The general strike of 1820 nonetheless demonstrated a qualitative shift in the emergence of working-class consciousness, although the separation between reformist and revolutionary consciousness was

not – and could not – be clear at this date, if only because of the nature of the state meant that reforms themselves required insurrectionary activity. The shift was, however, also evident in much smaller ways. The Articles of Agreement of the Society of Bookbinders of 1775 originally allowed both masters and journeymen to belong to the organisation. By 1814 the successor Company and Society of Bookbinders had extended occupational membership to include booksellers, but retained the mixed class base. By 1822, however, Article 12 of the newly formed Edinburgh Union Society of Journeymen Bookbinders could state ‘that when any member commences business, he must immediately leave the society’, although employers could be readmitted if they subsequently rejoined the ranks of the journeymen.⁹⁴

The result of industrialisation and urbanisation in Scotland was therefore to remove the unevenness between Lowland Scotland and England and, with it, the special conditions which had produced the militancy of the Scottish response. Indeed, the apparent lack of success of both industrial militancy and insurrection, combined with an upswing in the economic cycle, produced a turn towards constitutional reform among the labour movement which benefited the Whig Party, rather than any working-class organisation. From being in advance of the working-class in England, the working-class in Scotland fell behind it in terms of organisation and militancy until the rise of the Shop Stewards Movement during the First World War.

Thus, at some point between 1746 and 1820, all classes in Scotland came, for different reasons, to treat the British aspect of their national identity as politically decisive. Although Scottish workers were aware that different conditions pertained on either side of the Border (since their demands were intended to remove these differences), they do not appear to have considered themselves as being either ‘led’ by their English brothers and sisters, or acting in opposition to them, but to have realised that the British state was not susceptible to overthrow (or even reform) on one side of the border alone. These attitudes go back to the very beginning of Scottish radicalism. At no time in the history of the radical movement between 1792 and 1820 was Scottish nationalism the predominant political ideology. The rising and general strike, contra to much later interpretation, demonstrate the pan-British nature of this radicalism.

This was a contest over what it means to be British. For ruling class ideologues, for whom the state and the nation (and indeed, the economy) had already fused, the actions of the workers in 1820 were a threat to all. Might not such disturbances lead to foreign investors withdrawing their funds? ‘We can no longer be looked upon as arbiters of the world. In this point of view, our frantic Radicals have accomplished more than Napoleon ever could. With our own hands, we are tearing up, by the roots, the laurels of Trafalgar and Waterloo. These can only be tarnished, or rooted up, by British hands.’⁹⁵ The point is perhaps best illustrated by another song:

What land has not seen Britain's crimson flag flying,
The *meteor of murder, but justice the plea*,
Has the blood of her sons, in her ruthless wars dying,
Been the warm showers! to nourish fair liberty's tree.
Yes! if placemen and paupers in myriads unceasing,
If nations degraded, white slave trade increasing,
if scorn with oppression be reckon'd a blessing,
Then Britain has nourish'd fair liberty's tree.

Here Britain features both as the leadership of the alliance that crushed the revolutionary hopes of 1789 ('For kings have resolved that in Europe for ever/The tocsin of freedom shall sound never again'), and as of the site in which a truly revolutionary power—that of the working-class might eventually emerge to overthrow them:

May the time soon arrive when the tyrant and minion
 Shall be heard of no more save in tales of the evening,
 When freemen from labour in circle conveying,
 Tell them o'er, in the shade of liberty's tree.⁹⁶

The site of action for the singer is Britain, but the subject is the international upheaval between 1789 and 1820. What nationality was the author? In fact, this is an anonymous Scottish piece, first performed in Paisley at the Saracen's Head Inn to celebrate the release from prison of the English radical Henry 'Orator' Hunt on 22 October 1822. Yet without this knowledge, there is no way of saying whether the author is Scottish or English.

The Reverend Henry Duncan, in a passage during his novel *The Young South Country Weaver*, slips into the authorial voice to express the concern felt by his class over the relationship between Scottish and English workers. He argues that the educated nature of the Scottish workforce has made them susceptible to seditious ideas which devotional framework would once have prevented getting a hearing: 'Had their system [i.e. that of 'our Scottish ancestors'] been adhered to, there can be no doubt that, whatever might have been the discontents, the seditions, the impieties, of the lower classes in the *sister* kingdom, Scotland would not have been disgraced by becoming a party to the encouragement of blasphemous publications, and to those scenes of turbulence and treason, which have for the first time rendered it questionable, whether the superior education of the inhabitants is a blessing or a curse.'⁹⁷

A contrast may be drawn with Ireland. In 1820 the Irish presence in Scotland was simply much greater than in England: 7.2% of the population as compared to 2.9% in England and Wales.⁹⁸ The Irish presence among the radicals seems to have been at least proportionate to their presence in the workforce, if not to the population as a whole. Around 30 leaders of the underground radical organisation were arrested in February 1817. Of the thirteen whose nationality or occupation have been established, five were Irish and four of them were weavers. Two of the sixteen men sentenced to transportation for their part in the Battle of Bonnymuir were originally from County Down; one was a stocking-maker, the other (and this will come as no surprise) a weaver. Two of the seven men arrested for their part in the riot in Greenock were Irish, both labourers.⁹⁹

Most of these men were Protestants but, as Mitchell notes, these Protestants must be distinguished from those who were involved in the anti-Catholic Orange Lodges being established in Scotland at this time: rather being 'being part of the radical Presbyterian United Irish tradition, which was non-sectarian and which desired the same political, social and religious rights for all.'¹⁰⁰ As for Irish Catholics, the unanimity of the response to the strike call among weavers and spinners - given the extent to which the Irish had filled the latter occupation in particular - 'it is not unreasonable to argue that Irish spinners, like Irish weavers, went on strike in support of the radicals.'¹⁰¹ Irish workers, Protestant and Catholic, seem have to struck and risen in support of the demands of 1820 in their own right: that division in the working-class that would prove so effective in the 19th and 20th centuries was yet to be drawn.

Let us conclude with the figure whose letters and diaries provide the richest source of information on bourgeois fears during this period: Walter Scott. Scott was concerned to mobilise his version of Scottish national identity precisely to stop class consciousness becoming dominant and the spectacle of the royal visit in 1822, which Scott did so much to organise and direct, was an at least partially successful attempt to do so. The irony here, surely, is that the major contribution made by Scottishness to the events of the radical years was a component, not, as is so often claimed, of working-class militancy, but of the ideology of counter-revolution. In a letter written in 1826, Scott

suggested that only the retention of the Scottish identity prevented Scottish people, or at least their lower orders, from becoming 'damned mischievous Englishmen': 'The restless and yet laborious and constantly watchful character of the people, their desire for speculation in politics or anything else, only restrained by some proud feelings about their own country, now become antiquated and which late measures will tend to destroy, will make them under a wrong direction the most formidable revolutionists who ever took the field of innovation.'¹⁰² We may be grateful that Scottish workers ignored his advice, and overcame 'proud feelings about their own country' to become 'formidable revolutionists' in 1820: not to make a Scottish insurrection but to introduce the tactic of the working-class general strike in the context of a wider British movement.

Notes

¹ Scott to Morritt, 17 December 1819, *The Letters Of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. 6, 1819-1821, pp56-57.

² Bob Harris, *The Scottish People and the French Revolution* (Routledge, London, 2008) p.223

³ W. Scott, 'For a' That an' a' That', *The Poetical Works Of Sir Walter Scott* (12 Volumes, Adam and Charles Black: London, 1880), vol. 10, pp360-2.

⁴ 'Paisley Politics; or, Rab and Pate: A Dialogue', *Radical Renfrew: Poetry From The French Revolution To The First World War* Selected, Edited and Introduced by Tom Leonard (Polygon: Edinburgh, 1990), pp80-81.

⁵ J. Paterson, *Autobiographical Reminiscences* (Glasgow: Maurice Ogle and Co., 1871), p64.

⁶ H. Cockburn, *Life Of Lord Jeffrey With A Selection Of His Correspondence* (2 Volumes, Adam and Charles Black: Edinburgh, 1852), vol. 1, p246.

⁷ Paterson, *Autobiographical Reminiscences*, p65.

⁸ R. M. W. Cowan, *The Newspaper In Scotland* (George Outram and Company: Glasgow, 1946), pp23, 52-54.

⁹ Ibid, vol. 2, pp109-117.

¹⁰ W. Aiton, *A History Of The Rencounter At Drumclog And The Battle Of Bothwell Bridge In The Month Of June, 1679, With An Account Of What Is Correct, And What Is Fictitious In The Tales Of My Landlord Respecting These Engagements, And Reflections On Political Subjects* (Hamilton, 1821), pp7-8, 99.

¹¹ R. Brown, *The History Of Paisley From The Roman Period Down To 1884* (2 Volumes, J and J Cook: Paisley, 1885), vol. 2, pp166-168.

¹² Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, pp67-8.

¹³ J. Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon* (James Cook: Paisley, 1860), p66. For Parkhill's response to Walter Scott's attitude to the Covenanters in *Old Mortality*, see *ibid*, p64.

¹⁴ J. Parkhill, *The History Of Paisley* (Robert Stewart: Paisley, 1857), pp43-44.

¹⁵ Paterson, *Autobiographical Reminiscences*, pp66-67.

¹⁶ Sir John Hope to Melville, 10 August 1819, National Library of Scotland, MS 1054, ff. 172r-172v.

¹⁷ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (8).

¹⁸ R. Brown, *The History Of Paisley From The Roman Period Down To 1884* (2 Volumes, J and J Cook: Paisley, 1885), vol. 2, pp173-174.

¹⁹ Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, pp174-175.

²⁰ Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, p173.

²¹ Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, p176.

²² Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, p177.

²³ 'Reminiscences of the Radical Times in Kilmarnock and its Neighbours Addressed to a Friend in 1862', A McKay, *Burns and His Kilmarnock Friends With Other Pieces In Prose and Verse* (Archibald McKay: Kilmarnock, 1874), pp50-51.

²⁴ *Proceedings Of The Public Meeting Held At Newmills, Ayrshire; Upon the 25th Day Of September 1819*, p19.

²⁵ *The Proceedings Of A Meeting That Took Place At Linktown Of Kirkcaldy On The Third November, 1819, To Take Into Consideration The Proceedings At Manchester* (W. Aitchison: Edinburgh, n.d. [1819]), pp9-10, 11.

²⁶ Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, pp170-171.

²⁷ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (15), *The Spirit Of The Union*, vol. 1, no. 8, 27 November 1819.

²⁸ *Proceedings Of The Public Meeting Held At Newmills, Ayrshire; Upon the 25th Day Of September 1819, To Take Into Consideration The Late Proceedings At Manchester* (William Lang: Glasgow, 1819), pp5, 7.

²⁹ C. W. Thomson, *The Scottish Lion As a National Possession* (Robert Gibson and Sons: Glasgow, 1920), pp44-45. Thomson points out that, in newspaper reports of the Bannockburn commemorations of 1814, The St Andrew Cross has to be described by the journalists - the assumption being that readers would not otherwise have known what it was.

³⁰ Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, pp184-185.

³¹ *The Proceedings Of A Meeting That Took Place At Linktown Of Kirkcaldy On The Third November, 1819*, pp11, 23. See also

³² Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, pp169-70.

³³ E. PThompson, *The Making Of The English Working-class* (Revised with new Preface, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980), pp760, 757-8. The tradition was maintained in to the next phase of British radical – and socialist – activity. In his history of the Chartist movement R. G. Gammage records a meeting of 'several thousand persons' at Sunderland in 1838: 'Before the business of the meeting commenced the united bands struck up with the fine old martial and patriotic air of "Scots Wha Ha'e Wi' Wallace Bled".' *History Of The Chartist Movement, 1837-1854* (London, 1969, Facsimile of the 1894 Edition), p33. Gammage also reports a mass meeting from the same year in Newcastle where the banners bore, among other quotations, several from Burns. See *ibid*, p23.

³⁴ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (6).

³⁵ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (8).

³⁶ Brown, *The History Of Paisley*, vol. 2, p170. See also *The Proceedings Of A Meeting That Took Place At Linktown Of Kirkcaldy On The Third November, 1819*, p4. and *Proceedings Of The Public Meeting Held At Newmills, Ayrshire; Upon the 25th Day Of September 1819*, p3.

³⁷ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (15), *The Spirit Of The Union*, vol. 1, no. 8, 27 November 1819.

³⁸ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (6).

³⁹ 'State of the Country', *Edinburgh Review Or Critical Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 64, July 1819-October 1819, p304.

⁴⁰ Jeffrey to Wilkes, 24 August 1819, H. Cockburn, *Life Of Lord Jeffrey With A Selection Of His Correspondence* (2 Volumes, Adam and Charles Black: Edinburgh, 1852), vol. 2, pp189-190.

⁴¹ *The Proceedings Of A Meeting That Took Place At Linktown Of Kirkcaldy On The Third November, 1819*, p19.

⁴² National Library of Scotland, MS 2773, C. H. Hutchison Diary 1820-1848, pp5, 9-10.

⁴³ H. Miller, *Hugh Miller's Memoir: From Stonemason To Geologist* Edited by M. Shortland (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1995), pp215-216.

⁴⁴ Thomas Carlyle, *Reminiscences* Edited by James Anthony Froude (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881), pp120-121.

⁴⁵ Scott to Walter Scott, 16 November 1819, *The Letters Of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. 6, 1819-1821, p18.

⁴⁶ Scott to Lady Abercorn, 25 November 1819, *The Letters Of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. 6, 1819-1821, p29.

⁴⁷ Scott to Lord Melville, 26 November 1819, *The Letters Of Sir Walter Scott*, vol. 6, 1819-1821, p32.

⁴⁸ Lord Melville to Scott, 24 December 1819, National Library of Scotland, MS 3890/107, f. 253r.

⁴⁹ Carlyle, *Reminiscences*, pp.121-122, National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (16), *The Spirit Of The Union*, vol. 1, no. 10, 1 January 1820, Henry Cockburn, *Memorials Of His Time* (New Edition, Edinburgh and London: T. N. Foulis, 1909), pp343

-
- ⁵⁰ J. Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon* (James Cook: Paisley, 1860), p74.
- ⁵¹ Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, p76.
- ⁵² Lockhart to Croker, April 1820, National Library of Scotland, MS 1819/11/2-4
- ⁵³ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (16), *The Spirit Of The Union*, vol. 1, no. 10, 1 January 1820.
- ⁵⁴ Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, p79.
- ⁵⁵ Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, p83.
- ⁵⁶ J. R. Fraser, *Memoir Of John Fraser, Newfield, Johnstone* (J and J Cook: Paisley, 1879), p20.; Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, p84.
- ⁵⁷ National Library of Scotland, MS 2773, C. H. Hutchison Diary 1820-1848, p39.
- ⁵⁸ *Edinburgh Annual Register*, 1820, p37.
- ⁵⁹ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon, Lord Lieutenant Of Lancashire, Detailing The Events Of The Late Rebellion In The West Of Scotland, With Observations On The Present Alarming State Of That And Other Parts Of The Empire. By A British Subject* (John Smith and Son, William Blackwood and Cadell and Davies: Glasgow, Edinburgh and London, 1820), p3.
- ⁶⁰ *Edinburgh Annual Register*, 1820, p37. Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, p77
- ⁶¹ J. Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon* (James Cook: Paisley, 1860), p85
- ⁶² *The New Statistical Account Of Scotland* (15 Volumes, Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1845), vol. 7, Renfrew-Argyle, pp324-325.
- ⁶³ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, p9
- ⁶⁴ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, p10.
- ⁶⁵ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, p42.
- ⁶⁶ National Library of Scotland, MS 2773, C. H. Hutchison Diary 1820-1848, pp44-45.
- ⁶⁷ Fraser, *Memoir Of John Fraser*, p20.
- ⁶⁸ National Library of Scotland, MS 2773, C. H. Hutchison Diary 1820-1848, p43.
- ⁶⁹ Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon*, p92.
- ⁷⁰ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (1)
- ⁷¹ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, p65.
- ⁷² Lockhart to Croker, 10 April 1820, National Library of Scotland, MS 1819/7/1. See also Lockhart to Sophia Scott, April 1820, M. Lochhead, *John Gibson Lockhart* (John Murray: London, 1954), p72
- ⁷³ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (4)
- ⁷⁴ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, p16.
- ⁷⁵ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, p20.
- ⁷⁶ Lockhart to Croker, 10 April 1820, National Library of Scotland, MS 1819/7/3.
- ⁷⁷ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon, Lord Lieutenant Of Lancashire, Detailing The Events Of The Late Rebellion In The West Of Scotland, With Observations On The Present Alarming State Of That And Other Parts Of The Empire. By A British Subject* (John Smith and Son, William Blackwood and Cadell and Davies: Glasgow, Edinburgh and London, 1820), p22
- ⁷⁸ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, pp26-28.
- ⁷⁹ National Library of Scotland, RB.m.145 (4)
- ⁸⁰ Scott to Montague, 10 April 1820, *The Letters Of Sir Walter Scott* Edited by H. J. C. Grierson (12 Volumes, Constable and Company: London, 1932-7), vol. 6, 1819-1821, pp174-175.
- ⁸¹ Lockhart to Sophia Scott, April 1820, M. Lochhead, *John Gibson Lockhart* (John Murray: London, 1954), pp72-73.
- ⁸² Lockhart to Croker, 10 April 1820, National Library of Scotland, MS 1819/7/3.
- ⁸³ Buchanan to Scott, 10 April 1820, National Library of Scotland, MS 3891/140, ff. 50v-51r.
- ⁸⁴ 'Reminiscences of the Radical Times in Kilmarnock and its Neighbours Addressed to a Friend in 1862', pp66-67.
- ⁸⁵ 'Reminiscences of the Radical Times in Kilmarnock and its Neighbours Addressed to a Friend in 1862', p68.
- ⁸⁶ J. Parkhill, *The Life And Opinions Of Arthur Sneddon* (James Cook: Paisley, 1860), p97.

⁸⁷ 'Reminiscences of the Radical Times in Kilmarnock and its Neighbours Addressed to a Friend in 1862', pp70-71.

⁸⁸ J. R. Fraser, *Memoir Of John Fraser, Newfield, Johnstone* (J and J Cook: Paisley, 1879), pp21, 29.

⁸⁹ J. Campbell, *Recollections Of Radical Times Descriptive Of The Last Hours Of Hardie and Baird and The Riots In Glasgow, 1848* (Minerva: Glasgow, 1880), pp5-8.

⁹⁰ J. McAdam, *Autobiography Of John McAdam (1806-1883) With Selected Letters* Edited by J. Fyfe (Scottish History Society: Edinburgh, 1980), p4

⁹¹ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon*, pp35, 20, 39, 40, 42, 68.

⁹² A. Sommerville, *The Autobiography Of A Working Man* (London: Macgibbon and Kee, 1967) p30.

⁹³ A. Tyrrell, 'Political Economy, Whiggism and the Education of Working-Class Adults in Scotland, 1817-40', *Scottish Historical Review*, vol. 48: 1, no. 146, October 1969, pp154-158.

⁹⁴ E. Knox, 'Between Labour and Capital: the Petty Bourgeoisie in Victorian Edinburgh', University of Edinburgh PhD, 1986, p530.

⁹⁵ *A Letter To His Grace The Duke Of Hamilton and Brandon, Lord Lieutenant Of Lancashire, Detailing The Events Of The Late Rebellion In The West Of Scotland, With Observations On The Present Alarming State Of That And Other Parts Of The Empire. By A British Subject* (John Smith and Son, William Blackwood and Cadell and Davies: Glasgow, Edinburgh and London, 1820), p47.

⁹⁶ 'Song: the Deluge of Carnage at Length Has Subsided', *Radical Renfrew: Poetry From The French Revolution To The First World War* Selected, Edited and Introduced by T. Leonard (Edinburgh, 1990), p91.

⁹⁷ H. Duncan, *The Young South Country Weaver; Or, A Journey to Glasgow: A Tale For Radicals* (Second Edition, Waugh and Innes, T. Hamilton, Ogle, Duncan and Co, and W. Naynes and Son: Edinburgh and London, 1821), pp61-62. In the novel, the chief villain is an Englishman called Thistlethorn, whom the Radical dupe, Daniel Webster, says: 'He's a grand man that, though he be an Englishman.' Thistlethorn almost loses the confidence of a Radical audience by revealing his ignorance of the fact that Scotland is a Presbyterian nation. See *ibid*, pp67-69.

⁹⁸ T. H. Devine, *The Scottish Nation, 1700-2000* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1999), p487.

⁹⁹ Mitchell, *The Irish In The West Of Scotland*, pp90-6.

¹⁰⁰ Mitchell, *The Irish In The West Of Scotland*, p99.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, p104.

¹⁰² Scott to Croker, 19 March 1826, *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott* Edited by H. J. C. Grierson (12 Volumes, London, 1932-37), vol. 9, 1823-1826, pp471-2.