



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**A Study of the Debate on Scottish Home  
Rule, 1886-1914**

**Nathan Kane**

**PhD Scottish History**

**The University of Edinburgh 2015**

## **Abstract**

This thesis explores arguments for Scottish Home Rule, and the place these arguments were given during elections. It also discusses the interactions between Scottish Home Rulers with other Home Rule movements within the United Kingdom as well as attempts to build international support in the colonies and United States. Finally it examines the cultural and scientific manifestations of nationalism and how they were embraced by a Home Rule movement which was eager to identify evidence for devolution. The position of Scottish Home Rule before the Great War was very complex. Although the Scottish Liberal Association adopted it as a policy as early as 1888 the most ardent of Scottish Home Rulers were continually disappointed by the failure of the Liberal Party's leadership to commit to a time frame for introducing legislation. Despite this difficulty Scottish Home Rulers fought an uphill battle to keep the issue before the public through a significant body of pamphlets, journals, letters, and even in motions in the House of Commons. Between the second 1910 election and the Great War, the issue was kept in front of the Scottish Electorate and featured in almost all of the Liberal and Labour candidates' campaigns during the fourteen by-elections which occurred during the period. Culturally new expressions of 'Scottishness' can be seen in the establishment of bodies such as the Royal Scottish Geographic Society, the Scottish Historical Review and the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition. When these Scottish institutions ran into conflict with larger bodies based in England, usually associated with funding, the question of Scotland's relationship with the rest of the United Kingdom came into question. At these times nationalists within and without of these institutions could co-opt these concerns in order to further their appeals for greater Home Rule. Although Scottish Home Rule was never a dominant movement within Scottish politics before the war it did manage to find acceptance among a wide body of individuals and groups such as the Scottish Liberal Association, Young Scots' Society, Convention of the Royal Burghs of Scotland, Highland Land League, Scottish Labour League and Scottish Liberal Women's Association . This thesis will attempt to place Scottish Home Rule within the context of a time which saw the development of so many other great reforms and argue that although those who supported Scottish Home Rule did so for a variety of pragmatic reasons, the nationalistic ideology that Scotland should be governed by Scots, still found expression.

## **Signed Declaration**

I hereby pledge:

- (a) that this thesis has been composed by the myself, and
- (b) that the work is my own, and
- (c) that this work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification except as specified.

Nathan Kane

8 July 2015

## **Contents:**

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Tables</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Arguments for Scottish Home Rule</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Scottish Home Rule in By-elections</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Chapter 3: ‘Home Rule All Round’ Interactions Between Irish Scottish and Welsh Home Rulers</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Chapter 4: International Dimensions of the Scottish Home Rule Movement</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Science, Art, History, and expressions of Scottish Home Rule</b>	<b>184</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>221</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>230</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

This thesis would not have been possible without a great deal of assistance from a large number of knowledgeable and caring individuals. I have been very lucky to have been supported by two excellent supervisors, Ewen A. Cameron and James Kennedy. Were it not for their suggestions, guidance, and perhaps most of all patience, this project might have been abandoned long ago. I have also been blessed with the wonderful support of family and friends. My parents, Linda and Richard Kane, my grandfather, Walter Taylor, and my dear friends, Jo Ebelewicz and Hank Clay, have all selflessly offered assistance through countless generous expressions of support and kindness. I must also thank the hardworking staff of the many public and university libraries which I have visited in the course of conducting this research. Without their hard work and diligence this project would not have been possible.

**List of Abbreviations:**

**Edinburgh Evening News: EEN**

**National Library of Scotland: NLS**

**Scottish Home Rule Association: SHRA**

**Young Scots' Society: YSS**

**Tables****Table 1.1    80****Table 1.2    83**



## **Introduction**

This thesis is a study surrounding the debate for Scottish Home Rule between 1886 and 1914. Scottish nationalism is interwoven into the discussion but it was not the only great ideological shaper of the movement. Liberalism and Scotland's relationship with the Party it so loyally served during the long nineteenth century was essential in moulding the context in which the debate for Scottish Home Rule would take place. So too was the more prominent and controversial question of Irish Home Rule. This thesis will attempt to chart the development and interaction between Scottish Home Rule and these overshadowing political questions. The primary inspiration for the topic has been to question how a subject which could receive strong majorities among MPs representing Scottish constituencies could arouse so little credibility as a nationalist movement. The results of this study do not overturn assessments about the relative weakness of the movement during the period but it is hoped that they at least help to clarify its position, and crucially the motivation behind its support, within the broader political history of Scotland.

Scottish Home Rule has been described as occupying the margins of the margins of Scottish politics before the First World War.<sup>1</sup> If this description is accepted it might also be acknowledged that despite being scribbled on the margins, were we to imagine Scottish history as a book, Scottish Home Rule is a note which appears on several pages, including those of the Scottish Liberal Association; the Scottish Labour Party from its formation in 1888; the Highland Land League from its formation in 1886; the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition 1902-1904; the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland and, on several occasions, the majority of the Scottish MPs in the House of Commons. As well as these groups there was also the Scottish Home Rule Association (SHRA) and the Young Scots' Society (YSS) and several other nationalist and patriotic groups and periodicals who put considerable effort into promoting the cause. This list is not included to suggest that Scottish Home Rule was a dominant force in Scottish politics during the period. It was not. It did, however, have a place within these groups and associations. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Colin Kidd, *Union and Unionisms: Political Thoughts in Scotland, 1500-2000*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, p. 24-25.

thesis will attempt to shed light on the groups and individuals who scribbled Scottish Home Rule into the margins. By assessing the objectives, arguments and results of these groups a better understanding of Scottish nationalism before the War will be uncovered.

As well as the issue of Scottish Home Rule it is also interesting to consider the place of nationalism within Scotland. Colin Kidd has noted that Scots before the Great War were often enthusiastic supporters of continental nationalist movements.<sup>2</sup> ‘Scots were, it transpires, enthusiastic supporters of nationalist movements abroad. Glasgow alone was home to the Glasgow Garibaldi Italian Fund, the Glasgow Polish Association, the Glasgow Polish Committee and the Glasgow Working Men’s Garibaldi Committee.’<sup>3</sup> The extent to which Scotland supported the rights of small nations is intriguing. Certainly when one looks at the SHRA and the YSS one is able to see support among the leadership for the Boers. Gavin Clark, a president of the Scottish Home Rule Association, was responsible for several motions in favour of Scottish Home Rule between 1889 and 1893. Clark had been elected as a Crofter MP for Caithness in 1885. He lost the seat in 1900 over his support for the Boers. The YSS was founded as a pro-Boer group in direct response to the jingoism and imperialism of the early 1900s. If the Scots during this time were aware and supportive of other nationalist movements during the nineteenth century one might ask why they did not pursue it more actively themselves?

### **Terminology**

When setting out to discuss Scottish nationalism before the Great War one is invariably met with the question: did it exist? Contained within this yes or no question lies a host of complexities which must be wrought out before any attempt at an answer may be made. The first is defining the word ‘nationalism’. It is amusing to ponder if Britain has not produced more career scholars of nationalism than career nationalists. One of the great academic troubles of the word has been making the

---

<sup>2</sup> Douglas Young ‘A Sketch History of Scottish Nationalism’, in Neil MacCormick, (ed.), *Scottish Debates*, London: Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 5-20. Young hints that this enthusiasm for nationalist movements led many young Scottish nationalists to untimely deaths after enlisting to fight for the rights of Serbia and Belgium.

<sup>3</sup> Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p. 272.

actions of nationalists, their hopes, dreams and aspirations fit into our concept of the word. The challenge has been immense and difficult but it has borne fruit. One of the simplest definitions and perhaps most useful is that of Ernest Gellner. His theory of nationalism, published in 1983, argued that ‘Nationalism is a theory of political legitimacy, which requires that ethnic boundaries should not cross political ones’.<sup>4</sup>

Condensed into one sentence Gellner encapsulates much of one of the most powerful ideologies of the last two hundred years. His definition is beautiful, concise and accurate. Attempting to frame Scotland neatly within its context however is very difficult and even Gellner himself admitted that Scotland, might contradict his model.<sup>5</sup> One of the other most influential theorists of nations and nationalism was Benedict Anderson. His theory of nations as ‘imagined communities’ continues to inform discussion today.<sup>6</sup> Emphasis is given to the word ‘imagined’ because the size of nations necessitates that members of the community are able to conceptualise shared membership despite not being able to see all of the other members of the community on a face to face basis. Gellner’s ideas focussed on nations as modern constructs. With industrialisation came the need for a uniform society. Through nationalism modern society was able to ensure the production of individuals who would be adaptable to the necessities of a modern state.<sup>7</sup> Anthony Smith, however, took a different view of nations and nationalism. While his earlier research focussed on the pre-modern ethnic and cultural roots of nations, Smith has more recently come to accept that nationalism developed from the second half of the eighteenth century though it ‘drew on earlier religious expressions of a ‘covenantal’ form of nationalism that appeared in seventeenth-century England, Scotland and, more especially, the United Provinces of the Netherlands’.<sup>8</sup> Smith defines the object of nationalists as such:

To discover, or rediscover, nurture and safeguard the ‘true self’, the individuality, of the national community; to express that individuality

---

<sup>4</sup> Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2008, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43.

<sup>6</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1991, pp. 6-8.

<sup>7</sup> Ernest Gellner, ‘Do Nations have Navels?’, *Nations and Nationalism*, 2 (1996), p. 368.

<sup>8</sup> Anthony D. Smith, ‘National Identity and Vernacular Mobilisation in Europe’, *Nations and Nationalism*, 17 (2011), pp. 232-233.

to its fullest and freest extent; and as a result to make the community autonomous<sup>9</sup>

With so many competing definitions of nationalism it is difficult to conceptualise it for the practical purpose of studying a topic like Home Rule. The place of Scotland within models of reforming nationalism has recently received interesting discussion by James Kennedy. His own conception of nationalism is particularly well suited to the study of Scotland. ‘Nationalism as a political project seeks an arrangement in which the status of the nation is politically and/or culturally enhanced.’<sup>10</sup> Scotland in the nineteenth century has been described as a nation without a state.<sup>11</sup> He notes Michael Mann’s three instances of nationalism which include ‘state –reinforcing (France, England/Britain), state-creating (Germany, Italy,) state-subverting (Czechs, Slovaks)’.<sup>12</sup> Kennedy, however, contends that there is a fourth category of nationalism which is primarily interested in state-reforming. This was the nationalism of Scotland during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was not a nationalism that strove for separation from Great Britain but, rather, one that sought to redefine Scotland’s distinct position within empire. A nationalism that would have seen Scotland with complete control of Scottish matters while at the same time allowing the United Kingdom complete control over matters of empire.

Having presented an operational definition of nationalism it is now necessary to define Home Rule. This too is a difficult task as the term is both evocative and ambiguous. In its mildest form it could simply mean any increase in self-government or reformed local governance. However for the sake of this thesis the term shall be used as it was at the time most commonly interpreted, namely the devolution of a separate parliament for one or more parts of the UK to legislate on matters which primarily affected the territory receiving the parliament and minimally affected the empire as a whole. As will be demonstrated in the later chapters, Home Rule took many forms, notably Home Rule All Round which will receive more specific

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> James Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms: Empire, State, and Civil Society in Scotland and Quebec*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2013, p. 16.

<sup>11</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 15.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 15; Michael Mann, ‘A Political Theory of Nationalism and its Excesses’, in Sukumar Perival, (ed.), *Notions of Nationalism*, Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995, pp. 48-53.

discussion in chapter one. Many different plans were proposed for implementing Home Rule. Common points of dissent were whether or not the devolved bodies should be single or double chambered and, as highlighted by Gladstone's Irish Home Rule Bills, what would be done with the remaining representation at Westminster.

The phrase 'Scottish Home Rulers' will therefore be used to refer to supporters of the notion that Scotland should receive a devolved parliament to legislate on matters that would only affect Scotland. It is essential to stress the importance of the word devolution. With almost no exception, those who supported Scottish Home Rule either as MPs in the House of Commons or through groups like the SHRA, YSS or International Scottish Home Rule League sought devolution rather than independence. The critical difference between devolution and independence is that under a system of devolution the devolved parliament would always be subordinate to Westminster. Scottish Home Rule was not about breaking the Union of 1707. It was about revising how the Union would operate. The idea that Scottishness and Britishness can go hand and hand is an interesting one. The notion that Scottish nationalists might rightfully be considered unionists has been a recurrent theme in the historiography of Scottish nationalism. In *Union and Unionisms*, Kidd argues that Scottish Home Rulers were not seeking to destroy the Union. On the contrary, they were simply trying to modify the conditions of the Union in such a way that would lead to a more efficient governing. Finlay comes to a similar conclusion claiming, 'far from presenting a challenge to the British imperial ethos, Scottish home rule was founded on the premise that it would strengthen and maintain the unity of the British Empire'.<sup>13</sup> Time and time again the Scottish Home Rulers assured antagonists they were not seeking to break up the empire and they included statements affirming this on either the first or last page of nearly all of their pamphlets. Finlay goes on to quote the *Scottish Review* from 1888: 'those who advocate such a policy (Scottish Home Rule) are the true 'Unionists' while those who oppose it are really 'separatists'.<sup>14</sup> It was for this reason that one of the most outspoken and ardent Scottish Home Ruler of the period Charles Waddie could at

---

<sup>13</sup> Richard Finlay, *A Partnership for Good: Scottish Politics and the Union since 1880*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997, p. 48.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

once describe himself as a Nationalist and a Unionist with no shade of hypocrisy. Westminster's sovereignty, that is to say its position as the supreme legal authority, was not being attacked. Nowhere is this more clearly demonstrated than by the simple fact that almost all Scottish Home Rule agitation was devoted to gaining parliamentary support for the idea through the election of candidates in favour of Scottish Home Rule. With devolution the legitimacy of the devolved body is derived through the consent of the sovereignty.

This leaves us with the central question; is desire for Scottish Home Rule nationalistic? It is the argument of this thesis that the answer to this question is yes, but perhaps only in some cases. Indeed, one of the primary contentions of this thesis will be that although the relief of parliamentary congestion was undoubtedly one of the appeals of Scottish Home Rule, many of its supporters also strongly desired that Scottish legislation be framed without interference from Irish, Welsh and, most notably, English influence. It is from this latter viewpoint that Scottish Home Rule meets the definition of nationalism set for this thesis. Care must therefore be exercised in distinguishing between those who sought a Scottish Parliament for the sake of nationalism and those who merely desired to relieve parliamentary congestion by devolving legislation on workable lines. The former appears as an unemotional and pragmatic response to a difficulty. The latter seems often to have been inspired by a sense of patriotism, a sense of affection or loyalty for a country's traditions, cultures, history, institutions, and defence, towards Scotland. It should be noted however that Scottish patriotism did not inevitably inspire strong commitment to Scottish Home Rule. The *Scotsman* newspaper for example often demonstrated intense patriotism while remaining firmly against Home Rule.

While considering the motivation behind support for Scottish Home Rule it is also important to note the existence of both cultural and political nationalism. John Hutchinson argues that the difference between the two is 'whether the primary concern is with the establishment of a strong community or a strong territorial state,

as the basis of the nation'.<sup>15</sup> He however acknowledges that there is significant overlap between the two nationalisms:

Both nationalisms encouraged the rise of a civil society, of an educated citizenry engaged in a diversified 'public' sphere in which all could participate no matter what their social, economic, religious status. All nationalists appeal to the nation as historically determined and as moulded by human will.<sup>16</sup>

Miroslav Hroch has attempted to chart the development of national movements. Hroch argues that national movements may be periodised into three phases; A) is primarily intellectual and focussed on language, history, and culture, B) is denoted by patriotic agitation, C) which is characterised by a mass movement.<sup>17</sup> In the case of Scotland and Quebec, James Kennedy has noted that the overlap also extended to shared memberships in both 'cultural nationalist and political nationalist organisations, and their nationalisms embodied both cultural and political claims'.<sup>18</sup> One of the major themes of this thesis, specifically in chapters one and five, will be to look at the arguments being put forward for Scottish Home Rule to assess whether they are being made from a purely pragmatic standpoint such as solving the Irish Question or relieving parliamentary congestion or whether they represent the nationalistic sentiment defined above. The central analysis being that during the period under study there were a multitude of overlapping and sometimes competing motivations for groups and individuals to pursue Scottish Home Rule, many of which were politically and culturally nationalistic. The primacy which groups and individuals ascribed to these various motivations can be seen through their co-operation and sometimes even more explicitly through their conflict with other groups both favourable and antagonistic to Home Rule.

### **Parties and Pressure Groups**

Although pressure groups and political parties do share some characteristics, pressure groups tend to be more singular in their focus and less concerned with

---

<sup>15</sup> John Hutchinson, 'Cultural Nationalism' in John Breuilly (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 77.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, Translated by Ben Fowkes, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000, p. 23.

<sup>18</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 15.

putting up candidates for political office. Richard Finlay has noted the significance of the foundation of the National Party of Scotland in 1928 as a critical point in the history of Scottish nationalism. 'Co-operation with former Liberal and Labour allies was replaced by confrontation as the nationalists opted for complete self-reliance.'<sup>19</sup> Finlay is correct when he says that the majority of Scottish nationalists before 1928 sought to achieve their reforms through the existing parties. There was however still scope for conflict, particularly among the most advanced Scottish Home Rulers. Chapters one and two in particular will discuss the arguments and methods which groups such as the SHRA and the YSS used in attempts to pressure commitments out of the Liberal Party. The Young Scots' Society makes a particularly interesting group for study because it was created with the intention of revitalising the Liberal Party in Scotland. As will be discussed at greater length in chapter two their commitment to Scottish Home Rule as the best method of securing what they perceived as progressive Liberal legislation for Scotland actually put them in conflict with the Liberal Party leadership with regards to the selection of parliamentary candidates. James Mitchell has attempted to place Scottish Home Rule groups within the literature that exists on pressure groups. He describes them as being a 'promotional group'. That is a group which 'articulates a cause or set of values' as opposed to a 'sectional group' which represents the views of a specific section of society.<sup>20</sup> Another distinction is made between insider groups and outsider groups, which can loosely be defined as those with access to political power and those without. Mitchell further notes the work of Wyn Grant which has identified three types of outsider groups: potential insiders, outsiders by necessity and ideological outsiders.<sup>21</sup> These classifications are admitted to require a degree of flexibility in their application. Attempting to definitively place a group within these models will immediately run into trouble because of the variances of ideologies between group members and particularly changes in circumstances regarding the group's position over time. Scottish Home Rule groups are identified as usually falling somewhere

---

<sup>19</sup> Richard Finlay, 'Pressure Group or Political Party', *Twentieth Century British History*, 3 (1992), pp. 274-275.

<sup>20</sup> James Mitchell, *Strategies for Self-Government: The Campaigns for a Scottish Parliament*, Edinburgh: Polygon, 1996, p. 66.

<sup>21</sup> Mitchell, *Strategies for Self-Government*, p. 67; Wyn Grant, *Pressure Groups, Politics and Democracy in Britain*, Hemel Hempstead: Philip Allan, 1989, p. 17.



between ‘outsider by necessity’ and ‘ideological outsiders’. Where this framework becomes especially relevant for the purpose of this thesis is its discussion of the various strategies that will be used by these outsider groups:

An outsider, promotional group (as home rule groups have been) must first decide to whom it is addressing its case—political parties, Parliament, the civil service, the media or the public as a whole—and with what purpose. Is it attempting to affect the established institutions or, more radically, somehow find an alternative opening?<sup>22</sup>

Chapters one and two in particular will discuss the arguments presented for Scottish Home Rule to these different audiences and analyse how they varied. The main conclusion being that although there was variance between different audiences and the arguments which were presented in favour of Scottish Home Rule the nationalistic theme that the position of Scottish nation would be improved by excluding alien influence on Scottish legislation was consistently put forward. It should be noted here that alien or outside influence had different meanings to different people. For some this was interpreted as those returned to seats outside of Scotland. Though, as will be discussed in chapter two, even within a single group such as the YSS there was an ethnic dimension to the debate centred around whether or not non-Scots should be supported for Scottish parliamentary seats.

### **Historiography**

It is important to address the nature of Scottish identity. The notion of dual loyalty of the Scots as well as of the Welsh makes them interesting cases in the discussion of nationalism. It has led some, such as Tom Nairn, to claim that true nationalism did not exist in Scotland before the economic decline of the 1960s.<sup>23</sup> By comparing Scottish nationalism to the type of nationalism that was emerging on the continent Nairn found Scottish nationalism to be ill defined and malformed. Nairn identified a ‘Tartan Monster’ of ‘Kitsch symbols, slogans, ornaments banners, war-cries, knick-knacks, music-hall heroes, icons, conventional saying and sentiments (not a few of them “pithy”)

---

<sup>22</sup> Mitchell, *Strategies for Self-Government*, p. 66.

<sup>23</sup> Tom Nairn, *The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*, London: NLB, 1977, pp. 170-174.

the world' as a ridiculous manifestation of sub-nationalism unconnected with the more meaningful expressions of nationalism that were developing in Europe.<sup>24</sup>

Although *The Break-Up of Britain* is extremely useful for its comparisons of Scottish nationalism to European models, more recent work, such as that by Christopher Smout, Richard Finlay and Graeme Morton, have proposed that Scottish identity was not necessarily subservient to Westminster. Morton has demonstrated that the 'Victorian state was not a centralised one', and Scotland was left largely self-governed by its middle class through civil society, and it is therefore unreasonable to expect Scottish nationalists of the period to campaign for a centralised Scottish state.<sup>25</sup> Finlay, in particular, has stressed that through empire Scots were able to enjoy:

the key components of nineteenth-century European nationalism, such as racism, imperialism, and religious expansionism, economic expansion, monarchism and militarism, we see the Scots rejoicing in all those aspects of British imperialism and what is more, they do so as Scots with their own distinctive national characteristic.<sup>26</sup>

As Morton has noted, Smout's adaption along Scottish lines of Anthony Smith's notion of concentric rings is particularly useful for explaining Scottish identity.<sup>27</sup> Smout imagines an individual surrounded by seven rings representing: home/family, clan or kin, locality, nationality (Scottish), State (British), empire, and finally a dotted line representing communities which are less frequently subscribed to such as European or part of the U.N.<sup>28</sup> These rings are then intersected by other notions of identity such as skin colour, language, gender, and profession. One of the critical components of this theory is that the rings are not exclusive and Smout argues that 'a powerful sense of being Scottish has gone hand in hand with a powerful sense of being British for centuries'.<sup>29</sup>

Within the historiography of Scottish nationalism the four decades preceding the war are often relegated to the introduction and sections of early chapters. There

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>25</sup> Morton, *Unionist Nationalism, Governing Urban Scotland, 1830-1860*, East Linton: Tuckwell, 1999, p. 57.

<sup>26</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, pp. 9-10.

<sup>27</sup> Morton, *Unionist Nationalism*, p. 16; A.D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

<sup>28</sup> T.C. Smout, 'Perspectives on the Scottish Identity', *Scottish Affairs*, 6 (1994), pp. 102-103.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 112.

are of course exceptions which deserve discussion. Hanham's book *Scottish Nationalism* provides an excellent overview of the movement and pays particular attention to the literature created by members of the SHRA and the Young Scots. It is perhaps more than coincidence that his book coincided with a moderate series of electoral successes on the part of the Scottish National Party, culminating the astonishing victory of Mrs Winifred Ewing at the Hamilton by-election in November 1967. One might ponder what the effect of the successive campaigns for devolution and independence of the last fifty years has had on the historiography of Scottish nationalism. It still remains, even forty years after its publication, as the best source of encyclopaedic information of the movement during the decades before the war. As well as identifying the key motivations behind support for Scottish Home Rule, Richard Finlay's book *A Partnership for Good*, also contains an excellent history of the movement and provides a valuable report of the voting records of MPs representing Scottish constituencies on Scottish Home Rule motions before 1900.<sup>30</sup> This record indicates that excepting Dr G.B. Clark's first 1889 motion in favour, the following six motions in favour of Scottish Home Rule which came to a vote in 1890 and 1895 never failed to secure a majority of voting Scots.

James Kennedy's recent book comparing the *Liberal Nationalisms* of the YSS and the Nationalistes of Quebec has provided an excellent and overdue extension to our understanding of the YSS as a nationalist group with a 'dual aim: to promote both liberalism through support for radical reform and nationalism through support for Scottish Home Rule'.<sup>31</sup> Kennedy has contested the claim made by Hanham that 'the leading Young Scots nearly all found seats in Parliament after 1906'.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, he has argued that 'By 1905, fifteen Young Scots had been placed as parliamentary candidates and the Society had the support of sixteen MPs' was 'too sweeping'.<sup>33</sup> While in both cases he argues that many of the candidates cited possessed only a loose connection to the Young Scots, he still maintains that the association of these Liberals with the Society is suggestive of its growing

---

<sup>30</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, p. 49.

<sup>31</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 10.

<sup>32</sup> Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, London: Faber and Faber, 1969, p. 95 quoted in Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 63.

<sup>33</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, p. 54 quoted in Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 63.

strength. He also refuted the claim of Hanham that ‘by 1910 the Young Scots were not the force they had been before 1906’, and instead argued that the time around the Third Home Rule debate was a period of increased effectiveness.<sup>34</sup> By looking at the by-elections between the second 1910 General Election and the outbreak of War this thesis will seek to further develop this conversation, particularly with regards to the effectiveness of the Young Scots as promoters of Scottish Home Rule during elections, arguing that on many occasions they were able to ensure that the matter received a good public showing.

Scottish Home Rule, along with Welsh and Irish home rule, features prominently in John Kendle’s work looking at federalism within the United Kingdom. To many, federalism seemed to offer a solution to the dual problems of the Irish Question and parliamentary congestion. Kendle’s book, *Federal Britain*, provides several insights for the study of federalism in Britain during the designated period. Kendle shows that the political theorists and politicians in the UK were willing to look to North America and Australia for potential ideas on the formation of government.<sup>35</sup> Kendle is also quick to specify that ‘Home Rule All Around’, as it became known, was devolutionary rather than federal. He provides a very useful discussion of some of the criticisms of federalism within the UK during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. To anti-federalists such as A.V. Dicey and Edward Freeman, federalism could only be seen as a step towards disunity. Indeed, the claim that Home Rule, whether Irish or Scottish, would lead to the diminishing of empire was one of the most frequent criticisms voiced by Unionists. Kendle quotes Freeman to illustrate such an argument:

No one could wish to cut up our United Kingdom into a federation, to invest English Counties with the rights of American States, or even to restore Scotland and Ireland to the quasi-Federal position which they held before their respective Unions. A Federal Union, to be of any value, must arise by the establishment of a closer tie between elements which were before distinct, not by the division of members which have been hitherto more closely united.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 95 quoted in Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 128.

<sup>35</sup> John Kendle, *Federal Britain: A History*, London: Routledge, 1997, pp. 18-36.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 50.

Disunity and a challenge to parliamentary sovereignty were of primary concern for the constitutional theorist A.V. Dicey. One of the best discussions of Dicey's views on federalism comes from an article written by Christopher Harvie.<sup>37</sup> Harvie argues that while Dicey showed initial sympathy for Irish nationalists by 1886 he was not willing to risk damaging the stability of UK for the sake of Ireland, especially when there was no guarantee that Home Rule would satisfy Irish nationalists.<sup>38</sup> Despite assurances to the contrary by its proponents, Home Rule did raise a few constitutional difficulties. Although the West Lothian Question was coined in the 1970s by Tam Dalyell, the potential difficulty of post devolution Scottish MPs voting on English matters at Westminster, without the opportunity for voting on Scottish laws was already acknowledged in the nineteenth century. The fact that 'English Votes for English Laws' remains a contested political topic today is testament to the great difficulty of attempts to separate Englishness from Britishness with regards to parliament.<sup>39</sup>

Richard Finlay has usefully identified three explanations for the growth of desire for Scottish Home Rule following the 1880s. First was the obstruction and congestion caused by the Irish Question in the House of Commons. The second was the interlinked issue of Scotland's place in the UK and empire if Ireland was to receive Home Rule. Finally, there was a growth of nationalist sentiment. Although the first two are more or less self-explanatory the third requires further discussion. Finlay argues that this growth of nationalist sentiment was a reaction to Englishness becoming more populist and an increasingly 'London-centric view of Empire'.<sup>40</sup> These three explanations serve as a very good general guideline; however, the process of identifying Scottish Home Rulers within these categories is a task which deserves more attention. Colin Kidd identifies that one of the problems with studies of early manifestations of Scottish Home Rule is the tendency of historians to attempt to establish a continuous lineage from the mid nineteenth century through to

---

<sup>37</sup> Christopher Harvie, 'Ideology and Home Rule: James Bryce, A.V. Dicey and Ireland, 1880-1887', *English Historical Review*, 91 (1976), pp. 298-315. This article also gives interesting account of the relationship between academics and the Liberal Party.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 309.

<sup>39</sup> Vernon Bogdanor, 'The West Lothian Question', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 63 (2010), p. 156.

<sup>40</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, pp. 41-42.

the formation of the Scottish National Party.<sup>41</sup> The temptation to make these connections is very great. This is especially true of groups which shared members or republished articles from previous nationalistic associations. However, Kidd has accurately noted that the danger of paying too much attention to this lineage is that it distracts from attempts to interpret organisations based on their own statements.<sup>42</sup> Kidd believes that this has led to a gap in the historiography surrounding the significant differences that existed between these various groups. Identifying these differences is not an easy task. In *A Partnership for Good*, Finlay commented that ‘the problem facing the historian is that these issues formed a complex web in which different people with different interests put different emphasis on different aspects of policy at different times.’<sup>43</sup>

In their study of the place of Scottish nationalism within the Labour movement Bleiman and Keating have noted that while nationalist movements will attempt to draw support from every possible section of society, Anthony Smith’s observation that ‘Starting from the ideal of national independence, a nationalist movement seeks support in all sections of society where it can be found. The very classlessness of nationalist ideology facilitates its acceptance by different strata with conflicting aims. The result is several competing nationalisms within one movement.’<sup>44</sup> By discussing the place of Scottish Home Rule and arguments presented on its behalf by various groups and individuals a better understanding of the differences and similarities will emerge. Although the shared membership of some of the Home Rule groups progressing from the 1850s with the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights through 1880s with the SHRA and then the YSS, Scottish National Committee and Scottish National Party makes it very tempting to imagine the development as a series of dominoes leading to devolution, the closer the examination the more divergent the strands become.

---

<sup>41</sup> Colin Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, pp. 254-265.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, p. 42.

<sup>44</sup> Michael Keating and David Bleiman, *Labour and Scottish Nationalism*, London: Macmillan, 1979, p. 1; Anthony Smith (ed.), *Nationalist Movements*, London: Macmillan, 1976, p. 108.

## **Methodology**

An attempt has been made to embrace a wide body of source material to inform this discussion. The SHRA left behind a fairly sizeable body of pamphlet literature. This remains an invaluable tool for understanding the groups' leadership's plan and case for Scottish Home Rule. The YSS also possessed an active publication department which produced over 10,000 copies of *A Case for Scotland in 60 Points*. The other great literary medium for Home Rulers was the periodical. *The Scottish Patriot*, *Scottish Nationalist*, *Fiery Cross*, *Thistle*, *Scottish Nation*, *Young Scot*, *Guth na Bliadhna (Voice of the Year)*, and, to a lesser extent, *Scotia*, were all edited by strong Scottish Home Rulers and served as a platform for expressing their ideas. Although some of periodicals were short lived they are an excellent source for informing the study of the topic because they allowed for a wider range of topics than was possible through pamphlets. They also allowed for sympathetic contributors and serve as an excellent tool for examining the interaction between Scottish MPs when they were addressing a readership which one might assume attached value to the idea. The Scottish Liberal Association's collection, particularly their collection of candidate's addresses for the 1906 and both 1910 elections in the National Library of Scotland were very useful in chapter two which looks at the place of Scottish Home Rule in electoral contests. The manuscripts of Roland Muirhead at the National Library of Scotland and MacCallaum Scott papers at Glasgow University were also valuable for informing on the more private opinions of Scottish Home Rulers. William Spiers Bruce's manuscript collection at the University of Edinburgh was also a valuable resource which has been made much more useful in recent years by the efforts of Geoffrey Swinney to create a preliminary catalogue of its contents.<sup>45</sup>

It is important to recognise the effects which methodology can have on this picture of the press. As well as being influenced by which newspapers survived to be consulted, modern research is also influenced by varying levels of ease in which they may be accessed. In the case of the present research it has been necessary to utilise online databases of newspapers. This was most evident during chapter six which

---

<sup>45</sup> Geoffrey Swinney, 'Some new perspectives on the life of William Speirs Bruce (1867–1921), with a preliminary catalogue of the Bruce collection of manuscripts in the University of Edinburgh', *Archives of Natural History*, 28 (2001), pp. 285-311.

focussed on the international relations of Scottish Home Rulers. The following electronic resources were immensely valuable: The National Library of Australia's Trove, The National Library of New Zealand's Papers Past, The Library of Congress' Chronicling America, The University of Alberta's Peel's Prairie Provinces, The New York City Public Library catalogue, and the *New York Times* Digital Archive. Google, for instance, now provides access to hundreds of digital newspapers from the last three hundred years. In some instances their articles are free and hosted by Google. In other cases the search feature provides links to private databases which may charge a fee based on subscription or individual 'pay per view' access to specific articles. Free public access and online availability mean that these resources will inevitably be disproportionately used over harder to access resources which are kept locally on hard copy or microfilm.

The *Edinburgh Evening News (EEN)*, serves an excellent example of this. At the turn of the century it represented a distinctive rival to the jingo unionism of Edinburgh based *Scotsman*. However, while the *Scotsman* has for years been hosted on various online archival databases, the *EEN* is only just now being digitised and large tracts are missing, including the years 1905-14, 1916, 1919, 1922-31 and post-1932. Of course, the reply from the thorough historian would be to consult the extensive run of microfilm or, better yet, the original source but the difficulties associated with this can go beyond the difficulties of poor quality microfilm and the more laborious act of reading line by line. In the late stages of this research the Scottish Collection of the Edinburgh Central Library has closed for refurbishment. Across George IV Bridge the National Library of Scotland (NLS) holds only an incomplete selection of the paper on microfilm. Although they possess hardcopies bound in annual volumes, the years associated with the First World War are lent out on a restricted basis to reduce the risk of overuse.<sup>46</sup> With the gap in the digital run of the *EEN*, a researcher is confronted with the choice of travelling to another location or turning to a more readily available source. This criticism can of course be levelled against almost any of the less popular newspapers throughout history and onerous remains on the historian to put in the diligence of using a wide sampling of sources

---

<sup>46</sup> The fear of overuse is well founded and even when taking due care a researcher using such large bounded volumes cannot but feel they are contributing to the deterioration of the original.



to influence their discussion regardless of the possible inconvenience involved. However it is still a matter for vigilance.

Even among the digital archives differences emerge due to causes outside of the user's control, such as the quality of the search feature. A database with a good search feature will allow users to quickly find information relevant to their topic. A poor search feature will leave the user overwhelmed with results that can number into the hundreds of thousands and even millions. As important as the search feature is the way in which the search results are presented. To take the *Historic Scotsman* as an example, often search results are presented with an article title which clearly describes the result. However, on many occasions no title is given and the article will simply be listed as 'article' followed by a number. This of course gives little indication as to whether the article in question will be relevant to a researcher's interest. Thoroughness in this case is the best remedy; however, at a time when the internet allows scholars to access more and more resources online we run the risk of being overwhelmed by data available for consultation. As a result of this it is easy to see how databases that give the most direct results might become overused. This is further complicated by the knowledge that each database will have a pool of various resources. The pools are not necessarily of equal quality; therefore, it is possible to imagine a database which contains relatively few sources being more heavily used than one that contains more primary documents but does not yield results as easily. It is not hard to imagine the skewed view of the past which this could create. For example, the widely available online, and often quoted *Scotsman*, was staunchly unionist after 1886. Had this thesis not also been informed by research conducted on the *EEN* using microfilm, a very different image of Edinburgh's press reactions to Scottish Home Rule might have been formed.

The subject of digitisation and historical research has recently received very interesting discussion by Tim Hitchcock. He has noted that Googlebooks has digitised over seven million books. This fact is made even more remarkable given its relatively short existence and if its progress continues it will soon surpass the British Library which holds just under fourteen million books. As the digitisation process continues and the ability to search for keywords becomes more readily available the

effect on historical research will be momentous. Within the scope of this present chapter the complications of using keyword searches has been evident. A search for the phrase 'Scottish Home Rule' for example will not flag results containing the phrase 'Home Rule for Scotland'. To a reader scanning a page or document either phrase would jump out. But this is not the case for such database searches and extreme care must be given when choosing search terms.<sup>47</sup> Having outlined the pitfalls of these digital sources it remains for me to stress they have been of invaluable utility to this thesis. Not only have they increased the ease of locating search terms but they have also provided access to materials from around the world which time and financial restraints would have rendered the consultation of such infeasible.

Having discussed the methodology it might be worth laying down a brief outline of the structure of this thesis. It is broken down into five chapters. The first focuses on the arguments presented for Scottish Home Rule by various groups and individuals. Special effort is made to differentiate the views and arguments of those who approached Scottish Home Rule from a pragmatic standpoint and those who argued for it on the nationalistic line that Scotland should be governed by Scots in Scotland. This distinction is most notable when reviewing the arguments presented by Liberal politicians who were in theory committed to the idea of Scottish Home Rule but who had little practical involvement in the matter, and the more ardent Scottish Home Rulers who often belonged to groups which were fundamentally committed to securing it. The second chapter looks at the place of Scottish Home Rule in the election campaigns during the lead up to the First World War. One of the peculiar things about Scottish Home Rule during the period was that despite claims that there was little interest in the issue in the House of Commons debates, it frequently received the majority of Scottish votes. The second reading of the 1913 Bill was favoured forty-five to eight. Although the voting patterns were undoubtedly influenced by party lines, by looking at the issue as it appeared in campaigns it is hoped that an image will appear of how the issue was put before the general public. Gauging public opinion during this time is notoriously difficult; however, it is hoped

---

<sup>47</sup> For an excellent discussion of the topic see: Tim Hitchcock, 'Confronting the Digital or How Academic History Writing Lost the Plot', *Cultural and Social History*, 10 (2013), pp. 9–23.

that by adopting this approach we might reasonably expect to discover how politicians up for election wished to present the matter to their constituents.

The third chapter will discuss the relationship between Scottish Home Rulers and Welsh and Irish Home Rulers. Although there have been many comparisons between Scottish Home Rule and Irish Home Rule, this chapter will focus on discussing interactions between the various groups of nationalists and attempt to flesh out some of the difficulties of promoting Home Rule All Round by those who were striving for what they perceived as justice to their own nation. The next chapter will then move outside the United Kingdom and discuss attempts by Scottish Home Rulers to build international support for their movement. The SHRA and more particularly the International Scots Home Rule League were very keen to replicate the success of Irish Home Rulers. Although these attempts met with mixed results they still illustrate the strong desire of Scottish nationalists during the period that the movement come from the Scottish people, regardless of their new political identification. The fifth and final chapter will look at the place of nationalism within Scottish historical, cultural, and scientific institutions. Although the thesis up to this point will have focused primarily on political dimensions of Scottish Home Rule, this chapter will seek to argue that Scotland should represent its own interest in these fields.

When choosing how to structure this thesis there was a temptation to lay it down chronologically. This might have helped to develop a strong narrative and would probably have reduced instances of overlap between the chapters. The decision to approach the chapters thematically, however, was adopted with the hope of approaching the issue horizontally. A top down approach of the issue might read as a series of small but increasing successes which ultimately were swept aside by war. Furthermore, the purpose of this thesis is not to attempt trace the origins of the modern SNP through devolution back to the 1880s and, indeed, the research presented here suggests that such an exercise is anachronistic. By approaching the issue thematically, however, it is hoped that the discussion of these groups and bodies will spread across to uncover how they interacted with various groups and bodies that existed at the time.

The scope of this thesis has been largely confined to the years between 1886 and 1914. At first these years seem most apt because they contain the founding of the SHRA in the spring of 1886 and the outbreak of the First World War. As is often the case with any boundaries they work best with a healthy degree of fluidity. The end date requires an even more permissive border line. While the First World War changed a great many things, it did not crush all desire for Scottish Home Rule in 1914. Indeed, the experience of the War was used by some as further evidence of Scotland's urgent need for legislative independence. Therefore while the aim of this thesis has been focused on 1886 to 1914 an attempt has been made to trace the movement's beginning through to the foundation of the reformation of the SHRA in 1918. While the foundation of the SHRA marked a breakthrough in the movement for Scottish Home Rule it was the culmination of many trends. The National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights earlier in the century, while never demanding a Scottish Parliament, expressed a range of nationalist grievances and called for better management of Scottish affairs.<sup>48</sup> Although this association appears to have never called for a Scottish Parliament, the language that it used and its objectives shared a similar spirit to those of the Scottish Home Rule Association. A case for example might be made for beginning with the 1870s when the phrase Scottish Home Rule begins appearing in newspapers from the lips of no less than William Gladstone and Isaac Butt. However, it was not until the mid 1880s that these ideas solidified and found expression. Graeme Morton has marked the formation of the SHRA as a fundamental shift whereby demands for Scottish rights became 'about recreating a formal Scottish state on the lines of Westminster'.<sup>49</sup> This he attributed to the rise of 'citizen politics' which brought an end to the ability of the 'bourgeoisie to govern their civil society'.<sup>50</sup>

The centralist trend of the last quarter of the nineteenth century has also been noted by Tom Devine who has noted that the Education Act of 1872, extension of the working class vote and the creation of the Scottish Office in 1885 were all decisive

---

<sup>48</sup> Morton, *Unionist Nationalism*, p. 140.

<sup>49</sup> Morton, *Unionist Nationalism*, p. 197.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

moves towards increased centralisation.<sup>51</sup> Historians such as Christopher Harvie have claimed that the Scottish Home Rule movement was inspired by the Irish Home Rule movement.<sup>52</sup> There is some evidence for this claim, however, while Irish Home Rule was of absolute importance in inspiring desire for Scottish Home Rule it should not be forgotten that the manifestation of the desire for Scottish legislation to be made in Scotland by Scots occurred at the same time as Westminster was assuming new responsibility with regards to governing Scotland. This thesis will argue that although Irish Home Rule was absolutely influential in inspiring calls for the granting of a similar measure to Scotland, both through its example and as a result of the congestion of business which it caused, so too was the fundamental assertion that Scottish legislation should be free from the interference of non Scots.

---

<sup>51</sup> T.M. Devine, *The Scottish Nation: 1700-2000*, London: Penguin 1999, p. 287.

<sup>52</sup> Christopher Harvie, *Scotland and Nationalism*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1977, p. 35.

## **Chapter 1: Arguments for Scottish Home Rule**

Before the First World War arguments for Scottish Home Rule manifested themselves in a number of ways: first, through parliamentary debates in the House of Commons and, second, through publications on the behalf of patriotic organisations and home rule groups, most notably the Scottish Home Rule Association (SHRA) and the Young Scots' Society (YSS) but also including the Scottish Patriot Association and the International Scots Home Rule League. During the period, the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland developed an increasingly favourable attitude towards Scottish Home Rule, which culminated when the Convention approved a report in its favour in 1914. The fruits of their efforts were mixed; although these groups were able to establish several branches both at home and abroad and the issue eventually gained political support from a large majority of Scottish MPs, Scottish Home Rule only gained minimum momentum with the masses. Although these groups may be labelled as 'patriotic' because they promoted devoted love of their country and culture, whether or not they constituted nationalist publications is more contentious.

This chapter will assess the arguments for Scottish Home Rule put forward during the twenty-eight years before the First World War by various political and patriotic and, in some cases nationalist, groups which existed at the time. It is hoped that this discussion will show that Scottish Home Rule was supported for a range of reasons and, furthermore, that the arguments which were advanced in its favour varied depending on speaker and audience. Specific attention will be given towards examining the extent to which these arguments meet the criteria of nationalism, either political or cultural, as outlined in the introduction. The chapter is broken up into four sections. The first section will seek to place Scottish Home Rule among several of the political parties and groups of the period. The next will focus on arguments for Scottish Home Rule as they appeared in the House of Commons debates. The third will look at the position of Scottish Home Rule within what was one of Scotland's longest running representative bodies, the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland. The final section discusses the various Home Rule groups and periodicals which strongly featured Scottish Home Rule and other patriotic and

cultural issues on their agendas. The difficulty which has been encountered in dividing these individuals and groups into distinct sections reflects the overlapping nature that was evident in many of the political groups of the time.

While almost all Scottish Home Rulers recognised the supremacy of the British Parliament at a British level, many still expressed nationalism at a Scottish level by desiring to restructure the system so that purely Scottish affairs would be governed by Scots. A decisive division of what represented Scottish and British affairs was always open to contention. It is not here suggested that every advocate of Scottish Home Rule was a nationalist; indeed, it might be argued that there were many who supported it on a purely pragmatic basis as a method to relieve the stress of an overburdened Imperial Parliament. And still further there were others who sought to make Irish Home Rule more acceptable by pairing it with the less menacing Home Rule for Scotland. Even by the admission of the foremost Scottish nationalist of the period, Charles Waddie, in an instance of bitterness mourned, 'I feel a sinking of the heart when I consider that I have spent some of the best years of a long life trying to rouse you [the Scottish nation] from your present apathy.'<sup>1</sup> Despite the lack of a large scale movement in favour of Scottish Home Rule there were pockets of Scottish society where the movement proved popular.

This chapter will attempt to discuss the arguments that were used by various bodies and individuals as they called for Scottish Home Rule in the hopes of placing them within a framework of nationalism. As mentioned above being a Scottish Home Ruler did not make an individual inherently a nationalist. The same principle can be applied to arguments for Scottish Home Rule. Some arguments, like that of the Convention Royal of Burghs, were lodged primarily on the pragmatic grounds of creating a more effective parliamentary machine better able to deal with local legislation. Other arguments, like that of the nationalist periodicals, made much stronger appeals to historical claims and patriotic sentiments. In these publications we see an interesting mix of both cultural and political nationalism. The study of arguments presented in the House of Commons, however, offers the most interesting case for Scottish Home Rule. The reason for this is two-fold. First it is because of

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles Waddie, *Fiery Cross*, 1908, p. 8; quoted in Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 121.

the significance of the forum in which they were conducted. Even in the face of their opponents' claims that they were trying to destroy the sovereignty of the Imperial Parliament, their respect in the institution is cemented by the fact that it was through parliamentary debate that they sought to gain their aims. As Scottish Home Rule never posed any danger of civil war it was in the House of Commons that its future was to be decided. The second reason for particular interest in the parliamentary arguments for Scottish Home Rule is because of their duality which blended the practical argument of easing the congestion which they had all experienced with the more nationalist resentment that Scottish legislation was not being made according to the will of the Scottish people.

As well as discussing the types of arguments which were made in favour of Scottish Home Rule by the various groups and individuals it is also important to consider the audience which they would reach. The presence of different audience types will almost inevitably result in proponents seeking to elicit varying reactions. As will be mentioned later, one of the interesting accusations against two of the major parliamentary Scottish Home Rulers was that they put forward one image of Scottish Home Rule before the House of Commons and another in Scotland in front of Scots. There is an element truth to this which is perhaps independent of any desire to mislead the House of Commons over the position of Scottish Home Rule. The House of Commons is a markedly different audience than would represent the readership of a Scottish newspaper, a Liberal Association meeting or an election campaign meeting. This is a less homogenous body than would likely an annual meeting of local Liberal association in Scotland. MPs in favour of Scottish Home Rule would here have to appeal to varying and often conflicting interests of English, Irish and Welsh MPs. It is not hard to imagine that a speech to a body of which is composed of undecided voters is likely to be different than an article published in a periodical which was created for a subscribing audience. The political pamphlet was a crucial method of putting a message before the public during this time period. One of the benefits of pamphlets was that it allowed groups a method of putting their views before the public directly. Scottish Home Rule groups, most notably the SHRA and YSS groups during this period printed these in the thousands. This is demonstrative of these groups desire to spread the movement to a wide



audience and build support within the electorate. This desire perhaps reflects these groups' position as pressure groups. As will be discussed later one of the key factors in determining the influence of a pressure group over a party was its perceived capacity to be able to sway voters.

As well as considering the audience in which the debates surrounding Scottish Home Rule were presented it is also worth considering the context of the times in which they occurred. Although the subsequent chapters will provide context by way of introducing the topics which they discuss, a brief discussion of the political setting may here be included to provide a background for discussing the arguments which were put forth in favour of Scottish Home Rule. Although this thesis has been broken into chapters by topic rather than chronologically, it will become apparent that 1900 marks a distinction in the Scottish Home Rule movement. This is not to say that some continuity does not exist. Many of the SHRA were still active in the opening decade of the twentieth century. However the association itself had, in the words of Charles Waddie, entered into a state of suspended animation with the outbreak the Boer War 1900.<sup>2</sup> Interestingly the event which spelled the end of the first Scottish Home Rule group directly led to the creation of the next group which would champion its cause; the YSS. Although as we shall see later in this chapter there was some overlap in the goals of these groups and the arguments that they used in support of such goals, it is important to note that they were very much different bodies with different goals and crucially they were created as a reaction to a different set of circumstances. The SHRA was created in the spring of 1886 when Irish Home Rule dominated British politics. The YSS were a reaction to the jingo politics associated with the Khaki-Election and the Boer War. While the SHRA was a non-party group formed to promote the cause of Scottish Home Rule, the YSS was a distinctly Liberal group which sought to promote Liberal ideologies such as free trade. The significance of the Irish Home Rule debates on Scottish Home Rule should not be understated.

While the presence of literature supporting Scottish Home Rule can be found consistently throughout the thirty years before the First World War, its parliamentary

---

<sup>2</sup> 'The Vicissitudes of the Scottish Home Rule Association', *EEN*, 17 Apr. 1902, p. 3.

presence can be condensed to two periods, first 1889-1895 and second 1910-1914. Any student of British politics will immediately notice the correlation these dates share with Irish Home Rule and it is certainly not entirely coincidental. In both periods Irish Home Rule cast an enormous shadow across British politics. In 1886 Irish Home Rule had split the Liberal Party. The early 1890s saw Gladstone's second attempt to pass Irish Home Rule. In the years before First World War the balance of power was altered with the removal of the Lord's veto. At the same time the threat of civil war in Ulster made the matter of Home Rule even more paramount.<sup>3</sup> Given the significance of Irish Home Rule during this time period there are risks of approaching a study of Scottish Home Rule in a way that does not seek to interlink it with Irish Home Rule. The foremost danger would be to overstate Scottish Home Rule's significance due to the attention that it was given by the Liberal leadership in the hopes of easing the passing of an Irish Home Rule Bill. It is hoped that this danger might be balanced by a look at the interactions between the most adamant Scottish Home Rulers and the Liberal leadership. Chapter three will focus on the interactions between Scottish, Irish, and Welsh Home Rulers. As we shall later see, in many cases the conflict of interest was apparent to all parties. Although a lack of personal diaries on the part of many of the most prominent Scottish Home Rulers makes it difficult to ascertain their most personal views it is hoped that by studying the arguments which they presented to the public we may at least see what they believed would strike a note with their audience and most notably the electorate.

Although this thesis is primarily concerned with the debate surrounding Scottish home rule in the three decades preceding the First World War it is important to note that the movement did not spring out of nothingness. James Mitchell's work has stressed the significance of creation of the Scottish Office whereby 'acknowledging a political dimension to Scottish identity, Britain had provided a basis on which a demand for self-government would be made based on democratic principles'.<sup>4</sup> Calls for increased self-government for Scotland and in particular through administrative devolution had been had been persistent throughout mid

---

<sup>3</sup> This is of course an over simplification of the political climate during these periods. Parliament was required to deal with a host of turbulent issues, not least, disestablishment, education and land reform, free trade, militarisation, and social reforms such as the Insurance Act.

<sup>4</sup> Mitchell, *Strategies for Self-Government*, p. 43.

nineteenth century Scotland. These ideas were perhaps most potently exhibited in the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights which was formed in the 1850s. As Morton notes, the Scottish Rights Society was not about the restoration of a Scottish Parliament but rather ‘fairer treatment of Scotland from the Exchequer’ and ‘better administration and better government’.<sup>5</sup> The centre of this focus on improved Scottish government became the campaign for the re-establishment of the Secretary of State for Scotland. As will be discussed later in the chapter, the re-establishment of the Secretary of State for Scotland was also put forward in the 1850s by the Convention of Royal Burghs.

While the Crimean War saw the end of the romantic nationalism associated with the Scottish Rights Society, the movement for the re-establishment of the Secretary for Scotland was not put aside for long. In 1869 Sir Robert Anstruther and Edward H. J. Craufurd wrote to Gladstone on behalf of two-thirds of Scottish MPs seeking a Chief Secretary for Scotland.<sup>6</sup> Gladstone replied by setting up the Camperdown Commission to inquire into the status of Scottish Boards. The Commission’s report was largely in favour of maintaining the status quo with boards theoretically responsible to the Home Secretary; though in practice the Lord Advocate. The Commission did however highlight the dominance of the legal profession within the governing of Scotland.<sup>7</sup> This would continue to be a complaint and featured strongly in Rosebery’s arguments when he successfully championed the cause of re-establishing the post in the 1880s.<sup>8</sup> The cause was again supported by the Convention of Royal Burghs. Mitchell notes that the longstanding sources behind calls to re-establish the Secretary for Scotland were: ‘partly a feeling of neglect, partly injured pride but largely dissatisfaction with the system of administration’.<sup>9</sup> Although the Scottish Secretary was re-established in 1885 with the hopes of giving great attention to Scottish affairs and as a token of recognition of Scotland’s

---

<sup>5</sup> Morton, *Unionist Nationalism*, p. 140.

<sup>6</sup> James Mitchell, *Governing Scotland: the Invention of Administrative Devolution*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003, p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

distinctiveness both Richard Finlay and James Mitchell have noted that it was not enough to placate Scotland.<sup>10</sup>

Before turning to the arguments presented, it may be useful to briefly sketch the position of Scottish Home Rule among some of the various political bodies within Scotland. It seems to have an early appeal to members of the Scottish Labour Party. Their original programme included ‘Home Rule for each separate nationality or country in the British Empire, with an Imperial Parliament for Imperial affairs’.<sup>11</sup> Eventual labour leaders Ramsay Macdonald and Keir Hardie were members of the SHRA. Macdonald served as the Secretary of the London branch for a brief time in the 1880s. During Hardie’s unsuccessful Mid-Lanark by-election campaign Macdonald wrote to him stating:

But let the consequences be what they may, do not withdraw. The cause of Labour and of Scottish Nationality will suffer much thereby. Your defeat will awaken Scotland, and your victory will reconstruct Scottish Liberalism. All success be yours, and the National cause your champion. Here is no miner—and no other one for that matter—who is a Scotsman and not ashamed of it, who will vote against you in favour of an obscure English barrister, absolutely ignorant of Scotland and of Scottish affairs...<sup>12</sup>

Although it has been pointed out that the two seem to have lost interest in the group in the early 1890s one finds both Hardie and Ramsay Macdonald’s names among Ayes supporting motions in 1908, 1912 and Macdonald’s in 1908, 1912 and 1913.<sup>13</sup> There is a proverbial story told in David Bleiman and Michael Keating’s book *Labour and Scottish Nationalism* of Tom Johnston referring to publishing Scottish Home Rule articles in the Independent Labour Party’s newspaper *Forward* as touching Roland Muirhead for a loan.<sup>14</sup>

Scottish Home Rule also had a place on the agenda of the Highland Land League. The group passed a resolution in support at its annual conference, which

---

<sup>10</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, p. 44 and Mitchell, *Governing Scotland*, p. 30.

<sup>11</sup> David Lowe, *Souvenirs of Scottish Labour*, Glasgow: W. & R. Holmes, 1919, p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted in: Lord Elton, *The Life of Ramsay Macdonald*, London: Pall Mall, 1939, p. 61.

<sup>13</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 26 May 1908, vol. 189, cc. 968-75.

*Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, cc. 1446-91.

*Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, cc. 471-551. Hardie was absent from the 1913 debate on Scottish Home Rule.

<sup>14</sup> Michael Keating and David Bleiman, *Labour and Scottish Nationalism*, London: Macmillan, 1979, p. 58.

was ambitiously labelled ‘Celtic Parliament’ at Bonar Bridge, in June 1886.<sup>15</sup> The following year they again adopted a resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule.<sup>16</sup> The resolution was moved by H.G. Reid, the crofter candidate for Inverness. The resolution came after the suggestion by the Chairman, G.B. Clark. Clark had been returned as a Crofter MP in for Caithness in 1885. The resolution was also supported by John Murdoch who was not content with an earlier pronouncement by George Campbell, that the first question he would give to a Scottish Parliament would be related to the church and temperance.<sup>17</sup> Murdoch went further claiming, ‘It was for the Scottish people, not the Imperial Parliament to decide what those questions should be.’<sup>18</sup> Two years later Clark championed the cause in the House of Commons. Clark served as a president of the SHRA and introduced four motions in favour of Scottish Home Rule between 1889 and 1893. In 1893, John M’Crae, a member of the executive of the Highland Land League:

in submitting the annual report said that to settle the land question Scottish Home Rule must be secured. The land system in the Highlands was the worst in the world. The land question, which took precedence of the measure now before the people, urgently demanded, radical reform.<sup>19</sup>

Scottish Home Rule seems to have had some support among the Crofter MPs with Angus Sutherland, Roderick Macdonald, G.B. Clark, and even the Liberal Unionist Charles Fraser Mackintosh voting in favour of it in 1890.<sup>20</sup>

Perhaps not surprisingly among the Conservative Party one finds nearly as much antagonism to Scottish Home Rule as Irish Home Rule. Opposition in the House of Commons to Scottish Home Rule often stressed that it would lead to disunity. One such example can be seen during the reading William Cowan’s Government of Scotland Bill. Speaking in opposition Sir Henry Craik argued that there was nothing to be gained in devolution but very much to be lost:

---

<sup>15</sup> Ewen A. Cameron, ‘Communication or Separation? Reactions to Irish Land Agitation and Legislation in the Highlands of Scotland, c.1870–1910’, *English Historical Review*, 120 (2005), pp. 663-664.

<sup>16</sup> ‘Highland Land League Conference at Oban’, *The Scotsman*, 17 Sept. 1887, p. 9.

<sup>17</sup> Campbell was the Liberal MP for Kirkcaldy Burghs. James Hunter, ‘The Gaelic Connection: The Highlands, Ireland and Nationalism, 1873-1922’, *Scottish Historical Review*, 54 (1975), p. 182.

<sup>18</sup> ‘Highland Land League Conference at Oban’, *The Scotsman*, 17 Sept. 1887, p. 9.

<sup>19</sup> ‘The Highland Land League’, *Dundee Courier*, 21 Sept. 1893, p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> *The Scotsman*, 21 Feb. 1890, p. 5.

Is it worth while stirring up discontent which will arouse jealousies on the part of our southern brethren and which will divide Scotland into two bitterly hostile camps? You are merely ‘rubbing the poor itch of your opinion till you make yourselves scabs.’ You will arouse out of this discontent a fractious criticism of central administration. You will arouse antipathies on the part of your own southern brethren, and you will give rise to long and calamitous disputes and dissensions.<sup>21</sup>

Others, such as the marquess of Tullibardine, claimed that it would transform Scotland into a backwater province of England.<sup>22</sup> Although they were occasionally willing to flirt with the idea of Home Rule All Round in order to make Irish Home Rule on its own seem more absurd, for the most part Conservatives were as equally opposed to Scottish Home Rule as they were to Irish Home Rule.

There are a few notable exceptions. Hanham has noted that the Tory philanthropist John Crichton-Stuart, 3rd marquess of Bute, was an early advocate. In 1881 he wrote to Rosebery urging for the creation of a nationally representative body to meet in Edinburgh.<sup>23</sup> Bute was active in the SHRA. In 1889 he published an article in the *Scottish Review* which argued for the devolution of a single-chamber Scottish Parliament.<sup>24</sup> Interestingly, however, he remained cool on the subject of Irish Home Rule and in a letter to William Mitchell, which was subsequently released to the press, he suggested that ‘Home Rule might do very well in Scotland and very badly in Ireland’.<sup>25</sup> Alvin Jackson has suggested that some Scottish Tories, like Alexander Hugh Bruce, the sixth Lord Balfour of Burleigh, discreetly supported Scottish devolution. Jackson quotes a letter from Burleigh stating that he was, ‘afraid of finding myself committed to opposing things for Ireland, when I would take them for my own country’.<sup>26</sup> Bruce served as the Secretary for Scotland between 1895 and 1903. During the May 1914 Scottish Home Rule debate, Sir James Millar quoted

---

<sup>21</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, c. 526.

<sup>22</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, c. 1471.

<sup>23</sup> Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 84.

<sup>24</sup> John Crichton-Stuart, 3rd marquess of Bute, ‘Parliament in Scotland’, *Scottish Review*, 14 (1889), p. 400.

<sup>25</sup> ‘Lord Bute on Scottish Home Rule, Letter From the Marquis of Bute’, *Glasgow Herald*, 13 July 1889, p. 6.

<sup>26</sup> British Library, Walter Long Papers, Add.MS.62411, f.79 Balfour to Burleigh to Walter Long, 23 Jan. 1907, quoted in Alvin Jackson, *The Two Unions: Ireland, Scotland, and the Survival of the United Kingdom, 1707-2007*, Oxford: Oxford University, 2012, p. 237. As mentioned below, some of the Liberal Unionists were welcome to the idea of Home Rule All Around as a solution to the problem of Irish Home Rule.

a speech made by Balfour of Burleigh in Edinburgh, ““He was not himself,” he said, “much of a believer in Home Rule, but, as far as things Scottish could be decided in Scotland, he was an advocate of Home Rule.””<sup>27</sup> Although this is not an explicit commitment to a parliament in Edinburgh it does acknowledge the principle of Scottish Home Rule.

Unionist newspapers such as the *Scotsman* tended to view Scottish Home Rule in a similar light. *The Scotsman* and *Glasgow Herald* were long-term critics of Irish Home Rule. Richard Finlay has noted that during the years preceding the outbreak of the War the papers’ arguments against Irish Home Ruler focussed on the difficulty of the Ulster question.<sup>28</sup> Ireland was regarded as a negative example of nationalism.<sup>29</sup> Regarding Scottish Home Rule, its preferred method of opposition was mockery. In responding to D.V. Pirie’s 1908 motion in favour of Scottish Home Rule, *The Scotsman* said, ‘If not intended as a practical joke, it is an unconscious political satire.’<sup>30</sup> It should not however be assumed that all of the Scottish press was opposed to Scottish Home Rule. The following day the *Edinburgh Evening News* lamented that Unionists should so consider Scottish Home Rule and stated ‘It would be well, therefore, if during the recess, there was some strong expression of public opinion evoked in favour of Scotland managing her own local affairs.’<sup>31</sup> On the previous day it had been even more explicit in its support of Scottish Home Rule and as the *Edinburgh Evening News* was one of the few Scottish newspapers which espoused Scottish Home Rule it may be worthwhile to quote it at length:

It is proposed to give the Scottish Parliament power to levy taxes, except Customs and Excise, so that financial relations with England may be readjusted. Mr Pirie and his friends will, in this latter respect, have a hard task to relax the hold of the predominant partner. But even if this is found to be impossible, if the Scottish members are able to force their claim to the independent consideration of purely Scottish affairs, they will deserve the gratitude of the country. Between the great, alien, careless mass of English members, and the

---

<sup>27</sup> James Millar (Lanarkshire North East), *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 1517.

<sup>28</sup> Richard Finlay, ‘The Scottish Press and Empire: 1850-1914’, in Simon J. Potter (ed.), *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire c. 1857-1921*, Dublin: Four Court Press, 2004, p. 73.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

<sup>30</sup> Pirie sat for Aberdeen North 1896-1918. *The Scotsman*, 27 May 1908, p. 8.

<sup>31</sup> *EEN*, 28 May 1908.

reactionary hothouse of lords, Scottish affairs make practically no progress. Here is the most active political life in the three kingdoms, the keenest desire for progressive legislation, and it is baffled and thwarted at every turn, sometimes because a Liberal Government is too busy to attend to it, sometimes because the House of Lords is pleased to object. Recently we have seen how Scotland has been treated on temperance and the land question. The wishes of the country have simply been snuffed out. Does any man suppose that with Scottish members sitting in Edinburgh Scottish business would be at a standstill? The Tory plea is that Liberal legislation is not wanted. Tories thank Heaven for a House of Lords which has saved the Scottish landlords. That is true Toryism, the principle of which is that the people do not know what they wasn't, and that a non-representative house of Peers sitting in London is the best judge of what is good for them. At that rate, let us have an end of representative government altogether, and go back to the days when Scotland was ruled by Dundas and Braxfield. One thing is certain that if the Scottish people get their views put into clear, logical, decisive form by their own members acting together in full touch with public opinion, the House of Lords will think twice before treating them with the contempt which has lately manifested.<sup>32</sup>

It should be mentioned that the *EEN* was not always found to be in favour of Scottish Home Rule and before the turn of the twentieth century it had possessed a very critical view of the issue and especially the SHRA. This change in opinion may in part be attributed to a change on the part of its editor Hector Macpherson. In his biography, his son, also named Hector, noted Home Rule had not appealed to Macpherson in the early days of the movement 'but as time went on he began to support it for two different reasons: because of legislative need, and because of the advisability of conserving the national spirit and national life of Scotland.'<sup>33</sup> Within Edinburgh the *EEN* and the *Scotsman* often found themselves on opposing sides of political questions. During the early decades of the twentieth century the *EEN* possessed a markedly radical slant favouring Liberal legislation including, the Insurance Act, land reform, and, not least, Irish and Scottish Home Rule. It also was very critical of the Boer War and imperialism. The paper today often goes overlooked by researchers of the period perhaps due to the fact that sections of it have only just recently been digitised.

---

<sup>32</sup> *EEN*, 27 May 1908, p. 4.

<sup>33</sup> Hector Macpherson, *Hector Macpherson: The Man and His Work*, Edinburgh: W.F. Henderson, 1925, p. 43.



Perhaps one of the most ambitious attempts to persuade Unionists of the value of Home Rule came from the Round Table Movement in the years immediately preceding the Great War. The movement was based on ‘imperial federation’. Although there were a multitude of variations in what was meant by ‘imperial federation,’ the loose idea was that it would allow for an empire where local bodies would be responsible for governing matters which effected them individually but they would come together in one body to govern issues that affected the common interest of the empire. Proponents of imperial federation cited United States and later Canada as positive example of federal systems. While the Round Table Movement has already benefitted from detailed analysis by both John Kendle and Patricia Jalland it is worthy of brief comment here.<sup>34</sup> F.S. Oliver, described by Kendle as a ‘Unionist sympathiser’ in particular is worth noting because of his deliberate attempts to find converts to imperial federalism among Unionists.<sup>35</sup> For Oliver, Home Rule for Ireland might serve as an early step towards imperial federation. John Kendle has noted that theories of governing the empire along federal lines existed in the 1820s; however, it was in the 1860s that the idea received serious consideration and was pushed forward by talented intellectuals such as Edward Freeman.<sup>36</sup>

Two of the most important discussions of federalism came from Edward Freeman and A.V. Dicey. For both Dicey and Freeman one of the essential components of federalism was that it resulted in the division of sovereignty. Although Freeman was willing to accept that federalism could have its benefits, particularly in the case of previously independent states uniting, Dicey was never willing to part with the absolute supremacy of Westminster.<sup>37</sup> Responding to Gladstone’s first Irish Home Rule Bill in 1886 Dicey outlined his argument against Irish Home Rule in his book *England’s Case Against Home Rule*: In his case against a federal solution to Irish Home Rule, Dicey argues that such a solution ‘revolutionises the whole Constitution of the United Kingdom; by undermining the sovereignty of Parliament, it deprives English institutions of their elasticity, their

---

<sup>34</sup> John Kendle, ‘The Round Table Movement and “Home Rule All Round”’, *The Historical Journal*, 11 (1968) and Patricia Jalland, ‘United Kingdom devolution 1910–14: Political Panacea or Tactical Diversion?’, *English Historical Review*, 129 (1979).

<sup>35</sup> Kendle, ‘The Round Table Movement’, p. 340.

<sup>36</sup> Kendle, *Federal Britain*, p. 37.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

strength, and their life it weakens the Executive at home, and lessens the power of the country to resist foreign attack'.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore he believed that this solution would fail to satisfy Ireland's and leave it with neither independence nor the benefits of union.

Although he was one of the leading intellectual Unionists, Dicey's relationship with nationalisms was dynamic. Christopher Harvie quotes him as writing, 'If I were an Irishman I have little doubt I should be an out-and-out Nationalist, and therefore anger and indignation at fair nationalism is out of place in my mind.'<sup>39</sup> In 1920 Dicey and the first chair of history at Glasgow University Robert Rait collaborated to write *Thoughts on the Scottish Union*. Dicey and Rait argue that one of the primary triumphs of the Union between Scotland and England is that it united the two kingdoms into one state while still allowing for the survival of Scottish nationalism through the preservation of Scottish institutions most notably the Church, courts, and schools.<sup>40</sup> At first this may seem at odds with his dedication to the idea of indivisible parliamentary sovereignty. James Mitchell, however has noted that three ideas permeate through Dicey's work. They are: 'unity of government, equality of rights, and diversity of institutions'.<sup>41</sup> While Dicey's focus on parliamentary sovereignty is easily compatible with 'unity of government' and 'equality of rights', the idea of 'diversity of institutions', appears to cause trouble. Mitchell however, reconciles this when he explains that for Dicey there was a distinction between the state and civil society. Through civil society Scotland was able to exercise its distinctiveness. This is very near to the Unionist Nationalist experience described by Morton. Mitchell goes on to note that as the state's role increased in the twentieth century Diceyan arguments became increasingly tested.<sup>42</sup>

Among Liberal Unionists, Scottish Home Rule and 'Home Rule All Round' presented an interesting option. Home Rule All Round would have seen the

---

<sup>38</sup> A.V. Dicey, *England's Case Against Home Rule*, London: J. Murray 1886, pp. 196-197.

<sup>39</sup> Dicey to Bryce, 3 Jan. 1886, quoted in: Christopher Harvie, 'Ideology and Home Rule: James Bryce, A.V. Dicey and Ireland, 1880-1887', *English Historical Review*, 91 (1976), p. 307.

<sup>40</sup> A.V. Dicey and Robert Rait, *Thoughts on the Union between Scotland and England*, London: MacMillan, 1920, pp. 327-328.

<sup>41</sup> James Mitchell 'Devolution and the end of Britain?', *Contemporary British History*, 14 (2000), p. 65.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

establishment of devolved parliaments for Ireland and Scotland, and possibly England and Wales, which would have legislated on matters that affected the respective localities, while imperial business would have been left to Westminster. Many of the difficulties of Irish Home Rule, such as the in or out question of Irish representation after Home Rule, might have been avoided by such a system. George Whitely made the observation in the 1902 discussion relating to Scottish Home Rule suggesting that Home Rule All Round might offer the potential for reconciliation to those who had ‘strayed from the Liberal Party’.<sup>43</sup> There does seem to be some basis for this and by 1900 William Jacks, George Trevelyan and T. Buchanan had returned to the Liberal party and showed favour towards Scottish Home Rule. Jacks in particular was a strong supporter of Scottish Home Rule. In 1889 his speech in favour of federal home rule was published in pamphlet form.<sup>44</sup> Alistair Cooke notes that during his unsuccessful election campaign of 1886 Jacks stressed the mismanagement of Scottish legislation in Westminster and advocated the devolution of Scottish legislation as a means of improvement.<sup>45</sup>

Determining the place of Scottish Home Rule within the Liberal Party is a challenging task. The SHRA was formed during April and May of 1886. By June 1886 the Edinburgh Eastern Radical Association passed a resolution that:

Home Rule for Scotland is absolutely necessary, and heartily supported a movement promoted by the Scottish Home Rule Association, and urging all electors in the division to support no candidate who is not in favour of this recognition of Scottish National rights.<sup>46</sup>

The Radical Association further expressed its dissatisfaction in the prospect of the incumbent Liberal Unionist G.J. Goschen’s continued representation of the constituency. A similar resolution was passed at a meeting of all of the Liberal Associations of Forfarshire in October 1886.<sup>47</sup> The following year a motion in favour of a devolved Scottish Parliament came before the Edinburgh South Liberal

---

<sup>43</sup> Whitely was the MP for Stockport 1893-1900 and Pudsey 1900-8, *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 22 Jan. 1902, vol. 101, c. 634.

<sup>44</sup> William Jacks, *The House of Lords and Federal Home Rule. A political address to the Glasgow Central Liberal Association*, Glasgow: 1889.

<sup>45</sup> Alistair B. Cooke, ‘Gladstone’s Election for the Leith District of Burghs, July 1886’, *The Scottish Historical Review* 49 (1970), pp. 180-183.

<sup>46</sup> *EEN*, 9 June 1886, p. 2.

<sup>47</sup> *EEN*, 22 Nov. 1886, p. 2.

Association. On that occasion two motions were considered. The first by Thomas Reekie which argued that owing to the difficulty in parliament to pass reforms long demanded by the Scottish people and the expense of private bill legislation the:

business solely affecting each of the countries represented in Parliament ought to be transferred to local legislatures, so as to give to each of the countries full legislative and administrative control of its own affairs, thus setting free the time and energies of the Imperial Parliament for Imperial business.<sup>48</sup>

The motion was dropped in deference to a motion put by the association's secretary J.T. Grey, which acknowledged the claim of Ireland was paramount but put forward the claim of the Scottish people for 'the legislative and executive control of Scottish affairs' while preserving Scottish representation at Westminster.<sup>49</sup> In supporting the motion, several of the meeting's attendees cited in satisfaction Gladstone's promise that if Scotland asked for Home Rule she would have it.

In the February of the following year the annual meeting of the General Council of the Scottish Liberal Association approved the policy of Scottish Home Rule and adopted the resolution:

Also that this Association declares in favour of the application of the principle of Home Rule to Scotland, and instructs the executive that in the event of their appointing any deputation to attend any future Conference of the National Liberal Federation of England that such deputation be instructed to urge the claims of Scotland for Home Rule.<sup>50</sup>

Although it had been approved as a policy of the Scottish Liberal Association little action was taken by the Party. The following November, the Scottish Liberal Association renewed its support for the principle of Scottish Home Rule; however, it also carried a resolution against instructing the branches to make Scottish Home Rule a test question for parliamentary candidates at the upcoming general election. The Chairman of the General Council thought that to do so would be in conflict with the association's principle of the society by interfering with the independence of their local authority.<sup>51</sup> This was devastating for Charles Waddie, who, even after the

---

<sup>48</sup> Quoted in 'Edinburgh South Liberal Association', *The Scotsman*, 10 June 1887, p. 7.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> 'The Scottish Liberal Association', *The Scotsman*, 8 Feb. 1888, p. 8.

<sup>51</sup> 'The Scottish (Gladstonian) Liberal Association and Home Rule For Scotland', *The Scotsman*, 6 Nov. 1888, p. 6.

disappointment of Hardie's defeat at the 1888 Mid-Lanark by-election, still hoped to field a strong selection of Scottish Home Rulers at the next General Election. Filled with a passion which was unlikely to reconcile differences, he lamented, 'If this generation of Scotsmen unwisely succumb to the wiles of the English Liberals, they will have leisure for bitter repentance, while all future generations of Scotsmen will curse them for their folly.'<sup>52</sup>

I.G.C. Hutchison has offered some explanations as to why Scottish Home Rule failed to be taken on by the Liberal leadership during the period, especially the coolness of Gladstone's political confidants such as Rosebery and Edward Majoribanks, 2<sup>nd</sup> baron of Tweedmouth, on the issue. Hutchison notes that Majoribanks, who would later be Gladstone's Chief Whip:

was utterly against all fads, as his protest in 1887 against a Home Rule for Scotland motion being presented at a party conference revealed, "Some means should be devised to stop all sorts and conditions of men from moving strange and gruesome resolutions".<sup>53</sup>

Rosebery's position on Scottish Home Rule and Irish Home Rule is very complex and was discussed in the valuable PhD thesis by Robert Akroyd. In 1888, speaking before the Dalkeith Liberal Association, Rosebery encouraged Scottish Home Rulers to show patience, and suggested to them 'you must take care not to attempt to move your demand, when it is made, parallel with that for Ireland... The British Nation can only take one great question at a time.'<sup>54</sup> Regarding Home Rule for Scotland, Rosebery adopted a position similar to Gladstone. While he never denied it in an outright fashion, his statements in favour of it were so heavily qualified that they amounted to very little. Rosebery's speech regarding Scottish Home Rule before the Glasgow Liberal Club encapsulated his skill at coining phrases which Akroyd has described as 'wonderfully vague and mutable'.<sup>55</sup> Having attended a Scottish Liberal Association meeting in the afternoon which passed a resolution in favour of Home Rule All Round, Rosebery spoke before the University Liberal Club, arguing 'in the

---

<sup>52</sup> 'Scottish Liberal Association and Scottish Home Rule', *The Scotsman*, 7 Nov. 1888, p. 9.

<sup>53</sup> Quoted in: I.G.C. Hutchison, *A Political History of Scotland: Parties, Elections and Issues*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 2003, p. 161.

<sup>54</sup> 'Address to Dalkeith Liberal Association', *The Scotsman*, 2 Nov. 1888, p. 6, quoted in Robert John Akroyd, 'Lord Rosebery and Scottish Nationalism,' PhD Thesis University of Edinburgh, 1996, pp. 273-274.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

long run whatever Scotland wants, Scotland will get'.<sup>56</sup> The key phrase here may have been 'in the long run'; vague language caused frustration for the members of the SHRA who wanted concrete commitments. Akroyd has noted that both through his campaign for the secretary of Scotland and the establishment of the Scottish Grand Committee Rosebery displayed a commitment to providing Scotland with better representation.<sup>57</sup>

Although Waddie was disappointed by the failure of the Scottish Liberal Association to make Scottish Home Rule a test question across Scotland, there is evidence that at least one branch of that Association was prepared to withdraw support for candidates who did not support Scottish Home Rule. During the Edinburgh East by-election of 1888, the executive of the East Edinburgh Liberal Association passed a resolution stating that they would not support the incumbent Liberal MP, Robert Wallace. Their reason for doing so was they felt he had not represented the feeling of the constituency on a number of key issues. These included the Local Veto and an eight hour work day for miners. Also included in the list was the fact that:

on the important question of Home Rule for Scotland, we find in the analysis of the voting on the motion of Mr Dalziel, M.P., on 3rd April 1894, e.g. 'that it is desirable, while retaining the power and supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, to establish Legislature in Scotland for dealing with purely Scottish affairs,' that Mr Wallace was absent unpaired on both divisions.<sup>58</sup>

Regardless of the protest by the executive of the East Edinburgh Liberal Association Wallace would go on to win the seat. He represented it until his death in 1889. Despite Wallace's success, the action of the executive demonstrates that the SHRA was not the only body in Scotland which was willing to take politicians to task over the issue.

In 1891 at the national conference of the Scottish Gladstonian Liberal Associations, another resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule was passed:

---

<sup>56</sup> 'Speech at Glasgow University Liberal Club', *The Times*, 23 Nov. 1889, p. 10, quoted in Akroyd, pp. 277-278.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> 'The Dissident Position', *EEN*, 13 July 1895, p. 4.

That this National Conference is of opinion that Home Rule should be granted to Scotland so that the Scottish people could have the sole control and management of their own national affairs and suggests that the true solution of the question may be found in granting Home Rule Legislatures on a federal basis to Scotland, England, Ireland and Wales, but in respect of the urgency of the claim of Ireland, declares that that country must have first consideration.<sup>59</sup>

In proposing the resolution Ballie Walcot, Edinburgh, stressed the importance of the last sentence and claimed that any attempt to move Scottish Home Rule as parallel to Irish Home Rule would hurt the former. Despite a protest by Thomas M'Naught, colonial secretary, of the SHRA, the resolution passed unanimously. In 1891 the Eastern Committee of the Scottish Liberal Association declined to meet with the SHRA. As Adam Naylor has noted it was around this time that the SHRA began to diverge from the Scottish Liberal Association over the issue of giving primacy to Ireland.<sup>60</sup> In 1891 the Scottish Liberal Association voted against a resolution from M'Naught and passed an amendment declaring that it was unnecessary to revise its position from 1889.<sup>61</sup>

### **Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons:**

No less than thirteen motions in favour of Scottish Home Rule were discussed in the House of Commons between 1889 and 1914. Motions in favour of Scottish Home Rule were delivered by eight different MPs in the twenty-five years preceding the Great War. Of those that reached division only the first failed to receive the majority of Scottish votes. After that the Scottish majority steadily increased with Sir W.H. Cowan's 1913 motion receiving a Scottish majority of forty-five to eight. Aside from differences stemming from Home Rule All Round and whether or not to proceed with creating multiple parliaments for each nation at the same time; the motions all bore a remarkable resemblance to one another.<sup>62</sup> Simply

---

<sup>59</sup> 'Earl of Rosebery in Glasgow', *The Scotsman*, 23 Nov. 1889, p. 10.

<sup>60</sup> Adam Naylor, 'Scottish Attitudes Towards Ireland: 1880-1914', Edinburgh PhD Thesis, 1988, p. 45.

<sup>61</sup> 'Scottish Gladstonian Association', *The Scotsman*, 28 Feb. 1891, p. 11.

<sup>62</sup> Two notable exemptions would be Dr Hunter's 1892 motion which was counted out during its second reading and James Macpherson's 1913 motion. Hunter's proposal was that Scotland should hold an autumn session in which bills passed would automatically receive royal assent. Macpherson's motion was very much the same as previous motions save for the fact that it would have introduced female suffrage. This clause attracted considerable attention during the debate.

put, the motions expressed the desirability of establishing a Scottish legislature seated in Edinburgh that would have control of purely Scottish business and would have the power to raise taxes. As many authors, such as John Kendle, have pointed out, this would have been a devolutionary procedure rather than a true federal solution.<sup>63</sup> While the term federal was sometimes used, the Scottish Home Rulers went to great lengths to insist that they did not intend to challenge the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. When one looks at the goals of the various home rule groups one sees that they possessed very similar aspirations.

The SHRA was founded in 1886 with four objectives: To maintain integrity of the empire, secure a Scottish legislature for purely Scottish matters, maintain Scotland's position within the Imperial Parliament and foster national sentiment.<sup>64</sup> It was from this desire to foster national sentiment that we see cultural nationalism brought to the foreground by the SHRA. Members such as John Stuart Blackie were keen to use utilise the nation's history as a way of rejuvenating national life.<sup>65</sup> The YSS proclaimed that 'Devolution is, after the Abolition of the Lords' Veto, the most urgent reform of the time. Men of all parties recognise that this was absolutely necessary in the interests of Imperial efficiency and progress.'<sup>66</sup> Similar lists of objectives can be found in the editorials of the patriotic periodicals *The Scottish Nation*, *The Thistle* and *The Fiery Cross*. Although the goals of the home rule groups were consistent with the goals of the parliamentary Scottish Home Rulers, they were often more likely to appeal to issues of national sentiment and, therefore, less willing to compromise for the sake of politics. This desire to protect the national rights of Scotland made the executive of the SHRA less willing to see Ireland receive Home Rule without the assurance that Scottish Home Rule would follow within a reasonable time frame. The conflicts which this created between the executive and the other Scottish and Irish Home Rulers will be discussed at greater length in chapter three.

---

<sup>63</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 4.

<sup>64</sup> W.A. Hunter, *The Financial Relations of England and Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Home Rule Association, 1892, p. 18.

<sup>65</sup> John Stuart Blackie, *The Union of 1707 and its Results: A Plea for Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Morison Brothers, 1892, p. 15.

<sup>66</sup> William Laughland, 'Manifesto and Appeal to the Scottish People on Scottish Home Rule', Glasgow: The Young Scots' Society, July 1911, p. 2



Although parliamentary congestion was an essential element in the arguments presented in the House of Commons for Scottish Home Rule, nearly as prevalent is an antagonism towards English votes determining Scottish legislation. As early as October 1886 an editorial in the *EEN* complained ‘We have not only to wait till Scottish opinion is ripe before we can have reforms, but have also to tarry in patience till England comes round to our way of thinking.’<sup>67</sup> The remedy that was proposed was the establishment of a domestic legislature for Scotland. In seconding Dr Clark’s first Scottish Home Rule motion in 1889 William Hunter stated:

When a Scotch question is under discussion the English Members leave the House to seek more interesting places of retreat, and when the division bell rings they come in, and without having heard a word of the debate, and often without knowing what is the question on which they are going to vote, they overrule the Scotch Members.<sup>68</sup>

The two primary accusations were that English MPs were either ignorant of Scottish issues or that through their conservatism they deliberately held back progressive Scottish legislation. Very nearly echoing Hunter’s speech, Scottish Secretary George Trevelyan complained in 1893:

But I am sorry to say that in dealing with Scottish questions English Members never forget that they are Party men, and the consequence is that Scottish opinion is over-ruled by masses of gentlemen who pour into the House, and who know nothing whatever except the Lobby into which their Whip tells them to go.<sup>69</sup>

In these two examples, an important distinction can be made between a pragmatic argument formed to relieve the congestion or to ease Scottish neglect and an argument which treads nearer to nationalist lines that Scottish legislation should be framed by Scots free from outside interference.

The political composition of Scotland during the time period has been so well discussed that it hardly need be rehashed at length here. From the mid-nineteenth century down to the outbreak of the Great War, Scotland, excepting for the Khaki election in 1900, remained firmly in the Liberal Party’s grasp. In England the General Elections were much more closely contested. Indeed, many of the Liberal

---

<sup>67</sup> *EEN*, 4 Oct. 1886.

<sup>68</sup> William Hunter was MP for North Aberdeen, *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 09 Apr. 1889, vol. 335, cc. 84-88.

<sup>69</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 23 June 1893, vol. 13, c. 1844.

Governments would have never been able to maintain a majority had it not been for the Welsh and Scottish constituencies returning Liberal MPs at a much higher proportion than their counterparts. At its best this system allowed for the predominant feeling of the United Kingdom to be expressed at the Imperial Parliament. At its worst it meant that following a General Election one or several of the constituent countries of the UK were likely to be governed by a party which, had their country been consulted alone, would, never have been returned. Frustration at this state of affairs was not inherently reserved to Ireland, Wales, and Scotland as it was also possible for England to have returned a Unionist majority and still be under the rule of a Liberal Government as was the case in 1892 and both 1910 General Elections.

A careful reading of the debates reveals that in all but two of the House of Commons debates on Scottish Home Rule, either the mover or the seconder of the motion protested that Scottish legislation should not be determined by English votes.<sup>70</sup> While seconding Clark's 1890 Scottish Home Rule motion Seymour Keay, MP for Elgin and Nairn and a member of the SHRA, expressed his dissatisfaction when he stated:

Yet, in spite of this, what happens when the Scottish Members combine together for the purpose of passing some really Liberal measure? They are at once incontinently voted down by English Tories, who, no doubt, are thoroughly convinced that they know infinitely better about the needs of Scotland, and that their souls are burning with a greater anxiety for the welfare of Scotland than are the souls of the Scotch Members themselves.<sup>71</sup>

Temperance, education, disestablishment and land reform were all highlighted as issues that would have been settled had it not been for English interference.<sup>72</sup> In 1891 John Leng provided the most exhaustive list of Tory offences which was published in a SHRA pamphlet which also included, twelve occasions in which the Scottish majority had been out voted by perceived English Tory votes on a variety of issues ranging from the rights of county and town councils to acquire land and license to the

---

<sup>70</sup> It should be mentioned that complaints of Welsh or Irish MPs voting on Scottish issues also occur but in significantly reduced numbers.

<sup>71</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 19 Feb. 1890, vol. 341, cc. 687-688.

<sup>72</sup> B.D. Mackenzie, *Home Rule for Scotland: Why should Scotland Wait*, Reprinted from the Westminster review, SHRA: Edinburgh, 1891.

distribution of highland grant money. Leng was a member of the SHRA and MP for Dundee. In 1913 William Cowan MP for Aberdeenshire Eastern made the claim quite plainly:

We recently had the Crofters Act extended to the non-crofting counties of Scotland. You gave it too late. We had to wait twenty-five years for it. Do not excuse yourselves on the ground of the House of Lords Veto. We wrung it from you. If we had had a Parliament in Scotland this would have been given to us, and given to us in time, and thus saved to Scotland thousands of her worthiest sons who have been driven into exile by the callous indifference of this House.<sup>73</sup>

In its basest form, the Act allowed for the creation of new small land holdings and applied the benefits of the Crofters Act of 1886 to the whole of Scotland. Cowan is quite right to identify the difficulty which had be attached to the passage of the Small Landholders Act. Ewen Cameron has noted that the Liberal Government which was returned in 1906, first led by Cambell-Bannerman and then Asquith, was far from unanimous on the subject of land reform.<sup>74</sup> This divide could be seen in the Cabinet but it also went down throughout the Liberal Party. The process of passing the Act took five years and with the Bill having passed in the Commons was rejected by the House of Lords twice, first in 1907 and again in 1908. The quote by Cowan suggests that while the House of Lords was undoubtedly a major block to Scottish legislation so too was the House of Commons. For Cowan the solution was to establish a separate parliament in Edinburgh which would be free from interference. It should, however, be mentioned that Cowan's argument overlooks that divisions existed within Scotland. Cameron has noted that the country was divided on the issue across a multitude of levels.<sup>75</sup>

References to disestablishment of the Church of Scotland were particularly interesting within the Scottish Home Rule debates. Proponents of Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons who mentioned disestablishment tended to be in favour of it. Among Scottish Home Rulers outside the House of Commons there was not as much unity on the question. Charles Waddie for example was strongly defensive of the Church of Scotland. There was a consistency among them in that

---

<sup>73</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, cc. 477-478.

<sup>74</sup> Ewen A. Cameron, *Land for the People: The British Government and the Scottish Highlands, c.1880-1925*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 2009, p. 137.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 128-129.

they felt the question of disestablishing the Scottish church should be determined by Scotland alone. G.B. Clark brought up the issue of disestablishment in three out of four of his Scottish Home Rule motions. He pointed out that although he felt the majority Scottish MPs were in favour of devolution he recognized that a much larger portion of Scotland belonged to the established church than in Wales or Ireland and he felt strongly that Scotland alone should decide the fate of the Scottish Church as the Treaty of Union had stipulated. ‘I say it is impertinence in English candidates to raise the question of Scotch Disestablishment. I deny the right of the English people to determine this question at all...’<sup>76</sup> Disestablishment is a very difficult question within the historiography of Scotland. Although it is not possible here to give proper discussion to the topic it should at least be mentioned that between 1874 and 1895 the issue was very hotly contested in Scotland.<sup>77</sup> Scottish Home Rulers were by no means united on the question of disestablishment their desire to have the question settled in Scotland served as a potential link between the Welsh and Scottish Home Rulers

In seconding Dr Clark’s 1891 motion Sir Samuel Evans complained that in matters relating to Wales, Welsh MPs were overruled by their English colleagues. He provided a voting analysis of a motion for the disestablishment of the English church in Wales, concluding that English MPs had made up a disproportionate portion of the majority voting no.<sup>78</sup> The link between Welsh home rulers and disestablishment was so strong that while criticising Dalziel’s 1895 motion for Home Rule All Round, John Redmond, in order to press the pre-eminence of Ireland’s right to home rule, argued that it was not really a local parliament that Wales desired but rather an increased leverage in the present parliament to be able to pass reforms such as devolution.<sup>79</sup> Although issues such as language, land and educational reform certainly inspired Welsh nationalists before the Great War, it can be said without much contention that disestablishment was given pre-eminence over Welsh Home Rule. Evidence of this can be seen in the resolutions passed at a Scottish and Welsh

---

<sup>76</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 29 Apr. 1892, vol. 3, cc. 1690-1691.

<sup>77</sup> James G. Kellas, ‘The Liberal Party and the Scottish Church Disestablishment Crisis’ *English Historical Review*, 79 (1964), p. 31.

<sup>78</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 6 Mar. 1891, vol. 351, cc. 451-452.

<sup>79</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 29 Mar. 1895, vol. 32, cc. 536.

home rule conference held in 1890 at the National Liberal Club in London. Although this meeting will be discussed at greater length in chapter three, it is worth noting that one of the preconditions of the Welsh representatives of the Welsh Federation and Cymru Societies was that nothing be done to hurt the position of Irish Home Rule and Welsh disestablishment within the Liberal agenda.<sup>80</sup> Here the Welsh Liberals expressed their opinions explicitly and although it does not show that disestablishment was the sole cause of support of supporting Welsh home rule it does make clear that Welsh disestablishment was the higher priority on the agenda.

Temperance was probably the most frequently cited issue which was being held back by the state of affairs within the House of Commons. Again we see a consistent claim on the part of the Scottish Home Rulers that the legislation that Scotland desired was being held back by English votes. Sir William H. Cowan claimed:

To my knowledge there has been a Scottish majority in this House in favour of Scottish temperance reform since 1885—a majority which, being a minority of the House, has been always voted down by the English Members. So the Scottish Members have found it impossible to make effective the mandate that they have been given. England, as usual, has lagged behind. What has been the result of delay in a matter so vital? If this measure had been given to Scotland a generation ago, much might have been saved to Scotland—neglected children, ruined homes.<sup>81</sup>

It is clear from this statement that it was not simply parliamentary congestion that the speaker was complaining of. It was also the fact that Scotland was unable to pass desirable legislation due to the nature of the Imperial Parliament with England being considered to be the dominant partner.

In opposing Dr Clark's 1890 amendment in favour of Scottish Home Rule Edward Marjoribanks argued that a Scottish Parliament could achieve nothing which could not also be achieved by a Grand Committee.<sup>82</sup> With a Scottish Grand Committee Scottish legislation would first be discussed by a group of either predominantly or exclusively Scottish MPs in order to gauge Scottish opinion on a

---

<sup>80</sup> 'Welsh and Scotch Home Rule Conference', *Liverpool Mercury*, Feb. 26 1890.

<sup>81</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, cc. 476-477.

<sup>82</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 12 Feb. 1890, vol. 341, c. 695.

matter before the bill was brought in front the whole House to receive assent. However, the movers and seconders of Scottish Home Rule motions seem to have been very wary of grand committees. Also within the speeches of Dr Clark, Sir Henry Dalziel and Robert Reid, MP for Dumfries, we can see a distrust of Scottish grand committees. Clark and Reid simply doubted their effectiveness at relieving the problems.<sup>83</sup> Dalziel was far blunter stating, ‘The best that can be said of the Grand Committee is that it is one stage, and one stage only.’<sup>84</sup> He went on to say that he accepted the proposal for a Scottish committee only as a makeshift and temporary solution to the problem but was keen to insist that it would not fully solve the problem. It is worth noting that Dalziel’s motion was proposed on the very next day after the Secretary for Scotland, George Trevelyan, submitted a motion for establishing a Scottish grand committee. The extent which Scottish MPs in 1894 would have been satisfied by a Scottish grand committee may be judged by the fact that Dalziel’s motion passed 180 to 170 with a Scottish majority of nearly two to one, including the Secretary for Scotland. Immediately following the division A.J. Balfour asked whether the Government proposed to bring in a Bill. No reply was given. A Scottish Grand Committee was established in 1894 and fell into disuse by 1895.

By 1906 the question of a Scottish Grand Committee was again before the House of Commons. Campbell-Bannerman acknowledged that the present standing committees were over congested and said, ‘When an important Scottish measure has received the approval of the House, I will gladly see it referred as has formerly been done with excellent result, to a Scottish Grand Committee.’<sup>85</sup> The following February at a meeting of the General Council of the Scottish Liberal Association, Sir Robert Pullar moved to pass a report which outlined its commitment to establishing a Scottish Grand Committee. During the discussion John Gulland, MP for Dumfries and a Young Scot, moved an amendment which called for the proposed committee to consist of only Scottish MPs, be statutory with the Scottish estimates and legislation

---

<sup>83</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 6 Mar. 1891, vol. 351, cc. 443; Reid, *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 29 Apr. 1892, vol. 3, c. 1702.

<sup>84</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 3 Apr. 1894, vol. 22, c. 1288.

<sup>85</sup> Quoted in: ‘Imperial Parliament’, *The Scotsman*, 10 Apr. 1906, p. 6.

referred to it, and finally that it should have the power to sit in Scotland.<sup>86</sup> Gulland felt that the Committee should be statutory so that its findings would not be left up to the good will of the Imperial Parliament in which English Conservatives stifled Scottish desire for progressive legislation. Gulland's amendment essentially amounted to a trial of a Scottish Parliament under a different name. In supporting the resolution Charles Price said that it would serve as a useful temporary arraignment that would ultimately lead to a parliament in Scotland. Price was a Young Scot and MP for Edinburgh Central. Like many before him he cited the congestion of the Imperial Parliament which saw matters as trivial as football fields in Ireland discussed. He also went on to discuss the Agriculture Holdings Bill and claimed that they had an entirely different land system in England. He felt that 'If it had been considered by Scottish members of parliament they would have had a Bill more in keeping with what was required.'<sup>87</sup> Although the amendment was unanimously passed by the General Council of the Scottish Liberal Association when the Scottish Grand Committee was approved by the House of Commons later in the year it more closely reflected the unamended version of the report.

Simply the fact that two of the strongest Scottish majorities on the motions in favour of a Scottish Parliament came after a Scottish grand committee had been set up would certainly seem to suggest that a mere Scottish committee was not viewed as being sufficient to secure satisfactory Scottish governance. The Scottish Standing Committee had been set up in 1907 to consider exclusively Scottish bills in their committee stage. In 1908 Pirie, Scottish Home Rule motion was favoured forty-one to nine by Scottish MPs. In 1912 Dr William Chapple, Stirlingshire, and Alexander MacCallum Scott's, Glasgow Bridgeton, motions for a Scottish legislature were favoured forty-three to six and forty-three to seven respectively.<sup>88</sup> In introducing his resolution Dr Chapple was very critical of the Articles of Union claiming, 'If we had been given true political union, Scotland would have retained her authority over all those matters which were special to Scotland.'<sup>89</sup> Referring to the Scottish Committee during the discussion of Dr Chapple's motion the Labour MP for Dundee, Alexander

---

<sup>86</sup> 'Scottish Liberals and Scottish Home Rule', *The Scotsman*, 8 Feb. 1907, p. 7.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> Young, 'A Sketch History of Scottish Nationalism', p. 10.

<sup>89</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, c. 1449.

Wilkie, argued that he had spent six years dealing with what was to have been the ‘panacea for all Scottish grievances’. In that time he complained that Scots members ‘had been distinctly told by an English Member we have no right to legislate according to the opinions of the majority of the representatives of the people of Scotland’.<sup>90</sup> Finally, Sir W. H. Cowan’s Scottish Home Rule bill received a Scottish majority of forty-five to eight. Cowan paid special attention to presence of the fifteen English MPs who participated in the committee and labelled them ‘undesirable aliens’.<sup>91</sup> This is again a case of a Scottish MP showing hostility to the idea of Scotland being governed by non-Scottish MPs which of course is not a matter so much of congestion or pragmatism rather it is an idea which is bordering on the definition of nationalism. In the last Scottish Home Rule Bill before the Great War, Sir James Macpherson made the claim in nationalist terms:

I claim, too, that it is an expression—a clear and definite expression—of that sane and practical desire of Scotsmen for local self-government which has come down to us from the past. Scottish nationalism is not a question of party. It is not narrow; it is not embittered; it is not the product of mere semi-insular pride. Strong as is our attachment to our native country, its literature, its history, and its traditions, the strength of that attachment has not lessened but increased that broader side of the national spirit which glories in the inheritance and the continuance of an Empire which has come down to us largely through the wisdom, the powers, and the statesmanship of our kinsmen who have gone before. I, for one, would be no party to the introduction of a Bill which would in any way impair that inheritance, or deprive my fellow countrymen of their share in the performance of the high Imperial duties which they have performed in the past, and which they perform now in the Imperial Parliament.<sup>92</sup>

The word ‘nationalism’ remained conspicuously absent from the Scottish Home Rule debates in parliament before the First World War. Although the phrase ‘Scottish nationality’ was used frequently, James Macpherson was the only MP who used the word nationalism as a favourable motive for Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons.

Home Rule groups outside parliament seem to have been even more opposed to the idea that a Scottish grand committee would solve all of the ailments from

---

<sup>90</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, 1464-1465.

<sup>91</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, c. 479.

<sup>92</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 468.



which Scotland suffered. Charles Waddie was even more outspoken than usual in expressing his displeasure with the idea of a grand committee. He argued that it would be too heavy a tax on the time of Scottish MPs in ministerial positions such as the Prime Minister, Secretary of War and English Home Secretary. Furthermore he argued that it was unconstitutional to exclude any member of the House from hearing an argument and then having him vote on it. Whereas MPs such as Clark and Dalziel were willing to accept grand committees if they were a step towards greater devolution of powers, Waddie was vehemently against claiming of the members supporting the proposal ‘not one of those members ever got such a mandate from his constituents to propose such a thing’.<sup>93</sup> This represents a distinction between the parliamentarians and some of the staunchest Scottish nationalists. Whereas MPs were used to compromise and half measures many of the Scottish Home Rulers outside of parliament were less willing to accept anything short of a devolved parliament for Scotland.

### **Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland**

The House of Commons was not the only political body which debated the usefulness of establishing a Scottish Legislature. The Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland also gave the matter its consideration. Few Scottish institutions can claim longer lineage than the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland. By the time it was finally reorganised as the Convention of Local Authorities in 1975 it had been in regular operation for over four hundred years.<sup>94</sup> Although the influence of Convention had been significantly reduced following the 1833 Burgh Reform Act, the Convention of Royal Burghs Act 1879 and the Amendment Act of 1895 breathed new life into the Convention. These two acts allowed for the steady increase in acceptance of parliamentary and later police burghs to the Convention. A year after the Convention of Royal Burghs Act there were eighty-one burghs included. In 1896 following the Amendment Act the roll increased to ninety-one and this increase remained steady seeing one hundred and sixty-seven in 1906 and one hundred and

---

<sup>93</sup> Charles Waddie, *The Application of the Home Rule Principle: an Address delivered at the National Liberal Club London*, 7 Feb. 1893, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1893, p. 6.

<sup>94</sup> A Court of the Four Burghs, Edinburgh, Roxburgh, Berwick, and Stirling predates the Convention existed as early as the thirteenth century.

ninety-nine in 1908.<sup>95</sup> By 1914 the annual meeting of the Convention saw only two Scottish burghs unrepresented.

The Convention of Royal Burghs was inherently interested in the issue of local government within Scotland and its records and resolutions show a strong conviction to framing politics along local lines. In the early 1880s it played a noticeable role in petitioning for the re-establishment of the post of Secretary for Scotland. By 1885 the Convention possessed a long heritage of appealing for the restoration of the Secretary for Scotland. In the 1850s, along with the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights, the Convention had appealed to Queen Victoria for return of the position which had been abolished during the 1740s.<sup>96</sup> Nearly identical resolutions were passed by the Convention in 1856, 1857, 1858, and 1859. Similar resolutions were then passed in 1867, 1869, and 1881.<sup>97</sup> Its December 1885 Edinburgh meeting for that purpose was noted as one of the largest gatherings for the appeal. In a memorial to the Prime Minister Lord Salisbury, the Convention claimed that over 3,000 individuals from all parts and classes of Scotland were in attendance and strongly urged on him of the necessity of creating a separate department of State for Scotland presided over by a Minister of personal eminence.<sup>98</sup>

Another area in the realm of Scottish national character which the Convention entered was the teaching of Scottish History to school children. Following the lead of the Scottish Patriot Association, which was led by John Wilson in 1901, the Convention underwent an effort of examine the position of Scottish history within Scottish schools. It found that in many cases Scottish History was dealt with inadequately and often in way which gave offence to the national sentiment of the country. The most frequent complaint being the use of the word 'England' to refer to 'Great Britain'. Writing to the Scottish Education Department in August 1905 they objected that:

---

<sup>95</sup> Daniel William Kemp, *The Position of the Convention 1907-1908: A series of Articles which Appeared in the Glasgow Herald*: Edinburgh, 1908, pp. 10-11.

<sup>96</sup> 'Convention of Royal Burghs', *The Aberdeen Journal*, 25 Apr. 1855, p. 10. Twelve years earlier the Convention had voted against a similar measure.

<sup>97</sup> Convention of Royal Burghs, *Local self-government for Scotland : Report Approved by the Convention on 7th April 1914*, Edinburgh: The Convention, 1914, pp. 10-11.

<sup>98</sup> 'The Secretary for Scotland Bill: Memorials to the marquis of Salisbury', *The Scotsman*, 19 June 1885, p. 3.

The history that attracted the attention and won the admiration of the world is shorn of its greatness and dignity; its honours, by being ascribed as “English,” are taken from Scotland to add to the glory of another country to which they do not belong; and Scotland's history, thus belittled, is made to appear as a mere series of episodes in the history of England.<sup>99</sup>

*The Scotsman* credited the Convention of Royal Burghs for their attempts to raise awareness of the shortcomings in the teaching of Scottish history in schools. Having noted a report from Dr Struthers of the Scottish Education Department which claimed that Scottish history in schools was essentially English history, the *Scotsman* cried that it:

is disgraceful in Scottish pupils whose school education is assumed to be complete, and the disgrace is reflected largely upon the School Boards, and upon the teachers, regarding whom the examiner quoted confidently assumes that they must have taught out of text-books written entirely for the benefit of English children, and were themselves “either unable, or did not think it necessary, to supplement the contents of these books by telling their pupils anything about Scotland.”<sup>100</sup>

The Convention of Royal Burghs and the *Scotsman* make for two interesting counterpoints to the Scottish Home Rule groups that feature so heavily in this thesis. The *Scotsman* was thoroughly against both Irish and Scottish Home Rule. The Convention eventually came to favour it but largely from the pragmatic standpoint of relieving congestion. In both cases however we see a keen desire to promote the teaching of Scottish history in a way that will enhance the position of Scotland. It is important to note that Scottish Home Rulers did not possess a monopoly on patriotism during this time period. As chapter five will touch on, issues such as the teaching of Scottish history offered unique areas for expressing what might be considered cultural nationalism within a Unionist context.

The Scottish Education department replied to the Convention that while it was in sympathy with the Convention’s recommendations, it was a matter to which local school boards should attend. From here the impetus to pressure school boards seems to have been largely exerted by various groups including the Scottish Patriotic

---

<sup>99</sup> ‘The Convention of Burghs and School History Books’, *The Scotsman*, 7 Aug. 1905, p. 6.

<sup>100</sup> Editorial Article, *The Scotsman*, 9 Nov. 1906, p. 4.

Association, the St Andrew Society, and the Association for the Promotion of Teaching Scottish History in Schools and Universities.

During the thirty years leading up to the First World War, the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland's attention to the framing of Scottish legislation was expressed through attempts to reform the process of private members' bills. A reform of this sort was attractive to many MPs as it would have helped to ease the financial burden of achieving Scottish legislation while at the same time helping to resolve neglect of legislation which had increasingly become a source of objection and complaint. In 1876 the Convention sent a deputation to the Lord Advocate on the topic of private legislative procedure in the hopes of affording 'governing bodies in Scotland greater facilities of local legislation and generally to obtain greater attention to Scottish business in Parliament'.<sup>101</sup> Throughout the 1880s and 1890s the Convention passed various resolutions in support of Private Members Bills and local government reform and sent petitions and memorials to the Scottish Secretary and Government. Ultimately it would claim credit for the essential features of the Private Legislation Procedures Act 1899.<sup>102</sup>

The position of Scottish Home Rule within the convention of Royal Burghs underwent a change during the two decades before the Great War. In 1887, 1888, and 1890 the Convention rejected proposals for the establishment of a national legislator to control the affairs of Scotland. It was instead unanimously adopted that the Imperial Parliament should make further and better provisions as to development of Local Self- Government within Scotland. By 1906 the Convention's opinion had changed and Act sixty-eight of the Convention stated:

That in the opinion of this Convention, the time has now arrived when, owing to the increasing complexities of our social system, and the consequent congestion of business, that purely domestic business pertaining to the different divisions of the United Kingdom should be devolved upon Local Legislators possessing executive powers.<sup>103</sup>

This feeling was then again expressed in Act forty-one of the Convention during 1910: "That in the opinion of the Convention it is desirable that the Imperial

---

<sup>101</sup> Convention of Burghs, *Local Self Government*, p. 11.

<sup>102</sup> Daniel William Kemp, *The Position of the Convention*, p. 15.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Parliament should devolve upon the people of Scotland the control and management of their local affairs by Legislature and an Executive in Scotland's subordinate to the Imperial Parliament".<sup>104</sup> As may be seen in the language of the Act from 1906, the Convention requested the establishment of a Scottish Parliament on what might be described as the purely practical grounds that the current system was too complex and congested to allow for the effective framing of legislation within the Imperial Parliament. This is distinct from the language used in the House of Commons debates which also focussed on issues of pragmatism and easing of congestion, but went on to denounce interference with Scottish political aspirations by the alien votes of English Conservatism. Furthermore, it altogether lacked the inspired patriotism of Scottish nationalists outside Westminster such as, Charles Waddie, William Mitchell or John Stuart Blackie, which coupled the restoration of a Scottish Parliament with a return of national honour that had been eroded at from the Act of Union onwards.

Despite the lack of a strong nationalist argument the Convention's pronouncement was still greeted with excitement by the International Scots Home Rule League. A leading member of the league, Edinburgh Councillor F. J. Robertson, called it a reaffirmation of the Convention's 1706 opposition to an incorporating union.<sup>105</sup> With pleasure he highlighted to readers of the League's periodical, *The Scottish Nation*, that the report refrained from giving opinion on Ireland and reminded them that in 1886 the Convention had sent a memorial to Gladstone stating that if Irish Home Rule passed it would destroy the unity of empire.<sup>106</sup>

While the Convention may fairly be described as pragmatic in its view of Home Rule its discussion of devolution is still impressive due to the scope of its proposal. In a report of the Convention of Royal Burghs of 1914 the Convention claimed that commercial advantage was the compelling factor in support of the Union while fearfulness of the loss of national identity and sentiment within a parliament which it was decisively outnumbered was the strongest argument against.

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> F.J. Robertson, 'The Convention of the Royal Burghs and a Scots Parliament', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914) pp. 105-106.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid.

From this position the Convention went on to suggest that the growth of empire had reforged the question in a new form. ‘How can local autonomy be secured, compatible with an incorporating union, under a central government?’<sup>107</sup> In attempting to answer the question the Convention drew on the colonies for inspiration arguing that as they grew they began to crave autonomy while at the same time remained loyal to the empire and were beginning to share the burden of its defence. In order to rebalance this situation, the Convention suggested that the devolution of a Scottish Parliament might be the first step of a dramatic restructuring of the empire which could ultimately allow the Imperial Parliament linked to each section of empire.

This theory was not unknown; Home Rulers such as Charles Waddie had been promoting such ideas since the mid-1880s. It does show that the Convention was committed to the notion that various sections of British Empire could seek control of their own affairs while at the same time still participating and serving a shared empire. The financial relationship between the proposed Scottish Legislature and the Imperial Parliament were not neglected. In an interesting recommendation from the Convention it argued that Scotland’s proportion contributed to the Imperial Exchequer had increased since the Union from 2.4 per cent to 13.3 per cent and that under devolution the financial relationship between the two would have to be carefully considered as to bring it in line with Article XIV of the Union which stipulated that Scotland was to be taxed equally with England.<sup>108</sup>

As has been mentioned, financial arguments for Home Rule were not infrequent among its proponents. As far back as 1892 William Hunter, the MP responsible for the second Scottish Home Rule motion in the House of Commons, had proposed that Scotland was being overtaxed by a sum of nearly £1,100,000. And, as Richard Finlay has noted, while the accuracy of Hunter’s figures maybe called into question, it still confirms the fact that there were Scottish MPs who felt

---

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Scottish Home Rulers frequently claimed that they contributed too much and received too little from the Imperial revenue. The Pamphlet ‘The Union of 1707 Viewed Financially; and, Scotland and Home Rule, written by William Mitchell and published in the *Scottish Review* serves at the best example of this line of reasoning though it is worth noting that its figures were challenged by opponents.

that Scotland was paying more than her fair share of imperial burdens.<sup>109</sup> As is to be expected with a form of legislative devolution certain powers were to remain for the British Parliament under the Convention's suggestion, these included the familiar powers of 'Customs, Excise, Imperial Taxation generally, Imperial Defence, Imperial Credit, War, Treaties, Commercial Relations, Postal and Telegraph Services, Coinage, Copyright, Trade Marks, and Patent Rights'.<sup>110</sup>

Outside of these reserved powers affairs affecting Scotland were to be determined by a dual legislature sitting in Scotland. The lower house was to be elected democratically on a wide franchise while the second would be elected indirectly by popular selection. Unique among proposals for Scottish Home Rule was that of the Convention's suggestion that its ancient status gave it a particular claim to be represented in an Upper House which would have the power to reject or revise legislation. In discussing this point at a meeting of the General Convention, a motion was made to delete this clause but it proved unpopular and only received ten votes. The report was carried by an overwhelming majority of the General Convention on 7 April 1914 at a meeting that was attended by four hundred and four representatives including '166 lord provosts, provosts, and ex-provosts, 125 town clerks and ex-town clerks, and 57 magistrates and ex-magistrates'.<sup>111</sup>

Reactions in the press to the Convention's pronouncement were mixed. The *EEN* had reported that the Convention carried much more weight than it had in the past and that in recent years it had rendered valuable service in the realm of local administration. The *EEN*, which had for some time taken a favourable view to the idea of Scottish Home Rule, took issue with the desirability of establishing a Second Chamber. The paper which had a decidedly Radical lean and played a large role in the establishment of the YSS at the start of the century, felt that a Second Chamber would act in a similar capacity to the House of Lords which it called 'one of the greatest problems of British politics'.<sup>112</sup> *The Scotsman* too was quick to comment on the renewed vigour of the Convention and particularly appreciated its work to induce

---

<sup>109</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership for Good*, p. 44.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>111</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 1471.

<sup>112</sup> Editorial, 'The Convention and Home Rule', *EEN*, 8 Apr. 1914, p. 4.

the Government to make measures to protect the public from milk infection, which had recently featured prominently in its columns.<sup>113</sup> *The Scotsman*, however, took a different focus on the Convention's report on Scottish Home Rule. It focussed on one of the final paragraphs of the convention which called for the implementation of a federal system of local self government for the United Kingdom:

that a Federal system of local government offers a possible means of relieving the Imperial Parliament from the weight of unnecessary local legislative detail" and recommends that "it should be applied to suitable divisions of the kingdom where the inhabitants have racial and national instincts and traditions in common" divisions which "need not necessarily be confined to the geographical boundaries of each separate country"<sup>114</sup>

From this standpoint the author of the editorial attacked the Irish Home Rule Bill which was making its way through the House of Commons, claiming that a federal system established on this basis would be undesirable in Scotland and impossible to implement in England.

A month later this paragraph also received a hearty discussion in the House of Commons debate surrounding Sir James Macpherson's resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule. Macpherson had been keen to cite the support of the Convention as it could claim to represent some 3,000,000 of Scotland's estimated population of 4,759,455.<sup>115</sup> Opponents of the Bill during the debate, including Halford Mackinder<sup>116</sup>, were also keen to focus on the paragraph quoted in *The Scotsman*, and argued that the phrase 'not necessarily geographical boundaries,' was a recognition that the Convention sought a sombre practical solution to devolution rather than a recognition of nationalist principle.<sup>117</sup> Although this contention was challenged by William Pringle it does highlight a distinction among those who one might classify as Scottish Home Rulers.<sup>118</sup> For the most part the Convention confined its arguments to the practical issue of relieving the House of congestion and thus allowing for the more efficient government of Scotland. However, even in this

---

<sup>113</sup> Editorial, *The Scotsman*, 8 Apr. 1914, p. 8.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

<sup>115</sup> Macpherson was MP for Ross and Cromarty 1911-36, *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 1471.

<sup>116</sup> MP for Glasgow Camlachie January 1910 to November 1922.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., c. 1484.

<sup>118</sup> Pringle was a strong Home Ruler and sat for North West Lanark.



case where the report by the Convention recognised the practical advantages of devolution, its solution still reflected the principle that devolution be applied to ‘divisions of the Kingdom, where the inhabitants have racial and national instincts and traditions in common’. This brings us back to the discussion about the possible distinction between Scottish Home Rulers and nationalists. Was this proposal by the Convention an act of nationalism or pragmatism? In truth the answer is probably both.

Hitherto this discussion has largely been confined to the arguments presented by representative political figures and bodies such as parties, the Convention of Royal Burghs, and individual MPs. These groups were largely composed of elected officials who had a duty to govern based on multifarious wills and the needs of their various constituencies. The next section will attempt to look at arguments and motives for Scottish Home Rule as they were presented by various patriotic groups. These groups were organised voluntarily and were free to press their own issues and were only accountable to themselves and their presumably sympathetic readerships.

### **Home Rule Groups and their Literature**

As has been mentioned within parliament, arguments for Scottish Home Rule tended to favour issues such as congestion, over-taxation and contempt for English predominance. Discussions of Scottish Home Rule that occurred outside of parliament could be much more varied and much more willing to discuss other issues. In the case of the Convention of the Royal Burghs it seems that desire for Scottish Home Rule originated largely due the desire of creating a more efficient system of administering local governance. There were, however, several groups that sought Scottish Home Rule for more sentimental and patriotic motives. SHRA members like Charles Waddie, John Romans and T. D. Wanliss were relentless in correcting the misuse of national names. One of the most glaring examples is provided in Wanliss’ book *Bars to British Unity*; in it he describes a monument which had been erected to honour fallen soldiers of the Battle of Inkerman. The statue is dedicated ‘In Memory of the English, French and Russians who fell in the battle of Inkerman.’ This sent Wanliss into a rage and he exclaimed it was the result of ‘more than ordinarily senselessness; but that cannot excuse the authority of the

British War office for having sanctioned such a stupid and insulting blunder, or for allowing it to continue in existence'.<sup>119</sup> There exist dozens of pamphlets produced by the SHRA publishing correspondence between Scottish Home Rulers and offenders against Scottish national sentiment, not least a petition that was sent to the newly crowned King regarding his assumption of the title King Edward the VII.<sup>120</sup> In parliament the issue of the misuse of national names dropped after 1891 and from available evidence the issue regarding the King's title does not appear at all within the Scottish Home Rule debates.

After the turn of the century and as the SHRA became increasingly defunct, nationalist publications continued in the form of several patriotic periodicals.<sup>121</sup> *The Thistle*, *Fiery Cross*, *Scottish Nation*, *Scottish Patriot*, *Scottish Nationalist* were all dedicated to the principle of Scottish Home Rule. However, they also published articles on a host of Scottish topics outside of the realm of Scottish politics including, Scottish music, dance, song, and history. The *Scottish Patriot* published articles on a wide variety of topics ranging from the political to the cultural. It also regularly featured biographies of great Scottish patriots including Rosebery, Charles Waddie and Theodore Napier. Charles Waddie's *Scottish Nationalist* was by far the shortest lived and ceased publication after just four issues. *The Scottish Nation* and *The Thistle* were the most political of the two and frequently received correspondence from MPs such as Munro Ferguson, Duncan V. Pirie, and Alexander MacCallum Scott. Napier's periodical, *The Fiery Cross*, was by far the most eccentric of the patriotic periodicals.

*Scotia*, the journal of the St. Andrew Society, was particularly active in the promotion of Scottish studies. This was made apparent in the Society's constitution, 'The objects of the Society shall be to uphold the honour and dignity of Scotland, and to foster the study of Scottish History, Archaeology, Art, Literature, Music, and Customs, and to bring the Scottish Societies throughout the British Isles and abroad

---

<sup>119</sup> T.D. Wanliss, *Bars to British Unity*, William Paterson: Edinburgh, 1885, pp. 223-224.

<sup>120</sup> Charles Waddie and John Romans, *An Address to the people of Scotland: on the Historical and Constitutional bearing of the King's Assumed Title Edward VII*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1901.

<sup>121</sup> Occasional letters were sent on its behalf but its other activities had more or less ceased entirely.

into closer touch with the mother country.’<sup>122</sup> These objectives are very much along the lines of cultural nationalism as noted by John Hutchinson. He argues that cultural nationalism movements ‘typically precede or accompany political nationalism and take the form of ethno-historical ‘revivals’ that promote a national language, literature and the arts, educational activities and economic self-help’.<sup>123</sup> Despite focussing primarily on promoting the study of Scottish culture, the periodical often found space to discuss Scottish political affairs. Hutchinson notes that engaging in politics is not an uncommon feature of cultural nationalism. It does however make the process of distinguishing between a cultural nationalist and a political nationalist difficult. As noted by Kennedy the process is further complicated by the fact that membership between groups that might be described as culturally nationalist and politically nationalist often overlapped. While distinguishing between a person or a group being either culturally or politically nationalistic is very difficult, the table of contents of these periodicals do give at least give an indication of prominence which was attached to certain topics. In *Scotia* for example the vast majority of articles dealt with historical topics. Articles dealing with Scottish Home Rule were also present but to a far lesser degree. One of the best examples of political involvement on the part of *Scotia* came about when it published the results of a circular issued by the St Andrews Society as well as its sister society the Scottish Patriotic Association asking Scottish MPs for their stance on four issues: the misuse of national names, giving special attention to Scottish issues in parliament, Antarctic adventure funding and a bill regulating the title of sovereigns so that so that the numbering of the British sovereigns may in the future be correct.<sup>124</sup> Although most MPs were willing to pay at least lip service to the first three questions even a prominent Scottish Home Ruler like Munro Ferguson confessed that he did not feel that the question could be ‘usefully stirred’.<sup>125</sup> From this one can see an unwillingness on the part of Scottish MPs to embrace some of the more sentimental aspects of the Scottish Home Rule movement. Further evidence for this can be seen

---

<sup>122</sup> *Scotia*, 1 (1907), p. xvii.

<sup>123</sup> Hutchinson, ‘Cultural Nationalism’, p. 75.

<sup>124</sup> *Scotia*, 4 (1910), pp. 41-43.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 43.

by the lack of articles written by politicians published in the most extreme of the Scottish patriotic periodicals, *The Fiery Cross*.

Whereas contributions from MPs were a frequent feature among the other patriotic periodicals they were far rarer in Napier's publication. Even Charles Waddie, the Grand Old Man of Scottish Home Rule, was embarrassed by the antics of self-proclaimed Jacobite Theodore Napier. Although Napier had published pamphlets on behalf of the SHRA and was very prominent in circulating a petition regarding the King's title, his eccentricities, such as calling for the restoration of Ludwig of Bavaria, the alleged heir to the Stuart throne, as the Monarch of the UK caused Waddie to declare that 'Mr Napier's eccentricities have done incalculable harm to the cause of Scottish Home Rule.'<sup>126</sup> Scottish Home Rulers were often required to defend themselves from accusations that they were extremists or simply ridiculous. This is perhaps where discussions of the relationship between Scottish Home Rule MPs and Scottish Home Rulers can prove interesting. Both Clark and, twenty years later, Chapple were criticised for their connections with more fervent home rulers. For Clark it was his connection with the SHRA for Chapple it was the YSS.<sup>127</sup> The marquess of Tullibardine accused them of being 'warlike' when demanding Scottish Home Rule in Scotland but like 'doves' when they humbly requested it in parliament.<sup>128</sup> Tullibardine went on to quote a resolution of the YSS that read "That no scheme of Home Rule will be satisfactory which does not as an immediate result secure self-government for Scotland, and the other national divisions of the United Kingdom,".<sup>129</sup> He went on to ask if Chapple would be willing to substitute that resolution with the current resolution before the House. Clark faced similar criticisms from Arthur Elliot, claiming that the views of the SHRA were more substantial and disquieting than the motion presented.<sup>130</sup>

In the parliamentary debates on Scottish devolution Gladstone's name was nearly always held up in great esteem by the Scottish Home Rulers. In his 1913

<sup>126</sup> *Scottish Patriot*, 2 (1904), p. 60; quoted in Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 121.

<sup>127</sup> Adam Naylor, 'Scottish Attitudes towards Ireland: 1880-1914', Edinburgh University Thesis 1985, p. 96.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>129</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, cc. 1466-1467.

<sup>130</sup> Arthur Elliot was the son of the Earl of Minto and MP for Roxburghshire, *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 9 Apr. 1889, vol. 335, c. 85.

motion Cowan cited the oft-quoted Gladstone statement ‘I will consent to give to Ireland no principle, nothing that is not upon equal terms offered to Scotland, and to the different parts of the United Kingdom’, as evidence for the necessity of Scottish Home Rule.<sup>131</sup> However, by 1893 Gladstone had fallen out of favour among the leadership of the SHRA. This can probably in part be attributed to his Irish Home Rule bill of 1893 not including a scheme of Home Rule All Round. When they were unable to get Gladstone to comment on the issue during a speech at Albert Hall both William Mitchell and John Romans felt compelled to resign their positions within the Liberal Party. In his letter of resignation, Romans, who had previously been a member of the National Association for Vindication of Scottish Rights forty years earlier, wrote:

I have, down to this time, endeavoured to fulfil the duties expected of me as convener of a Liberal committee, without intruding unnecessarily in the principles of Scottish Home Rule, but by thus trying to execute my duty as convener, I am now afraid I might sacrifice a principle more valuable by far to Scotland than all other political questions of the present day, viz, the birthright of every free people to make the laws by which they are governed, unmolested by any other people or nation.<sup>132</sup>

A similar explanation was offered by Mitchell while describing the circumstances of his own resignation from the Liberal party. This unwillingness to put other issues such as Irish Home Rule in front of Scottish Home Rule is a distinguishing characteristic between the leaders of the SHRA and the MPs who were also simply members of the association.

Of the groups supporting Scottish Home Rule before the war, the YSS occupied a unique place because of their position as a pressure group within the Liberal party. Whereas the SHRA was not affiliated to political party, the YSS was a distinct section of the Liberal Party dedicated to promoting classic liberal ideals. James Kennedy has recently made valuable contribution to the study of the YSS and has noted that as the first decade of the century wore on, the group increasingly looked to Scottish Home Rule as a solution to Radical questions such as Land

---

<sup>131</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, c. 472.

<sup>132</sup> John Romans, *Home Rule for Scotland with Introduction by W Mitchell*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1894, pp. 46-47. The full letter of resignation appeared in the appendix while Mitchell recounted his resignation in introduction.

Reform.<sup>133</sup> Furthermore Kennedy notes that by 1911 Scottish Home Rule became the most popular topic for YSS speakers.<sup>134</sup> This point is made clear when Kennedy quotes one of the Society's vice presidents A. Rutherford Ker:

the legislative independence of Scotland as far as it is consistent with Imperial Unity... This object should stand out clear and pronounced as the important part of the Young Scots' policy, the realization of which will justify our existence as a national organisation.<sup>135</sup>

This support for the policy Home Rule was not completely without opposition within the party and at least one officer resigned over the matter.<sup>136</sup>

As mentioned earlier, the SHRA had failed effectively to make the issue a test question for candidates across Scotland before 1900. YSS provided a much more effective at promoting candidates. Kennedy notes they even received a note expressing gratitude and a subscription from Campbell-Bannerman for their contributions during the 1906 general election.<sup>137</sup> That said they were not unwilling to oppose Liberal candidates who were not willing to support their policies. This is seen most evidently in the adoption of William G. C. Gladstone in the 1911 Kilmarnock by-election, where they were prepared to support the Labour candidate had Gladstone been unable to convince them of his commitment to Scottish Home Rule.<sup>138</sup>

Their rigour as nationalists is evidenced by the fact that they were even able to gain the support of Charles Waddie who served as a vice-president of the Liverpool branch of the YSS.<sup>139</sup> Waddie's hostility towards what he, not incorrectly, perceived as indifference on the part of the Liberal leadership had alienated him from the main body of the Society. In the month before his death Waddie received a special vote of thanks at a Scottish Home Rule meeting held jointly by the Scottish Nationalist Committee and YSS. The Scottish National Committee had been created in 1910 and was composed of twenty-one MPs to promote the cause of Scottish Home Rule. Waddie had been calling for such a committee as early as

---

<sup>133</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 231.

<sup>134</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalism* p. 129.

<sup>135</sup> *The Young Scot*, 1, (1904), p. 38; quoted in: James Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 61.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>138</sup> 'Kilmarnock Burghs', *EEN*, 6 Sept. 1911, p. 4.

<sup>139</sup> 'In Memoriam—Charles Waddie', *The Thistle*, 4 (1912) p. 41.

1894.<sup>140</sup> In 1912 the committee sent a deputation to Asquith to press the cause of Home Rule All round as a solution to the Irish question. Although Asquith claimed to be in sympathy with some of the objects of the deputation he refused to give a commitment to a specific time in which to address them. Furthermore he rejected the principle that Scotland was inherently entitled to the same treatment noting:

The local circumstances vary so much. Historic conditions themselves are so different. The economic differences, particularly if you compare Scotland and Ireland, are so enormously different. To apply a cast-iron rule to the other is not I think sound statesmanship and sound business. We must deal with each part of the Kingdom having regard to its special requirements and history.<sup>141</sup>

Here Asquith justifies his unwillingness to commit himself to system of Home Rule All Round which required simultaneous devolution of legislatures. Although many of the more moderate Scottish Home Rulers were not opposed to Ireland receiving devolution first, Asquith's failure to commit to a fixed timeframe for implementing Scottish Home Rule afterwards would have been a frustration to many. In spite of Asquith's reservation on the topic Scottish Home Rule pass a second reading in 1913. It is tempting to speculate what might have happened had it not been for the outbreak of war but that is perhaps a topic better left until more research has been conducted.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has sought to discuss the relationship between groups who espoused Scottish Home Rule and the arguments they put forward in its support. It has drawn primarily on published sources, pamphlets, periodicals, newspaper reports of meetings, and Hansard; it is therefore important to acknowledge that they would have been, to at least some extent, crafted towards their intended audience. In the case of the debates before the House of Commons, the audience and objective appears on the surface, easy to identify; to gain the majority of votes among fellow MPs and pass legislation in favour of Scottish Home Rule. In reality the situation was more complex, Newspaper reports and Hansard's records of the debates ensured

---

<sup>140</sup> Charles Waddie, *The Government and Scottish Home Rule*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1894, pp. 9-10.

<sup>141</sup> Oxford Bodleian Library, Asquith Mss, 89, fos. 1-12, Deputation from Scottish Liberal MPs, 6 May 1912.

that the speeches and voting outcomes would reach a much wider audience. It might also be acknowledged that, in light of frontbench reluctance on the topic, the chance of Scottish Home Rule being brought into law were was slim. The debates did however allow a platform for both promoting and debating the topic in a forum of singular importance, in which success might lend itself to the issue an increased perception of legitimacy among both elected officials and the wider public.

In the case of the periodicals, the scope of the audience is difficult to assess and would have varied widely between them. *The Scottish Nation* for example ran for several years and boasted being available in dozens of cities across the world. While this claim is difficult to verify, and it should be noted many publications had a tendency of exaggerating sales, it undoubtedly reached a wider audience than the similarly titled, *Scottish Nationalist*, which was published by Charles Waddie, which produced only a few issues before being given up. Both however would have served a similar function of allowing those at the forefront of campaigning for Scottish Home Rule such as Waddie and Hector Macpherson a platform for presenting their ideas, corresponding directly with and updating those who had an interest in the topic. The higher production and sales price of periodicals meant that they were likely to reach a narrower audience than the pamphlet, the most popular of which were reproduced on a scale of tens of thousands. It is perhaps therefore not surprising that it was the two groups which exerted the most effort in promoting Scottish Home Rule through the political parties, in practice the Liberal Party, the SHRA and YSS, which left behind the largest collection of pamphlet literature on the topic.

Evaluating the success of the Scottish Home Rule movement before the Great War is difficult. Opponents of Scottish Home Rule continually accused the movement of not having popular support.<sup>142</sup> This claim was strongly denied by Cowan when he said at the outset of his 1913 Government of Scotland Bill:

The Scottish Liberal Members to a man are declared and convinced Home Rulers. That seems rather curious if there is no demand for Home Rule in Scotland. It is well-known that ours is a cautious race, and I am perfectly certain that Scottish Members would never be so

---

<sup>142</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 1507.



foolish as to place themselves far ahead of public opinion in Scotland upon so vital a matter as this.<sup>143</sup>

It is evident from the division lists that the majority of Scottish MPs were willing to vote in favour of Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons. Whether or not this constitutes a nationalistic movement is perhaps contentious and it should be mentioned that many Liberals, including non-Scots, voted as a matter of course. Although it meets the basic requirement of following the ideal that lines of governance should not cross national boundaries, certainly when compared to other nationalist movements it appears to lack urgency. While this chapter has sought to clarify arguments which were presented by political groups in favour of Scottish Home Rule, chapter two will help to establish the prominence given to Scottish Home Rule during hotly contested by-elections.

It is clear that Scottish MPs were at least partly inspired by the notion that Scotland should be in exclusive control of affairs pertaining only to Scotland; but like other issues that were favoured among Scottish liberals, such as temperance, land reform, education and disestablishment, although desirable, they were not willing to forsake the party in order to force the issue in the way that their Irish counterparts were over Irish Home Rule. This chapter has argued that arguments presented for Scottish Home Rule varied among its supporters. In the House of Commons issues such as the easing of parliamentary congestion were given a great deal of prominence. Home Rule All Round was also presented as an effective solution to many of the difficulties associated with the Irish Home Rule Bills. Outside parliament Scottish nationalists drew on a wide spectrum of ideas to support their claims for Scottish Home Rule. These were heavily influenced by patriotic ideas and allusions to Wallace and Bannockburn were a constant feature in their pamphlets and periodicals. Although these patriotic images were intended to inspire the flame of nationalism within the public they inevitably caused embarrassment for some. It is, therefore, not so surprising that while the politically focussed *Scottish Nation*, edited by Hector Macpherson, was able to draw on numerous MPs for contributions the much more eccentric *Fiery Cross*, edited by the Jacobite Theodore Napier, was less well connected. Periodicals such as *Scotia* and *The Scottish Patriot*

---

<sup>143</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, c. 475.

demonstrated that Scottish Home Rule, which is inherently political, also found its way into the literature of groups who were primarily concerned with topics relating to cultural nationalism. The link between those interested in cultural, scientific and artistic expressions of Scottishness and the Home Rule movement will be discussed at greater length in chapter five.

This chapter has also sought to show that Scottish Home Rule was embraced by a diverse body of groups across the late Victorian and Edwardian period. There is a temptation to paint Scottish Home Rulers all with an air of eccentricity, but the fact that Home Rule was able to find support among the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland suggests that there were many sober minded individuals who held important positions within their communities who also supported the idea of establishing a parliament in Scotland for the purpose of creating Scottish legislation.

## **Chapter 2: Scottish Home Rule in By-elections**

In preparation for the 1912 House of Commons debate regarding Scottish Home Rule the marquess of Tullibardine went through the rigorous process of analysing the election addresses of Scottish Radicals for references to Scottish Home Rule. The marquess had represented West Perthshire in Parliament since 1910 after having previously failed to win East Perthshire in 1906. The result of his research, which he announced to the House, was that of the forty-eight candidates he examined only twenty-two had made reference to Scottish Home Rule.<sup>1</sup> Although some members disputed the claim, Tullibardine raised an interesting question regarding the position of Scottish Home Rule during elections. This chapter will particularly focus on the position of Scottish Home Rule between the December 1910 general election and the outbreak of war in 1914. This an interesting period for the Scottish Home Rule movement, not least because a bill in favour of it passed a second reading in the House of Commons in 1913. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these years also coincided with a period of increased activity on the part of the YSS. It was a very turbulent time within British politics. House of Lords Reform, Irish Home Rule, and increasingly the potential for war with Germany were just a few of the issues which occupied the Liberal Government.

Between 1910 and 1914 there were fourteen contested by-elections in Scotland, in which the Liberals were successful on ten occasions. The Conservatives were able to secure four seats in the by-elections. Three of the four Conservative victories were in three-cornered contests where a Labour candidate secured a higher polling than the Conservative margin for victory.<sup>2</sup> This chapter will seek to place Scottish Home Rule within the context of these by-elections in order to better develop the discussion surrounding its position within Scottish electoral politics. Although these contests were primarily fought on traditional Liberal politics of the period such as Irish Home Rule, free trade, House of Lords reform, land reform, and the Insurance Act, Scottish Home Rule still featured in nearly every campaign, sometimes prominently.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, cc. 1467–9.

<sup>2</sup> I.G.C. Hutchison, *A Political History of Scotland 1832–1924: Parties, Elections and Issues*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986, p. 257.

This chapter will be broken up into three sections. The first will seek to establish the historical context in which the by-elections were fought. The second will look at the position of Scottish Home Rule in the election addresses of Liberal candidates during the general elections leading up to the period in question. This will attempt to assess the validity of Tullbaldine's claim that there was no mandate for Scottish Home Rule because so few Scottish MPs had made reference to the issue during their elections. Finally, the third section will focus on the place of Scottish Home Rule within the fourteen by-elections which occurred after the second general election of 1910 and the outbreak of war in 1914. This period of time is significant for the study of Scottish Home Rule for a number of reasons, not least because of the formation of bodies like the YSS, Scottish National Committee, and the Scottish Home Rule Council, all of which advocated the creation of a Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh to deal with purely Scottish legislation. Equally important was the success of a number of measures in support of Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons, notably that of William Cowan, which passed its second reading and was supported by forty-five Scottish MPs and opposed by eight.<sup>3</sup> It is hoped that this discussion of the place of Scottish Home Rule during these elections will help contribute to our understanding of its place within the dynamic era of Edwardian politics.

The study of Victorian and Edwardian by-elections has recently been enhanced by a collection of essays edited by T.G. Otte and Paul Readman. At the outset Otte and Readman note their surprise that more research has not been done into British by-elections during this period given their ability to alter the shape of Parliament. The period between 1918 and 1997 saw 929 by-elections. By contrast, 1834-1914 witnessed over 2600.<sup>4</sup> By the late 1860s party leaders devoted increased attention to by-elections and increasingly devoted money and manpower to increase

---

<sup>3</sup>Cowan sat for Aberdeenshire East.

<sup>4</sup> The gap between these figures should be qualified by noting that the tradition of holding a by-election upon appointment for government office was largely abandoned. Also the trend towards younger MPs has resulted in fewer by-elections resulting from death in office. T.G. Otte and Paul Redman, 'Introduction' in T.G. Otte and Paul Redman (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics 1832-1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013, p. 2.

the chances of electoral success.<sup>5</sup> By-elections present an interesting opportunity to study issues such as Scottish Home Rule. During a general election the resources of a pressure group would be distributed across a country. At a by-election, however, small pressure groups could devote their full strength to one constituency. Otte and Readman quote a W.S. Caine, a temperance campaigner from the 1890s, who commented ‘they [by-elections] are always valuable to any great agitation...no opportunity like a bye-election for bringing any political principle before the country’.<sup>6</sup> There is certainly some truth to this statement and groups such as the YSS were keen to use by-elections to promote the cause of Scottish Home Rule, both by putting it in front of the general public and by seeking commitments from candidates. David Butler has noted that one of the more subtle functions of by-elections is that they allow trials of policies and ‘provide a platform for speeches that might otherwise be less remarked, an extra opportunity for public education (as distinct from vote-gathering)’.<sup>7</sup>

This national attention makes by-elections an interesting source of study for a historian concerned with an issue such as Scottish Home Rule. As D.A. Hamer notes, by-elections were less likely to be dominated by national issues and pressure groups stood a better chance of getting voters to give special attention to their issue as opposed to simply voting with their party.<sup>8</sup> In a general election smaller issues are likely to take a back seat to more prominent debates. Also there is awareness on the part of the voter that during a general election the voting will determine which party will be in power for the next several years. Butler notes that one of the striking features of some by-elections is not just the degree of voter participation but also the incidence of ‘party loyalists voting for the other side’.<sup>9</sup> Another aspect of by-elections noted by Hamer is that they allow pressure groups to pool their limited

---

<sup>5</sup> Kathryn Rix, ‘By-elections and the Modernisation of Party Organisation, 1867–1914’ in T.G. Otte and Paul Redman (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics 1832–1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013, p. 153.

<sup>6</sup> Otte and Redman, ‘Introduction’, p. 8.

<sup>7</sup> David Butler, ‘By-Elections and their Interpretation’, in Chris Cooke and John Ramseden (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics*, London: UCL Press, 1997, p. 5.

<sup>8</sup> D.A. Hamer, *The Politics of Electoral Pressure: A study in the history of Victorian Reform Agitations*, Hassocks: Harvester Press Limited, 1977, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Butler, ‘By-elections and their Interpretations’, p. 10.

resources into one area.<sup>10</sup> There is perhaps some danger in overstating the significance that certain topics, such as Scottish Home Rule, receive during by-elections. However they also offer a unique opportunity to look at a distinctly Scottish issue that might be overshadowed during a general election to gauge how it was presented to the electorate.

The significance of by-elections was not just a matter for interpretation by the contemporary press. Over the years many historians have paid attention to these by-elections as they attempted to gauge Liberal chances had the General Election of 1915 not been displaced by the outbreak of war. Historians such as Henry Pelling have used these by-elections to argue that Labour had made great advances during the period; whereas Peter Clarke has contested that Labour's success has been largely overstated and the Liberal Party's demise remained uncertain before the outbreak of the First World War.<sup>11</sup> Regardless of whether or not Labour had actually begun to precipitate the fall of the Liberal Party in Scotland, Liberals were jealous that Labour should not make progress at the expense of Liberal votes. A 1908 memorandum on the Socialist and Labour movement in Scotland prepared by joint secretaries of the Scottish Liberal Association claimed that the movements were steadily growing in Scotland and were intent on getting Labour candidates to stand for parliament.<sup>12</sup> This had the potential and did in turn lead to several three cornered contests between Liberal, Unionist, and Labour candidates. These contests were fascinating not just because of how they split the electorate but also how they mobilised and grouped various sections of the parties. Labour and Liberal candidates might be described as a progressive vote for their stance on legislation regarding social reform. Liberals and Unionist might have consider working together as an anti-socialist block however as the editor of *The Scotsman* J.P. Croal noted in a letter to the prominent liberal MP Alexander Muray Master of Elibank, the issue of Home

---

<sup>10</sup> Hamer, *The Politics of Electoral Pressure*, p. 20.

<sup>11</sup> Henry Pelling, *Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain*, London: Routledge, 1978, pp. 115–120; Peter Clarke, 'The Electoral Position of the Liberal and Labour Parties, 1910–1914', *English Historical Review*, 90 (1975), pp. 828–836.

<sup>12</sup> National Library of Scotland, Murray of Elibank MSS, MS 8801, fos. 145.

Rule made it nearly impossible for the Liberals and Unionists to work together to avoid three cornered fights.<sup>13</sup>

As Ian Packer has noted, no opinion polls existed to monitor public opinion. As such, by-elections provide some of the best data for reading into the electorate's mind.<sup>14</sup> It should be mentioned that there is some debate between historians as to what by-elections say about public opinion. In 1990 Pippa Norris identified two of the main theories behind the interpretation of by-election results as the 'campaign thesis' and 'referendum thesis'.<sup>15</sup> The campaign thesis stresses the significance of by-elections as isolated events which reflect local issues such as candidate personality, election strategies, media and polls. The referendum thesis sees by-elections as a way of testing satisfaction with the current Government in office. Both theories have merit. While elections were undoubtedly effected by unique factors such as candidate selection, recent work by Paul Readman and Luke Blaxill has stressed the significance of national politics in Edwardian by-elections arguing that by-elections 'tended to be fought and won on the issues dominating the national political discourse'.<sup>16</sup> What represents the national political discourse of a nation within a nation state makes the study of Scottish by-elections a particularly interesting topic.

This chapter has relied heavily on the use of newspapers. There are certainly disadvantages to this method primarily the possibility of political bias which then, as it still does today, had the potential to shape reporting. This has been mitigated to some extent by drawing from a diverse collection of papers, and specifically the *EEN* and *Scotsman* which were on opposing sides of the Home Rule debate. Although their editorials columns frequently took opposing views there was a strong degree of consistency between their reports of political meetings especially with regards to what was said by candidates. This was no doubt largely due to the fact that in many occasions their accounts of the meeting would be drawn from the same source

---

<sup>13</sup> J.P. Croal 9 July 1907, National Library of Scotland, Murray of Elibank MSS, MS 8801, fos. 131.

<sup>14</sup> Ian Packer, 'Contested Ground: Trends in British By-elections, 1911–1914', *Contemporary British History*, 25 (2011), p. 157.

<sup>15</sup> Pippa Norris, *British By-Elections: the Volatile Electorate*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 3.

<sup>16</sup> Readman and Blaxill, 'Edwardian By-elections', p. 228.

leaving only marginal room for interpretation. Newspapers are important for the study of Scottish Home Rule because, for many MPs reports of campaign meetings are where we see their most comprehensive discussions of topics such as Scottish Home Rule. While diaries offer amazing insights into personal feelings many of the figures who were prominent within the Scottish Home Rule did not leave behind extensive manuscript collections and therefore newspaper reports make up much of what is left of their views on matters.

### **Background:**

A brief survey of elections before 1900 shows that although Scottish Home Rule did not appear as frequently in election campaigns, though there are a few notable exceptions. Scottish Home Rule saw great success with the election of James Dalziel in the 1892 Kirkcaldy by-election where he was supported by Charles Waddie. The Scotsman reported that Waddie had taken Dalziel ‘under his wing on behalf of the Scottish Home Rule Association’<sup>17</sup> While this reference is too vague to draw significant interpretations on the nature of their relationship it might be mentioned that the evening after winning the election Dalziel visited a meeting of the SHRA and spoke on behalf of Dr Hunter’s proposed Scottish Home Rule Bill.<sup>18</sup> He would go on to submit motions in favour of Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons in 1894, 1895 and his 1911 bill in favour of Scottish Home Rule passed its first reading 172 to 73.

Overcoming the apathy of those who were supportive of Scottish Home Rule in principle but not in action was a persistent problem for Scottish Home Rulers. During the 1890 by-election in Partick, Cunningham Graham accused the Liberal candidate Sir Charles Tennant of only offering lip service to the issue.<sup>19</sup> Tennant had replied favourably to a letter from the SHRA and said that if he was elected and a similar measure to Clark’s previous resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule was

---

<sup>17</sup> *The Scotsman*, 29 Feb. 1892, p. 8.

<sup>18</sup> *EEN*, 14 Mar. 1892, p. 2.

<sup>19</sup> Tennant had previously sat for Glasgow (1879-1880), and Peebles and Selkirkshire (1880-1886).



introduced he would vote in favour of it.<sup>20</sup> Cunningham Graham however was not convinced and said:

Sir Charles Tennant was an older man and a more experienced man than he was...So about the possibility of Home Rule for Scotland, when the issue was plainly put before him, and it was stated that a certain amount of votes would be lost if he did not favour the idea, he was absolutely ready to pledge himself to Home Rule for Scotland, and if there had been enough of them there, would have pledged himself to Home Rule for Japan as well.<sup>21</sup>

Tennant was never given a chance to fulfil his promise as he was defeated by the Liberal Unionist candidate J.P. Smith by a narrow margin.

During the 1895 Inverness-shire by-election Liberal candidate Donald Macrae said that he would not allow issues such as disestablishment take precedent over questions that were closer to his heart such as land reform, one man one vote, and Scottish Home Rule.<sup>22</sup> Another interesting example can be seen a year later during the 1896 Aberdeen North by-election which saw Captain Duncan Vernon Pirie returned by a majority of four hundred and thirty. *The Scotsman* noted abundant election literature and posters including slogans such as ‘Captain Pirie, the Aberdonian for Aberdeen,’ and ‘A Scottish National Party’.<sup>23</sup> When addressing his constituents following his victory Pirie was reported to have said, ‘they had returned a candidate whom four days ago very few of them had seen, and who had no other recommendation except that he was a Scotsman and in favour of Scottish Home Rule’.<sup>24</sup> His opponent in the election was the English socialist Thomas Mann. Regarding his commitment to Scottish Home Rule it should also be mentioned that Pirie would go on to move a Scottish Home Rule Bill in 1908 which was carried with two hundred fifty-seven in favour and one hundred and two against. Of the Scottish MPs forty-four voted in favour of it and nine against it. Pirie was the second MP for Aberdeen North who was strongly in favour of Scottish Home Rule. William Hunter, whom Pirie succeeded as MP for Aberdeen, had been a strong supporter of Scottish Home Rule and member of the SHRA. The SHRA supported Keir Hardie’s

---

<sup>20</sup> ‘Charles Tennant’s Candidature’, *The Scotsman*, 28 Jan. 1890, p. 7.

<sup>21</sup> ‘Mr Cunningham Graham MP on the Partick Election’, *The Scotsman*, 28 Jan. 1890, p. 7.

<sup>22</sup> ‘Inverness-shire Election’, *Glasgow Herald*, 11 June 1895, p. 10.

<sup>23</sup> ‘Representation of North Aberdeen’, *The Scotsman*, 2 May 1896, p. 10.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

unsuccessful bid for Mid-Lanark.<sup>25</sup> In Hardie's election address, which is often quoted, he stated, 'I am strongly in favour of Home Rule for Scotland, being convinced that until we have a parliament of our own we cannot obtain the many and great reforms on which I believe the people of Scotland have set their hearts.'<sup>26</sup> Hardie received just six hundred and seventeen (8.7%) votes.

The election was a disappointment to Keir Hardie who would go on to play an instrumental role in the Labour Movement. Hardie had the enthusiastic support of the SHRA.<sup>27</sup> Charles Waddie regretted the decision to support Hardie, and before a conference of the SHRA he stated that 'they could not afford to throw away seats'.<sup>28</sup> As well as the financial costs of contesting seats there was also the risk of loss of reputation through a poor showing. Hamer has noted that one of main dangers of a pressure group running an independent candidate is that in the likely event that they fail they might seriously undermine a group's claims to strength.<sup>29</sup> This could serve to substantially undermine subsequent threats of independent candidates or bloc voting. Scottish Home Rule also received good discussion during the West Edinburgh by-election of 1888 which coincided with a series of six talks on the issue organised by the SHRA. The Liberal candidate T.R. Buchanan, who had been returned for the seat as a Liberal Unionist in 1885 and 1886, was pressed by both Irish and Scottish Home Rulers over his views.<sup>30</sup> In reply to a letter from William Mitchell, the treasurer of the SHRA, Buchanan stated that although he felt by supporting Gladstone's Irish Home Rule policy he was also supporting Scottish Home Rule, he would not commit himself to the policy of Home Rule All Round offered by Mitchell.<sup>31</sup> Interestingly the issue cropped up again during Buchanan's career when he served as the Gladstonian candidate during the East Aberdeenshire by-election of 1892. Although Buchanan again insisted upon his Scottish Home

---

<sup>25</sup> James G. Kellas, 'The Mid-Lanark By-Election (1888) and The Scottish Labour Party 1888-1894', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 18 (1965), p. 322.

<sup>26</sup> Young, 'A Sketch History of Scottish Nationalism', p. 9.

<sup>27</sup> 'Representation of Mid-Lanark', *The Scotsman*, 9 Apr. 1888, p. 8.

<sup>28</sup> 'Scottish Home Rulers in Glasgow', *The Scotsman*, 19 Sept. 1888, p. 8.

<sup>29</sup> Hamer, *Electoral Pressure*, p. 24.

<sup>30</sup> Gordon Pentland, 'By-Elections and the Peculiarities of Scottish Politics, 1832-1900', in T.G. Otte and Paul Redman (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics 1832-1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013, p. 289.

<sup>31</sup> 'The Scottish Home Rule Association and the West Edinburgh Election', *The Scotsman*, Jan. 7 1888, p. 9.

Rule credentials Ramsay MacDonald visited the constituency to consider the suitability of contesting it. The *Dundee Advertiser* was premature in announcing him as a candidate on behalf of the Scottish Home Rule interest. He did however meet with the SHRA and deliver speeches on the topic while considering the constituency.<sup>32</sup> Despite being reported to have an offer of support from Labour, MacDonald decided not to contest the seat citing the shortness of time before the election.<sup>33</sup> Buchanan would go on to win the seat with a majority of over 1,300.

The event is interesting not just because of the future importance of MacDonald but also because it displays the desire of the SHRA to interfere in elections where they did not feel the candidate was suitable. In 1895 the SHRA went so far as to blame the Master of Elibank's defeat in the West Edinburgh by-election on the fact that although he was favourable to Scottish Home Rule he was unwilling to authorise the issue of one of their manifestos.<sup>34</sup> The year before Waddie had offered not only his own support but the majority of electors in the Leith by-election to Munro Ferguson's Liberal Unionist opponent W.A. Bell. In both cases the SHRA and Waddie's claims should be treated sceptically. It is perhaps here where the distinctions between the by-elections that occurred during the 1890s and those between 1911 and 1914 is most noticeable. While in both cases Scottish Home Rule featured frequently and occasionally prominently, the SHRA did not have the same electoral clout or resources as the YSS. As will be discussed at greater length later in the chapter, the YSS were able to influence elections and on some occasions block candidates they deemed incompatible to their cause.

The period between the December 1910 general election and the outbreak of the First World War was filled with political struggles which had the potential to shape the way Britain was governed for decades to come. It is therefore little surprise that the period has received so much attention from historians. Although a thorough summary of the four years could, and has, filled volumes, a very brief sketch of the political climate may serve to help contextualise the environment in which these by-elections were fought. Following the death of Henry Campbell

---

<sup>32</sup> 'Another Candidate', *Dundee Advertiser*, 28 Nov. 1892, p. 6.

<sup>33</sup> 'East Aberdeenshire Election', *Dundee Advertiser*, 2 Dec. 1892 p. 5.

<sup>34</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule Association and West Edinburgh Election', *EEN*, 10 June 1895, p. 2.

Bannerman in 1908 Herbert Asquith succeeded him as Prime Minister. In 1909 the House of Lords sparked a constitutional debate by vetoing David Lloyd George's 'Peoples' Budget'. After a threat to increase the number of peers so as to counter Conservative dominance in the House of Lords, both the 'Peoples' Budget' and the Parliament Act of 1911 were passed. One result of the Parliament Act of 1911 was that the House of Lords could only delay legislation by sending it back to the Commons. After it passed in the Commons for the third time it would be sent for royal assent regardless of the House of Lords' opposition.

Although its power had been significantly reduced, the House of Lords was still able to disrupt Liberal legislation. Two examples of this can be seen in the Welsh Disestablishment Bill and the Plural Voting Bill of 1912. Both of these bills were delayed by the House of Lords for two years before being swept aside by the crisis of war in 1914.<sup>35</sup> Following the passage of the Parliament Act, the Liberal Party faced the daunting process of making good on its promises to the various groups to whom it owed its narrow majority in the House of Commons. In order to survive the two elections of 1910 the Liberal Party depended on the Irish Nationalists. In order to maintain their support, a third Irish Home Rule Bill was moved in the April of 1912. It was a difficult proposal that angered Irish Nationalists with its modesty while at the same time it alarmed Unionists for failing to offer concessions to Ulster.<sup>36</sup>

The position of devolution during the few years before the war has received some attention. Patricia Jalland has sought to determine the place of devolution within the upper ranks of the Liberal Party as they grappled with possible solutions to solving the question of Irish Home Rule. She noted that before 1912 both Churchill and Lloyd George dabbled with plans of Home Rule All Round. In spite of this initial interest she concluded that after the 1912 decision to introduce Irish Home Rule separately, the party was unable to fully commit to a federal solution because of pressure from the Nationalists and the general apathy of England to the idea. Ultimately Asquith preferred rather to keep it in the background and adopted a

---

<sup>35</sup> Chris Cook, *A Short History of the Liberal Party 1900–1997*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998, p. 55.

<sup>36</sup> Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule an Irish History*, London: Orion, 2004, pp. 129–131.

noncommittal policy which attempted to ‘neither encourage nor discourage federal enthusiasts’.<sup>37</sup> Richard Finlay has contended that by 1910 Scottish Home Rule had become serious policy in Scotland due to the difficulty of securing social reform and the Scottish National Committee was formed to press the matter.<sup>38</sup>

On 4 August 1910, the newly formed Committee issued a manifesto calling for an immediate and practical form of devolution.<sup>39</sup> The manifesto bore the signatures of twenty-one Scottish MPs.<sup>40</sup> Like most calls for devolution of the period it complained of the overburdened Imperial Parliament which often framed bills to solve English problems and then adapted them for Scotland as an afterthought. It also lamented the necessity of Scottish MPs spending so much time and money outside of country which they represented:

An outstanding fact in connection with present conditions is that, however overwhelming the preponderance of opinion may be among Scottish representatives in favour of any particular social or political reform, it is rarely possible for the will of the people of Scotland to secure legislative effect.<sup>41</sup>

The committee’s remedy was a devolved legislature to deal with Scottish business. In preparation for the second 1910 general election the Scottish National Committee met and unanimously resolved that Scottish Home Rule should feature in all election addresses.<sup>42</sup> The following week *The Times* reported that the executive of the Committee had ordered a large quantity of Scottish Home Rule leaflets for distribution during the next election.<sup>43</sup>

### **General Elections:**

Before beginning to discuss the position of Scottish Home Rule in the by-elections between December 1910 and the outbreak of the Great War it may be useful to consider its place in recent general elections. After the first 1910 general

---

<sup>37</sup> Patricia Jalland, ‘United Kingdom Devolution 1910–14: Political Panacea or Tactical Diversion?’, *The English Historical Review*, 94 (1979), p. 783.

<sup>38</sup> Finlay, *A Partnership For Good*, p. 57.

<sup>39</sup> ‘Scottish Business in Parliament a Home Rule Manifesto’, *The Scotsman* 5 Aug. 1910, p. 7.

<sup>40</sup> Captain A.C. Murray the radical MP for Kincardineshire subsequently joined the committee in November.

<sup>41</sup> ‘Scottish Business in Parliament a Home Rule Manifesto’, *The Scotsman*, 5 Aug. 1910, p. 7.

<sup>42</sup> ‘Political Notes’, *The Times*, 19 Nov. 1910, p. 10.

<sup>43</sup> ‘Political Notes’, *The Times*, 25 Nov. 1910, p. 12.

election the Asquith administration reintroduced the ‘People’s Budget’ and it passed through the Lords without division. The Liberals also introduced the Parliament Bill 1910 which would remove the Lords Veto over Money Bills, allow Bills passed in three successive Parliaments to become Acts despite opposition from the Lords, and limit the maximum length of a Parliament to five years. King Edward VII died suddenly in May, and in order to avoid thrusting the newly crowned King George V into a deep political controversy a constitutional conference was held with the aim of clearing the deadlock between the Commons and House of Lords. This conference was unsuccessful and the second general election of 1910 was set for December. In light of these circumstances it is unsurprising that House of Lords reform dominated both elections.

This brings us back to Tullibardine’s statement regarding Radical addresses discussing Scottish Home Rule during the second 1910 general election. If the general elections of 1910 were dominated by issues such as the ‘Peoples Budget’ and House of Lords Reform where then did Scottish Home Rule fit in? It should be noted however that Tullibardine’s challenge was immediately questioned by Walter Menzies, MP for South Lanark, who expressed disbelief and asked of his own December 1910 election address: ‘Did I not also say, in my Election address, that I thought the time would come for Scotland?’; to which Tullibardine replied: ‘No, I do not think there is one word about Scottish Home Rule.’<sup>44</sup> What Menzies’ 1910 address did contain was a reiteration of his 1906 address in which he said:

With regard to Irish Questions, I have always been in favour of relieving the congestion of the Imperial Parliament by devolving upon the various parts of the United Kingdom more power over their local or domestic affairs. Fear of Irish Legislation in this direction need not have any deterrent effect upon Electors of Liberal or Free Trade tendencies at this election.<sup>45</sup>

Whether or not this statement implied Home Rule for Scotland is open to interpretation. It is worth noting some of the limitations of this approach to appraising feeling towards Scottish Home Rule. Not every politician who supported the idea of devolution would have necessarily mentioned it in his election address.

---

<sup>44</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 1912, vol. 34, c. 1469.

<sup>45</sup> Walter Menzies Election Address December 1910, Scottish Liberal Party Election addresses, National Library Scotland, Acc. 11765/19.

As the December election took place so soon after the previous election many of the candidates chose not to reiterate all of their political ideals and rather chose to focus almost exclusively on the House of Lords. J.A. Murray Macdonald, Falkirk Burghs, for instance made no references to devolution in either of his election addresses; however, as John Kendle mentions in *Federal Britain*, Macdonald was one of the more active Scottish politicians with regard to Home Rule All Round during the first years of the twentieth century.<sup>46</sup> He made fairly regular contributions calling for devolution in the International Scots Home Rule League's periodical, *The Scottish Nation*. Furthermore, it should be acknowledged that not every candidate who spoke favourably of devolution in an election address would go on to actively support it if elected. The appearance of discussions of devolution in election addresses should therefore be seen merely as a rough guide to issues which the candidate wished to put before the electorate.

A survey of the other sixty-seven Liberal addresses from the election reveals that the devolution of local affairs was mentioned in half of them with the establishment of separate Parliaments, or as it was referred to then, 'Home Rule All Round', being the usual method of devolution.<sup>47</sup> This marks a notable increase over the elections of 1906 and January 1910 where Scottish Home Rule only featured in approximately twenty-five of the election addresses.<sup>48</sup> Many candidates were more explicit than Menzies in their calls for Home Rule. During his December 1910 candidacy for Peebles and Selkirk, Donald Maclean stated, 'I am a home ruler for Scotland as well as Ireland. It is full time that purely Scottish affairs should be settled by Scotsmen in Scotland.'<sup>49</sup> Five candidates made reference to the Scottish National Committee which had been formed earlier in the year. These candidates tended to devote more attention to the issue. Henry Watt's address is perhaps the best example of desire for Scottish Home Rule during the election:

Ireland being the earliest claimant has the first call, but Home Rule for Scotland is equally necessary. The Scottish National Committee (of

---

<sup>46</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 87.

<sup>47</sup> The Liberals did not contest Wigtownshire, Glasgow Blackfriars, the two universities, and ran only one candidate, Winston Churchill, in the two Member constituency of Dundee.

<sup>48</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/17-18.

<sup>49</sup> William H. Cowan, Aberdeen East; Henry Watt, Glasgow College; Robert Munro Ferguson, Leith; John C. Wason, Orkney and Shetland; Robert Munro, Wick, NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

which I am one of the Secretaries) has been formed to promote this object. Scotland is almost half a century ahead of England in its thinking and general readiness for social legislation. But we are borne down by the dead weight of English obstruction at every turn...I consider the present state of affairs a scandal and an injustice and, if you do me the honour of again returning me to the House of Commons I, as an out-and-out Scotsman born and bred in this locality, will use every exertion towards the accomplishment of these reforms.<sup>50</sup>

This election address clearly demonstrates the connection between Scottish Home Rule and those supporting progressive legislation. Watt was a secretary of the Scottish National Committee and successful candidate for Glasgow College.

It is worth noting that Scottish Home Rule also featured in many of the Labour candidates' election addresses. Labour contested five seats during the second 1910 election and four out of five of them were in favour of Scottish Home Rule. Furthermore, two of the three successful candidates were in favour of Scottish Home Rule.<sup>51</sup>

**Table 1: Labour Candidates December 1910 General Election**

<u>Constituency</u>	<u>Candidate</u>	<u>Won</u>	<u>Devolution</u>	<u>Poll</u>
Dundee	Alexander Wilkie	Yes	Yes	29%
Fifeshire West	William Adamson	Yes	No	53%
Glasgow Blackfriars	George N. Barnes	Yes	Yes	59%
Glasgow Camlachie	J. O'Connor Kessack	No	No	18%
Lanarkshire Mid	Robert Smillie	No	Yes	24%

Alexander Wilkie, MP for Dundee, said that he was in favour of giving the fullest measure of autonomy to Ireland in the administration of its own affairs. He went on 'I am however, prepared to go further, and would be in favour of granting autonomy to Scotland and all parts of the empire, with one Central or Imperial Parliament over all.'<sup>52</sup> In the 1890s Ramsay Macdonald had served as the secretary of the London branch of the SHRA and, as mentioned earlier, Keir Hardie's unsuccessful 1888 Mid Lanarkshire by-election had received support from the Association. Hardie was also

<sup>50</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

<sup>51</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

<sup>52</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.



supported during the election by his close associate and friend Robert Smillie. Smillie would go on to contest the seat on three occasions including the December 1910 general election, where he also promoted the devolution of Scottish business. In his address he wrote:

I am in favour of Self Government for Ireland. I am also in favour of the people of Scotland having the right to manage their own local affairs, as purely Scotch Questions have been sadly neglected in the past; partly through the Imperial Parliament being over-burdened and partly because of the indifference of some of the Scottish Members, and of the “predominant partner,” to the grievances of the Scottish people.<sup>53</sup>

His address is interesting because it touches on the issue of indifference of the ‘predominant partner’. There is a distinction to be made in the desire of a Parliament to reduce the burdens of an over overworked Parliament and a desire to have Scottish legislation separated from the indifference of a predominant partner.

The Liberal candidate for Glasgow Bridgetown, MacCallum Scott, was also sensitive to perceived interference to Scottish legislation. Scott was born in Lanarkshire in 1874 and attended Glasgow University alongside the other future Liberal MP William M.R. Pringle.<sup>54</sup> Scott advocated the devolution of separate Parliaments for Scotland, Ireland, England and Wales. He claimed, ‘If we had Home Rule for Scottish affairs our Small Holdings Bill and our House-Letting Bill would not have been destroyed by an English House of Lords.’<sup>55</sup> MacCallum Scott won the seat and became part of the Scottish National Committee; however, by April 1912 he was doubtful of its continued usefulness unless a committed leader was to be emerged. ‘Pringle lacks initiative. Pirie is too featherheaded. Henry Watt is too light\* weight... I have otherwise been too busy otherwise to attempt it. J. Hogge might.’<sup>56</sup> As his diary indicates MacCallum Scott could be outspoken. In August 1912 he was temporarily suspended from Parliament following after refusing to be silent following an unsatisfactory response to one of his questions to the Indian Under

---

<sup>53</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

<sup>54</sup> Cameron Hazlehurst, ‘Scott, Alexander MacCallum (1874–1928)’, *ODNB*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/72181>, accessed 19 Apr. 2013)

<sup>55</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

<sup>56</sup> A MacCallum Scott Diaries, Apr. 15, 1912, Glasgow University Library, MS Gen 1465, difficult to decipher\*.

Secretary.<sup>57</sup> That same year Scott introduced a Bill to establish devolved Parliaments for England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales which passed its first reading, 264 votes to 212.<sup>58</sup>

Almost all of the addresses for this election focused on reforming the House of Lords. The Upper Chamber was frequently portrayed as blocking the way to Scottish legislation, especially land reform. This sentiment was also expressed by Adam R. Rainy in his address to Kilmarnock. Speaking of the House of Lords he complained:

As things are we have to await the education of the slower intelligences in the South of England...I am also convinced that no settlement of the whole constitutional question can be final till your voice in the election of your own member can be made effectual by the decisions of the Scottish Members being the authority as to legislation for Scotland.<sup>59</sup>

Rainy was also a member of the Scottish National Committee and he supported Henry Dalziel's 1911 Bill for Scottish Home Rule which passed its first reading just ten days before Rainy's death 26 August 1911.

As this chapter has focussed on the position of Scottish Home Rule within the elections immediately before the war there is a danger of overstating its significance. Liberals during the December general election of 1910 overwhelmingly focussed on the issue of House of Lords reform. Free Trade and Land reform through the Small Holders Bill also featured prominently. Legislation such as: Smallholders Land Bill, Plural Voting, Local Veto, Education, Navy spending, Home Rule for Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, were all portrayed as being delayed by the hereditary upper house. Although many appealed for Home Rule for Scotland the battle cry of the Liberals during the election was 'Peers or People!' The next section of this chapter will focus on the content of the by-elections which followed.

---

<sup>57</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 6 Aug. 1912, vol. 41, cc. 2972–3.

<sup>58</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 3 July 1912, vol. 42, c. 1155.

<sup>59</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

**By-elections, March 1911-April 1914:****Table 2**

Year	Constituency	Winning Party	Winning Candidate	Labour Vote	Majority
8 Apr. 1914	East Fife	Liberal	Herbert Asquith	n/a	n/a
26 Feb. 1914	Leith Burghs	Conservative	George Currie	3,346	16
12 Dec. 1913	South Lanark	Conservative	William Watson	1,674	251
8 Dec. 1913	Wick	Liberal	Robert Munro	N/A	443
7 Nov. 1913	Linlithgowshire	Liberal	John Pratt	N/A	521
10 Sept. 1912	Midlothian	Conservative	John A. Hope	2,413	32
26 Feb. 1912	Glasgow St Roll.	Liberal	Thomas M. Wood	N/A	469
2 Feb. 1912	Edinburgh East	Liberal	James Hogge	N/A	925
22 Dec. 1911	Govan	Liberal	Daniel Holmes	N/A	986
11 Nov. 1911	North Ayrshire	Conservative	Duncan Campbell	N/A	271
26 Sept. 1911	Kilmarnock	Liberal	William Gladstone	2,761	2,286
6 July 1911	Glasgow Trade.	Liberal	James White	N/A	1086
14 June 1911	Ross and Crom.	Liberal	James Macpherson	N/A	2464
19 Apr. 1911	East Lothian	Liberal	John D. Hope	N/A	468
9 Mar. 1911	North E. Lanark	Liberal	James Millar	2,879	1,200

As the table shows the Liberals were forced to contest fourteen by-elections during the three years before the war. By-elections during this period were of unusual significance because of the narrow majority controlled by the Liberals. The December 1910 election left Asquith with a shaky majority. The election had essentially been a draw between the Liberals and Conservatives, the Conservatives received more total votes but the Liberals occupied one more seat. Asquith's majority was only maintained with the help of Labour and the Irish Nationalists. Ewen Cameron has noted that 'For many New Liberals the optimism of having reduced the obstructive power of the House of Lords was mitigated by the revival of the Irish Home Rule question, a Gladstonian hangover.'<sup>60</sup> He suggests that the

<sup>60</sup> Ewen A. Cameron, *Impaled Upon a Thistle: Scotland Since 1880*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010, pp. 97- 98.

frustration over this delay was one of the possible explanations for the revival of the debate around Scottish Home Rule. Asquith however was uninterested and Cameron is right to note Asquith's apathy when visited by a deputation Scottish MPs in favour of the subject.<sup>61</sup> In spite of Asquith's coolness on the subject the by-elections of the period demonstrate that both Liberal and Labour candidates were putting the issue in front of the Scottish electorate. While it would be an egregious exaggeration to say that these elections were decided by the issue of Scottish Home Rule, a study of the fourteen by-elections immediately preceding the war reveals that it was relevant and possessed a life of its own beyond being a method for securing Irish Home Rule.

Scotland and Wales returned more than their proportional share of Liberal MPs. As such, Liberal seats lost in these by-elections were heralded by the Conservatives in the press as a rejection of Liberal leadership and more specifically a rejection of Home Rule.<sup>62</sup> In their recent study of by-elections Paul Readman and Luke Blaxill have noted the significance which the press attached to their outcomes.<sup>63</sup> *The Scotsman* referred to loss of the Liberal seat in the 1913 South Lanarkshire by-election as 'a clear interdict [sic] of the shooting down of Ulster Loyalists'.<sup>64</sup> This sentiment was also expressed by the newly elected Conservative William Watson. Following his victory he said, 'The result must be accepted as a condemnation of the Home Rule policy of the Government...The result is above everything a demand that the Ministry shall submit themselves to the verdict of a General Election.'<sup>65</sup> Indeed, even Liberal victories were called into question when the Liberal candidate received a reduced majority. This was the case in the Linlithgowshire by-election of 1913 and, following the announcement of the results, *The Times* reported that both candidates were 'shouldered high' and carried out by their supporters.<sup>66</sup> At a post-election gathering the defeated Conservative candidate called the by-election a victory for the Unionists, and a sign that the people did not

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> 'Press Comments On Home Rule', *The Scotsman*, 15 Dec. 1913, p. 7.

<sup>63</sup> Paul Readman and Luke Blaxill, 'Edwardian By-elections', in T.G. Otte and Paul Readman (eds), *By Elections and British Politics: 1832–1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013, pp. 232–233.

<sup>64</sup> Editorial, 'South Lanark', *The Scotsman*, 15 Dec. 1913, p. 8.

<sup>65</sup> 'Lanark Result', *The Times*, 15 Dec. 1913, p. 9. The Government's policy regarding the Insurance Act and land reform was also called into question.

<sup>66</sup> 'Liberal By-Election Reversals', *The Times*, 10 Nov. 1913, p. 8.

want Home Rule. Five of these seats were contested by Labour and on three of these occasions the Liberal candidate lost by fewer votes than the Labour candidate polled.<sup>67</sup>

While Scottish Home Rule may have only appeared in twenty-two of the forty-eight December 1910 Radical candidates' election addressees consulted by the marquis of Tullibardine, it featured in almost every Liberal by-election candidates' campaign during the fourteen contests which occurred between that election and the outbreak of war. Sometimes it was considered solely on its own merits. At other times it was dealt with at the same time as Irish Home Rule. The Radical candidate for North East Lanark, J. Duncan Millar exemplified this latter method during the first Scottish by-election following the December 1910 general election. Opening his campaign in the town hall of Motherwell he declared:

While deeply in sympathy with their Irish friends he was, however, a Scotsman, and did not see why Scotsmen should not also have a measure of Home Rule. (Cheers.) The case of Ireland was paramount. It had suffered more than Scotland. He was one of those who believed that Irish Home Rule should come first and soon, but he said a measure of Scottish Home Rule should also come.<sup>68</sup>

Millar went on to serve on the Scottish National Committee which was formed to keep Scottish Home Rule in the forefront of politics and having won the by-election voted in favour of motions for Scottish Home Rule in both 1912 and 1913 in the House of Commons.

The by-elections during the period just before the First World War were hotly contested. Each seat gained by the Unionists could be used as evidence that the electorate was against granting Home Rule to Ireland. Likewise, seats retained by the Liberals would provide confirmation of the electors' support of the Government's ambitious series of legislation. After the 1900 and 1906 general elections both parties intensified their organisation in constituencies and attempted to strengthen their election tactics.<sup>69</sup> Both parties seemed to recognise the importance of these improvements. Indeed, when the Liberals lost seats during these by-elections it was

---

<sup>67</sup> I.G.C. Hutchison, *A Political History of Scotland 1832–1924: Parties, Elections and Issues*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986, p. 247.

<sup>68</sup> 'Radical Campaign Opened', *The Scotsman*, 21 Feb. 1911, p. 10.

<sup>69</sup> Hutchison, *Political History of Scotland*, pp. 221, 231.

often said that more thorough campaign organisation and the use of more resources, such as automobiles, would help to prevent it from happening in the future.<sup>70</sup> The use of automobiles in electioneering was on the rise and their novelty proved exciting to the electorate. Kathryn Rix has noted that in the 1905 Kingswinford and Whitby by-election voters threatened to vote against a candidate unless they got to experience a ride at speeds over fifty miles per hour.<sup>71</sup>

One of the best examples of these reformed methods of contesting by-elections was the 1914 contest in Leith Burghs. It had been necessitated by Robert Munro-Ferguson's promotion to Governor General of Australia. Munro-Ferguson had served as the chairman of the Scottish National Committee and was responsible for seconding Dr Chapple's 1912 motion for devolving a Parliament for Scotland.<sup>72</sup> He began his parliamentary career by winning the Ross and Cromarty by-election of 1884. Munro-Ferguson had served as Leith Burgh's MP for over twenty-five years, even managing to hold his seat through the Khaki election of 1900 which saw many Liberals replaced by Unionists. His connection with Scottish Home Rule was particularly interesting as he was a Liberal Imperialist after the Rosebery tradition and after returning from Australia after the War he served as the Secretary of State for Scotland in the government of the vehemently Unionist Bonar Law.

The Leith by-election saw Provost Malcolm Smith challenge Conservative George Welsh Currie and the Labour candidate Joseph Nicholas Bell. Scottish Home Rule was a marked feature of the election. Although the issue was a common topic for discussion by candidates in other by-elections, in the Leith by-election it particularly stood out. Both the *EEN* and *The Scotsman* noted the prominence of Scottish Home Rule literature and posters in the constituency during the run-up to the election.<sup>73</sup> From the outset Provost Smith had set himself as a strong Scottish Home Ruler and endeavoured to bring the issue before the electors. Making special reference to it he said he supported it beyond sentimental reasons. As well as easing the congestion of the Imperial Parliament he argued that M.Ps representing

<sup>70</sup> 'South Lanark', *EEN*, 14 Sept. 1913, p. 4.

<sup>71</sup> Kathryn Rix, 'By-elections and the Modernisation', p. 81.

<sup>72</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, cc. 1454–1457.

<sup>73</sup> 'The Voting: A Busy Day', *The Scotsman*, 27 Feb. 1914, p. 7; 'Political Literature', *EEN*, 26 Feb. 1914, p. 6.

constituencies from England Wales and Ireland were unlikely to understand the complex differences that existed in Scotland regarding licensing, education and the land.<sup>74</sup> On another occasion he went so far as to say:

It was natural that the democracy should have the power to regulate its own affairs within its own borders... The Liberal party had to bring forward a scheme for Home Rule for Scotland, and till that was settled they need not expect the affairs of Scotland to be satisfactorily managed.<sup>75</sup>

Like many candidates for Scottish by-elections he had been approached by members of the Scottish Home Rule Council and responded to their questioning saying, ‘That he is in favour of Scottish Home Rule and prepared to advanced it in any way possible.’<sup>76</sup> As such, he received support from the International Scots Home Rule League, the Scottish Home Rule Council, and the YSS. Both the YSS and the Scottish Home Rule Council held enthusiastic meetings on his behalf.

The YSS was formed immediately following the Khaki Election of 1900. Largely due to the impetus of the *EEN*, it began as a body to combat jingoism and inspire and educate young men on the principles of Liberalism. While the Boer War proceeded, the group focused on upholding rights of free speech. After the war, the YSS were influential in Scottish Liberal success upholding free trade. From here the group developed an advanced Radical platform on a variety of social issues from land reform to housing. As the first decade of the twentieth century closed Scottish Home Rule was frequently put forward by the group as the paramount method of addressing the problems.<sup>77</sup> In 1911 the Society issued a pamphlet claiming that ‘Devolution is, after the Abolition of the Lords’ Veto the most urgent reform of the time.’<sup>78</sup> Claims for Scottish Home Rule were usually framed from the point of parliamentary inadequacy but there was also occasionally an ethnic dimension, which claimed that Scottish legislation should be framed by Scots. On the most

---

<sup>74</sup> ‘Leith Burghs By-election: Unionist and Labour Candidates Adopted a Three-Cornered Contest’, *The Scotsman*, 13 Feb. 1914, p. 9.

<sup>75</sup> ‘The Contest in Leith Burghs’, *EEN*, 17 Feb. 1914, p. 7.

<sup>76</sup> ‘Radical Candidate on Scottish Home Rule’, *The Scotsman*, 24 Feb. 1914, p. 9.

<sup>77</sup> James Kennedy, “‘Contrasting Liberal Nationalists’: The Young Scots' Society and the Ligue Nationaliste

Canadienne’, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 13 (2007), p. 51.

<sup>78</sup> William, Laughland, *Manifesto and appeal to the Scottish People on Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Young Scots Society, 1911, p. 2.

striking occasion, the YSS considered opposing W.G.C. Gladstone's candidature in the 1911 Kilmarnock by-election.<sup>79</sup> This action is perhaps reflective of their increased activity which existed during the period. Kennedy has noted that they had recent influence at Glasgow Tradeston and Ross and Cromarty in blocking the candidature of individuals they deemed out of sympathy with the 'Scottish National point of view'.<sup>80</sup> They did so stating that, 'when plenty of experienced Scotsmen were available, they deprecate greatly that an untried Englishman should have been chosen to contest a safe Scottish Radical seat'.<sup>81</sup> It is worth noting that Scotland had a long history of electing Englishmen to Parliament, notable examples at the time included, Herbert Henry Asquith, Winston Churchill, and Augustine Birrell. Earlier in the year of the Kilmarnock by-election they issued the question to all of their branches: 'Are you of opinion that it is desirable, where at all possible, that candidates for Scottish constituencies should be Scotsmen, or at least, men fully conversant with Scottish affairs and in sympathy with the Scottish national point of view?'.<sup>82</sup> The motion had passed with twenty-eight branches voting in favour and only four against. The society then held a meeting to determine whether or not they should support Gladstone or the Labour party's candidate. The Society's support was ultimately gained due to Gladstone promising to support a number of Scottish issues, notably Scottish Home Rule.<sup>83</sup> At a meeting that same day Gladstone strongly proclaimed his support for Scottish Home Rule. It is interesting to note that in a bid to gain the group's support, the Labour candidate also notified the YSS that he would be willing to support Scottish Home Rule.

In studying Victorian electoral pressure D.A. Hamer has noted that two of the methods groups used to exert pressure were to run independent candidates or to play the parties off of each other.<sup>84</sup> Although in the case of Scottish Home Rule the Unionists were never a serious option, the rise of Labour candidates and three

---

<sup>79</sup> Ewen A. Cameron, 'Young Scots' Society (act. 1900–c.1920)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/theme/100417>, accessed 16 Nov. 2012].

<sup>80</sup> *Young Scots Handbook*, 1911-12, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Glasgow, Young Scots Society, 1911p. 6.: Quoted in, Kennedy *Liberal Nationalism*, p. 132.

<sup>81</sup> 'Kilmarnock Burghs Election: Labour Candidate to be Selected Young Scots' Dissatisfaction with Mr Gladstone', *The Scotsman*, 4 Sept. 1911, p. 7.

<sup>82</sup> 'Young Scots Society and Home Rule', *EEN*, 18 Dec. 1911, p. 2.

<sup>83</sup> Cameron, 'Young Scots'; 'Kilmarnock Burghs', *EEN*, 6 Sept. 1911, p. 4.

<sup>84</sup> Hamer, *The Politics of Electoral Pressure*, p. 23-24 and 30-31.



cornered contests put an additional squeeze on the Liberal Party. With both strategies Hamer contends that it was often the tactical threat rather than the actual act of voting for the other party or an independent candidate which was the most useful tool for gaining concessions from the Liberal Party. This brings us back to one of the main differentiating features of pressure groups and political parties. While political parties emphasise the importance of getting members elected to political office pressure groups are more often content if their issue is earnestly pursued by those who are elected.

It might here be mentioned that there is a difference between conceding to an issue during a by-election and actually following through with it once elected. Hamer notes that although opportunism and electoral necessity has created many converts to various political causes they were often of very limited reliability once elected.<sup>85</sup> One of the great difficulties which faced advanced Scottish Home Rulers was getting action out of Liberal politicians who were only nominally committed to Scottish Home Rule. As mentioned earlier, Scottish Home Rule was approved of by the Scottish Liberal Association since the late 1880s. This is an important factor to consider when appraising the role of Scottish Home Rule within the by-elections under study. Although W.G. Gladstone did go on to vote in line with the majority of Scottish Liberals in favour of the 1912 and 1913 Scottish Home Rule Bills his commitment to putting forward the movement might be questioned. Hamer has noted that the truly reliable parliamentary advocates of pressure groups came from individuals who were adherents first who went on to become MPs. A contrast with Gladstone's election can be seen in the campaign of James Hogge who was a leader in the YSS who went on to contest Edinburgh East in 1912.

The sudden death of Sir James P. Gibson in January 1912, left the constituency of East Edinburgh open for contest.<sup>86</sup> No time was lost in adopting Hogge as the candidate for what would be a relatively short campaign leading up to the 2 February 1912 polling date. Councillor Muir of Glasgow described Hogge as

---

<sup>85</sup> Hamer, *The Politics of Electoral Pressure*, p. 8.

<sup>86</sup> Gibson himself had been in favour of Scottish Home Rule an active participant in the Scottish National Committee.

‘Radical of the Radicals, nane o’ your weak Radicals gaen in the hin [sic]’.<sup>87</sup> This is hardly an exaggeration and his zeal can be further seen, as the *ODNB* notes, by his *Who’s Who* entry in which under recreation he cites ‘work’.<sup>88</sup> A native of Edinburgh, Hogge studied at the University of Edinburgh, where he served as editor of the student newspaper and president of the student’s representative council. He was known in Edinburgh political life from his early days as a leader of the YSS.

Hogge and his colleagues had clashed with the Tories of Edinburgh over the Boer War. The *EEN* later described this as being seen as an ‘unpardonable’ crime by the Tories and the cause for what it saw as derogatory tactics during the hotly contested election. The *EEN* accused the Tories of mudslinging and making personal attacks. One such incident involved calling Hogge to account for a joke at the expense of teetotalers and anti-gamblers made in a speech made while serving as a councillor in York. *The Scotsman* claimed that Hogge had emphatically denied making such a speech when questioned by a heckler. It then went on to quote a report of the speech from the *Yorkshire Herald* October 1909, along with letters condemning the speech from the editor of the *Yorkshire Herald* and the Dean of York.<sup>89</sup> In the speech Hogge recounts a dream where, like Dante, he was led through Hell, with his conductor pointing out various peoples, including teetotalers, anti-gamblers, and poignantly, the editor of the *Yorkshire Herald*. The outcry was largely placated when Hogge reminded the public in a special interview with *The EEN* of his position as honorary secretary in both temperance and anti-gambling societies.<sup>90</sup>

As mentioned above, before contesting East Edinburgh he had unsuccessfully attempted Glasgow Camlachie during the December 1910 general election where he had been defeated by the narrow margin of just twenty-six votes in a three-cornered contest. In that contest he also advocated Scottish Home Rule and claimed he ‘would do all in my power to secure a scheme of devolution which would

---

<sup>87</sup> ‘East Edinburgh Contest: Mr Hogge’s Last Lap’, *EEN*, 2 Feb. 1912, p. 6.

<sup>88</sup> Gordon F. Millar, ‘Hogge, James Myles (1873–1928)’, *ODNB*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45599>, accessed 13 Nov. 2012].

<sup>89</sup> ‘The Speech Which Mr Hogge Denies: Remarkable Gream of Teetotalers and Anti-Gamblers’, *The Scotsman*, 31 Jan. 1910, p. 12.

<sup>90</sup> ‘Editorial’, *EEN*, 1 Feb. 1912.

give to Scotland control of her own affairs'.<sup>91</sup> Hogge's prospects for East Edinburgh were much better. He had the support of the influential Irish vote as well as strong support among labour. Edinburgh East had returned a strong Liberal majority in both of the 1910 general elections. Had it not been a three-cornered fight the constituency might have been one of the last seemingly safe by-elections that the party fought in Scotland. As such, neither candidate received overwhelming support from the front ranks of their respective parties. Hogge was an adamant supporter of Scottish Home Rule. He had been closely involved with the Young Scots' publication of 'Scottish Home Rule: The case in 60 points'. This document which recycled many of the arguments made by the now derelict SHRA was widely produced and distributed and the number of copies exceeded ten thousand. Although the by-election focussed heavily on the Insurance Act his speeches reflect his conviction to Scottish Home Rule. On almost every occasion where Home Rule for Ireland is mentioned he is sure to include a line referring to 'equal justice' being given to Scotland. This idea was prominent in his very first speech upon being adopted as the Liberal candidate.<sup>92</sup> At one campaign meeting he asked the audience:

why he should waste time by telling the Irishmen of the Canongate all about the Home Rule question, which they knew. All that they wanted to know was that he was prepared to vote and speak on the subject in which they were interested. Every time his vote would be given to achieve for Ireland a measure of local self-government. (Applause.) Every time his vote would be given in order to secure for Scotland what they proposed to grant for Ireland.<sup>93</sup>

Here Hogge distinguished himself from the ranks of Liberals who had been accused of secret apathy regarding Home Rule because the Liberal majority was only gained because of the support of the Irish Nationalists. Scottish Chief Whip John Gulland reinforced this description of Hogge stating:

There were Scottish members and Scottish members. There were some who went about Scotland shouting for Scottish Home Rule and for greater attention to Scottish questions in the House of Commons, but who took no trouble at all in the House of Commons to look after Scottish questions. If there was one more than another who embodied the lion rampant it was Mr Hogge.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> NLS, Acc. 11765/19.

<sup>92</sup> 'East Edinburgh Contest', *EEN*, 23 Jan. 1912, p. 2.

<sup>93</sup> 'East Edinburgh Contest', *EEN*, 26 Jan. 1912, p. 3.

<sup>94</sup> 'East Edinburgh Contest', *EEN*, 23 Jan. 1912, p. 2.

Gulland had been a prominent member of the YSS and was a strong advocate for Scottish Home Rule. With Hogge's campaign and subsequent career in the House of Commons we can see some truth in Hamer's assessment that the most reliable MPs come from members of a pressure group who go on to be elected as opposed to candidates who are petitioned and converted during elections. The difficulty of finding MPs who were willing to go beyond merely agreeing with Scottish Home Rule in principle and promote it wholeheartedly was discussed by Hogge at the eleventh annual meeting of the YSS shortly after his Camlachie defeat:

They could talk till they were black in the face; they could organise as they liked; they could represent whom they chose; but so long as they were not prepared to put the Government in a difficulty on the floor of the House of Commons he questioned their bonafides on the question of Scottish Home Rule, a policy in regard to which the Young Scots were quite clear.<sup>95</sup>

Throughout the by-election, and later in the House of Commons, Hogge made it clear that he believed that a Scottish Parliament sitting in Edinburgh would best handle Scottish questions. On numerous occasions he can be seen badgering Asquith and Scottish Secretary Thomas MacKinnon Wood as to the Government's plans to submit a Scottish Home Rule Bill in upcoming sessions. During the final week of his campaign he devoted a meeting almost entirely to the question of Scottish Home Rule. Hogge prescribed Scottish Home Rule as the remedy to many of Scotland's woes ranging from rural depopulation, emigration and land use to intemperance, poverty and education. Then he asked, 'Would any man with a breath of Scottish spirit neglect an opportunity of securing for Scotland a Parliament of her own for dealing with her own problems?'<sup>96</sup> Such language suggests that he thought Scottish Home Rule could relieve many of Scotland's problems. Second, that he felt the attitude of East Edinburgh towards Scottish Home Rule was such that he could peg his campaign to it. Although it is often very difficult to determine the true personal beliefs of a politician, their campaign speeches and manifestos should give an indication of what they believe their electors will enthusiastically support. In this case Hogge was correct by a majority, albeit reduced, of 924 votes.

---

<sup>95</sup> *Aberdeen Journal*, 1 May 1911, p. 6.

<sup>96</sup> 'East Edinburgh Contest', *EEN*, 27 Jan. 1912, p. 4.

The marquess of Tullibardine also commented on the phenomenon of electing Englishmen to Scottish seats. In 1908 he wrote a letter to *The Scotsman* lamenting what he described as:

an invasion of Scotland by England... If Scotsmen have one right, it is surely that of being represented in Parliament by their own countrymen... No one can cavil at the stray Englishman here and there representing a Scottish constituency, any more than Englishmen can object to a few Scotsmen in England, but when it appears to be a recognised part of the Radical policy to out their own countrymen from all the important seats in Scotland, it is time that Scotsmen, irrespective of party, should rally together and show that they have some people of their own fit to represent them in Parliament.<sup>97</sup>

Indeed, in 1908 it was the marquess who asked the YSS what business they had, as a 'so called patriotic body', supporting candidates from the south. No doubt party politics played a hand in the inspiration for Tullibardine letter. In a decade with such a fierce rivalry between the parties, opportunities to criticise were seldom foregone. While part of this letter was clearly focused on attacking the Party organisation of the Liberals the language used specifically focussed on the issue of Scottish seats being represented by outsiders. Further on Tullibardine asked of patriotic Scots, 'Are they going to sit tamely by and see these representative Scottish seats represented by people who have no right to represent Scotland?'<sup>98</sup> It is interesting to see this question being aired by members of both parties.

This was not a new complaint in Scotland. In 1890 the *Scotsman* published a letter which complained of the same problem, calling it 'a travesty of representative government' that nearly a third of Scottish seats were represented by Englishmen, specifically London Barristers.<sup>99</sup> The writer of the letter published in *the Scotsman* did not doubt the ability of Englishmen, however:

Finally, it seems an absurd thing for Scotsmen to clamour for Home Rule when they admit that they cannot get men in the country to govern or represent them. Fancy a Scottish Parliament composed of mostly London barristers. There is too much apathy throughout

---

<sup>97</sup> 'English Radicals for Scottish Constituencies', *The Scotsman*, 6 May 1908, p. 11. The year saw Robert Harcourt elected in Montrose, Winston Churchill in Dundee and Arthur Ponsonby in Stirling.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> And. Dewab, 'Mr. Asquith and the Twenty-one other Englishmen Representing Scottish Constituencies', *The Scotsman*, 6 Oct. 1890, p. 9.

Scotland in this matter, and for the credit of the country it ought to be remedied.<sup>100</sup>

The stereotype of English barristers representing Scottish seats seems to have had some currency in Scotland and it featured in the letter between Ramsay Macdonald in Keir Hardie during the latter's 1888 by-election which was quoted in the previous chapter. Interestingly, the SHRA was not unanimous in its position of the issue. At the fourth annual meeting of the Association in 1891, Keir Hardie moved an amendment to a resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule which argued that political associations should give preference to Scotsmen when selecting candidates. *The Scotsman* reported that G.B. Clark, who was acting as chairman of the meeting, interrupted Hardie, requested the amendment be withdrawn and noted that they soon hoped to have Hardie representing an English seat. The original resolution was adopted without the amendment.<sup>101</sup>

During his 1912 East Edinburgh by-election campaign, James Hogge was questioned by an elector if he approved of the elimination of the twenty-one English MPs and 'foreign Radicals' holding Scottish seats. Although Hogge replied in the negative it shows that the idea was present. When referring to the aftermath of the Leith by-election, a Young Scot writing to the *EEN* said that in the future 'Englishmen must be warned off' as candidates.<sup>102</sup> In April 1911 during the East Lothian by-election campaign John Hope had been asked a similar question by an elector. 'Does Mr Hope admit if we had Home Rule for Scotland a large number of our Scottish constituencies would still be represented by Englishmen? Do they understand Scottish business?'<sup>103</sup> While he too replied that he thought it should be left up to individual constituencies, he added, 'Personally, I regret that we have so many Englishmen representing Scottish constituencies.'<sup>104</sup> Unfortunately on these occasions neither candidate elaborated on their reasons for resenting Englishmen sitting for Scottish seats. It is difficult to know whether it was founded out of ethnic

---

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>101</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule Association', *The Scotsman*, 30 Sept. 1891, p. 8.

<sup>102</sup> 'A New Candidate Wanted', *EEN*, 2 Mar. 1914, p. 3.

<sup>103</sup> 'The East Lothian Campaign', *EEN*, 8 Apr. 1911, p. 8.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

jealousy or the Liberal trend to allow prominent English politicians to contest safe Scottish seats.

While the YSS were eventually won over, the *EEN* was not so easily placated and it continued to publish editorials lamenting that Englishmen should so frequently contest Scottish seats. One article belittled attempts to assert Gladstone's Scottish heritage, arguing that in the case of MPs, 'environment was more important than heredity'.<sup>105</sup> Although the author largely agreed with Gladstone's politics along the usual Radical lines, he questioned whether any Englishman, more specifically any Anglican, could deal with distinctly Scottish questions such as the Church or education 'as would a Scotsman born and bred'.<sup>106</sup> The paper went on to claim that if this process were to continue, Scotland would lose its distinct national voice in Parliament and further by claiming that 'Protest is made now; if protest is disregarded, the democracy of Scotland will revolt.'<sup>107</sup> While the likelihood of serious revolt was unlikely, the paper did call for the organisation of Scottish MPs along national lines and this was a prospect which had been suggested for decades by the likes of the SHRA and more recently by the president of the YSS, Edinburgh Councillor F.J. Robertson.<sup>108</sup>

Although the YSS occasionally caused mischief for the Liberal Party they could be a valuable asset during elections. During many of the by-elections which occurred in the lead up to the First World War, the group was responsible for holding several meetings in support of Liberal candidates. Their presence during the East Lothian by-election of 1911 was especially significant. They held numerous meetings in support of the Liberal candidate, J.D. Hope, in his campaign against the Unionist, Hall Blyth, one of which was said to have been attended by over one thousand listeners. These meetings covered a wide range of Liberal topics including free trade, House of Lords Reform, land reform, and both Scottish and Irish Home Rule. They also came equipped with an automobile for transporting twenty or so political workers across the constituency. The car was said to have roused a

---

<sup>105</sup> 'Editorial', *EEN*, 6 Sept. 1911, p. 2.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>108</sup> 'Editorial', *EEN*, 8 Sept. 1911, p. 2; 'The Future Relationship of Scotland to the Liberal Party', *The Scotsman*, 11 Mar. 1909, p. 6.

significant amount of attention and was decorated with banners carrying slogans such as, ‘The Tories try to make you “all Blythe,” but the Liberals are your only “Hope”’ and ‘Scotland Demands Home Rule, not House of Lords' Rule’.<sup>109</sup> Some Scottish Liberals, especially those associated with the YSS, viewed the House of Lords as a hurdle to progressive legislation such as land reform.<sup>110</sup> In spite of their puns, their enthusiastic meetings on behalf of the candidate were said to have always received a good hearing. Furthermore, it was suggested that some desire was expressed that they should establish a local branch of the society in the area.<sup>111</sup> For his part, Hope was a strong Scottish Home Ruler and as an originator of the Scottish National Council, he considered it a duty to keep the issue at the front of Scottish politics.<sup>112</sup> Hope benefitted by having close ties to the constituency. Although born in Midlothian in 1860, his father James Hope had been an eminent agriculturist. John Hope won the seat by a majority of 468. His stance on Scottish Home Rule survived the War and, campaigning in the 1918 general election, *The Scotsman* reported a meeting in East Linton at which he reminded the audience that he had always been in support of Scottish Home Rule.<sup>113</sup> Hope would retain the seat until 1922 when he lost to the National Liberal candidate Walter Warring.

The YSS also attempted to keep the issue of Scottish Home Rule in the public mind by questioning the candidates on their views. When candidates would not pledge themselves for Scottish Home Rule they were more than willing to speak out against them. During the three-cornered South Lanark by-election of 1913 they made strong attacks on the Labour candidate for not thinking Scottish Home Rule was a question ‘of first importance’.<sup>114</sup> This was consistent with the view of R.E. Muirhead, prominent nationalist and strong socialist, that the Labour candidate should only be supported if the Liberal candidate will not pledge himself to Scottish Home Rule.<sup>115</sup> Given his more than generous contributions to the Society it is very

---

<sup>109</sup> ‘The Young Scots' Campaign’, *EEN*, 10, Apr. 1911, p. 2.

<sup>110</sup> ‘Mr McCrae, M.P., and the House of Lords’, *The Scotsman*, 18 Oct. 1907, p. 8.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*; ‘The Young Scots’, *EEN*, 18 Apr. 1911, p. 4.

<sup>112</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule Demonstration: The Synod Hall Meeting, Scotland's Shameful Treatment’, *EEN*, 19 Apr. 1911, p. 6.

<sup>113</sup> ‘Haddington and Berwick: Mr Hope on Political Adventures’, *The Scotsman*, 12 Dec. 1918, p. 6.

<sup>114</sup> ‘South Lanark’, *EEN*, 1 Dec. 1913 p. 3.

<sup>115</sup> Hutchison, *A Political History of Scotland*, p. 242.



likely that his opinions held considerable clout.<sup>116</sup> The NLS records of the Scottish Secretariat show dozens of receipts from the treasurer of the YSS for donations and on one occasion, incidentally just three months after the South Lanark by-election, he received a receipt for the purchase of five thousand copies of the pamphlet, ‘The Case for Scotland in 60 points’. It is telling to note that these receipts were usually enclosed with a note of the group’s recent activity supporting the cause of Scottish Home Rule or the notice of a branch passing a resolution in its favour. During the Linlithgowshire by-election of November 1913 the YSS used an automobile to tour the constituency and pass out thousands of leaflets. The *EEN* reported them holding a meeting in Stoneyburn, where no Liberal meeting had yet taken place.<sup>117</sup> As Hutchison has noted, their best compliments may be seen in the descriptions given by their political opponents. He quotes one as saying, “For many years this Society was the spearhead of the Liberal attack in Scotland. In almost every town there was a branch and a vigorous activity was carried on... It was subtle propaganda but in its way extremely effective.”<sup>118</sup>

Some discussion has already been given regarding the position of Scottish Home Rule within the ranks of the Liberal Party; however, it is also worth devoting some attention to its place among the Unionists. Certainly when looking at the parliamentary debates we see that it is vehemently opposed with both speeches and votes during every debate. The usual grounds for opposition were that it was undesired, expensive and would lead to the disintegration of the empire. Outside Parliament the relationship becomes more interesting. There were some Tories who were willing to flirt with the idea of federalism in the unforeseen future if it meant delay and postponement to the immediate granting of Irish Home Rule.

By May 1914 the Scottish Home Rule was sufficiently developed as a political question that the Scottish Unionist Association drafted a memorandum for the guidance of candidates in what would have been a 1915 general election. Although from the beginning the memorandum sets out that it did not believe the

---

<sup>116</sup> *Papers of the Scottish Secretariat and of Roland Eugene Muirhead*, NLS, Acc. 3721 box 146, II.

<sup>117</sup> ‘West Lothian Election: Help From the Young Scots’, *EEN*, 3 Nov. 1913, p. 3.

<sup>118</sup> Thomas Graham, *Willie Graham*, London: Hutchinson, 1948, p. 39; quoted in Hutchison, *Political History of Scotland*, p. 233.

situation called for strong counter demonstrations or aggressive tactics it recognised that candidates would be questioned and heckled on the matter.<sup>119</sup> It went on to state that every Scottish Radical member is ‘more or less pledged to Scottish Home Rule, many of them directly and emphatically’ and further that “if the Radicals are returned at a General Election they would declare that they had a mandate for Scottish Home Rule’.<sup>120</sup> This of course would be at great variance with the state of affairs as they were described by the opposition during the 1912 debate on Scottish Home Rule. Then the marquess of Tullibardine had complained that the motion should be introduced ‘when it has hardly ever been mentioned in Scotland, and certainly has never been mentioned officially since the movement first started’.<sup>121</sup> While the accuracy of this claim is open to debate, it is interesting to note that at least when speaking among themselves, and in confidence, many in the Scottish Unionist Association admitted the idea had widespread support among their political opponents.

Beyond the narrow realm of party politics, the manifesto next acknowledges that there is a strong feeling of national sentiment in the country. One of its most interesting aspects was its take on Scottish Home Rule as it relates to Irish Home Rule. It described Scottish Home Rule as:

[A] sort of twin project to Irish Home Rule, so that, Scotsmen, who from their religious and business instincts would otherwise might have refused to consider any scheme so preposterous as Home Rule for Ireland, might be induced to support the Irish Nationalists on the plea that they were giving a helping hand to people who in return would help them to realise their own national aspirations.<sup>122</sup>

Scottish Home Rule has long been intertwined with Irish Home Rule but this line of thought suggests a subtle difference from the usual interpretation of the relationship. Rather than Scottish Home Rule being seen as a hanger on to Irish Home Rule here it is presented as something that is desirable in itself and Irish Home Rule is to be made more palatable by its close association with ‘their own national aspirations’. This was not the first time that this sentiment had been expressed. In 1912 the prospective

---

<sup>119</sup> House of Lords Records Office, Andrew Bonar Law Mss. 32/3/30.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>121</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, cc. 1457–9.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*

candidate for East Fife, Colonel Sprot, described Scottish Home Rule as ‘bait’ to conceal from the people the true Government policy of Home Rule for Ireland.<sup>123</sup> This notion was echoed a year later during the South Lanark and Wick burghs by-elections. In a long editorial article *The Scotsman* accused the Radicals of presenting Irish Home Rule as a ‘means to an end’ a ‘necessary step towards devolution—the clearing away of an obstacle in the way of Home Rule for Scotland and Home Rule All Round’.<sup>124</sup> It then goes on to declare that Irish Home Rule would actually be an obstacle to Home Rule. This line of reasoning had been repeated by many of the Unionist candidates in by-elections after the general election of 1910.<sup>125</sup> This idea had existed for some time. Following the split in the Liberal Party over Gladstone’s first Irish Home Rule Bill some of the Scottish Liberals who voted against the Bill, including William Jacks<sup>126</sup> and Charles Fraser Mackintosh, proposed federal home rule as an alternative to Irish Home Rule alone. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Charles Fraser Mackintosh was a member of the SHRA and a supporter of Home Rule All Round despite his reservations regarding Irish Home Rule.<sup>127</sup> These arguments suggest that there was some popularity in the idea of Scottish Home Rule which could be tapped for various reasons by either party.

As mentioned in the previous chapter there were a few examples of Tories supporting Scottish Home Rule. Even the marquess of Tullibardine seems to have at least temporarily warmed to the idea in 1917. Tullibardine, who succeeded his father as the 8<sup>th</sup> duke of Atholl, wrote:

The more I look into the question, the more I am driven to the conclusion that the bulk of existing politicians of both parties in the House of Commons know little, and care less, for the interests of Scotland, and that the best way out of it would be complete control of purely Scottish affairs by Scotsmen, and a National Parliament or Convention for the purpose, and for that purpose only[.]<sup>128</sup>

<sup>123</sup> ‘Colonel Sprot on Home Rule’, *The Scotsman*, 15 Feb. 1912, p. 10.

<sup>124</sup> *The Scotsman*, 12 Nov. 1913, p. 8.

<sup>125</sup> It is worth mentioning that advanced Scottish Home Rulers had been making this argument to the Liberal leadership for many years, first to Gladstone and then later to Asquith. Prominent members of the SHRA, John Romans and William Mitchel resigned their positions in their local Liberal Associations over Gladstone’s reserved enthusiasm on the issue.

<sup>126</sup> Jacks was MP for Leith 1885-1886 and Stirlingshire 1892-1895.

<sup>127</sup> Fraser Mackintosh was MP for Inverness-shire 1886-1892. Ewen A. Cameron, *The Life and Times of Fraser Mackintosh, Crofter MP*, Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen Press, 2000, p. 165.

<sup>128</sup> ‘Duke of Atholl on Proportional Representation: A National Parliament for Scotland’, *The Scotsman*, 30 June 1917, p. 6.

It does not seem that Atholl took much interest in the issue thereafter. He is probably best remembered for his influential role in the foundation of the Scottish National War Memorial. His wife the duchess of Atholl, however, remained opposed to Scottish Home Rule throughout her political career. She spoke against George Buchanan's 1924 Government of Scotland Bill.<sup>129</sup> The Duchess was one of the earliest female MPs elected to the House of Commons and served as the Member for Kinross and West Perthshire from 1923 to 1938. In 1924 she became the first female appointed as a Unionist government minister.

A striking example of Tory use of Scottish Home Rule during the pre-war period comes from a speech made by Conservative Party chairman Arthur Steel Maitland at a Unionist meeting in support of the Unionist candidate for the 1913 by-election. *The Scotsman* reported that he said:

[A]ppeals had been made in that constituency, and they were going to be made soon in Edinburgh at another meeting of Scotsmen, on the score that Scotsmen wanted Home Rule for Scotland. (Cheers.) He was really delighted to hear that applause, because everyone who wanted Home Rule for Scotland would oppose the present Home Rule Bill for Ireland. If there was one measure that would absolutely stand in the way of local self-government being given to any other parts of the United Kingdom it was this present home Rule Bill. If they wanted Home Rule for Scotland England, or Wales, they ought to have real federal system for the whole United Kingdom, treating each part of it equally, letting each part govern its own local affairs, and meeting with the same powers and for the same purposes in a general Parliament, but once they had set up a special Parliament, with special powers that they could not give to the others, all chance of a decent federal system for Scotland and the other countries was gone. (A Voice—"Scotland's independent".) (Cheers.) Scotland would not be independent when she had got forty Irish members managing her affairs, and she was not allowed a part in the management of theirs.<sup>130</sup>

This is worth quoting at length because it highlights several interesting ideas. First, it strikes a similarity with one of the major difficulties of even the current system of Scottish Home Rule, the West Lothian Question, whereby MPs sitting for Scottish constituencies are allowed to vote on local matters of the rest of the UK but no such opportunity is afforded to the other members. Second, it further shows the Unionists'

<sup>129</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 9 May 1924, vol. 173, cc. 816–825.

<sup>130</sup> 'West Lothian By-Election: Stirring Meetings', *The Scotsman*, 1 Nov. 1913, p. 10.

willingness to play with the idea of Federal Home Rule in front of the Scottish electorate. Third, *The Scotsman's* record of the audience's reaction to the speech which it earlier described as the 'principal Unionist meeting of the evening' suggests that there was support among the electorate of West Lothian. It's easy to imagine the tactical advantage which might have been gained by high ranking Tories offering the promise of a more perfect Federal Home Rule Bill as an alternative to an immediate Irish Home Rule Bill. However, to assume that the audience reported to have numbered over one thousand should be in the loop would perhaps be too much. Of course not all of those cheering would have necessarily have been Tories but it is worth noting that there were a high number of Tory voters for that election. The Unionist candidate James Kidd receiving forty-eight per cent of the vote at 5094.

James Kidd's opponent during the West Lothian by-election was John Pratt. As mentioned above, Pratt received strong support from the YSS during the election. They held meetings and handed out thousands of leaflets in his support. Pratt was born in South Shields in 1873 and attended the University of Glasgow, he remained in Scotland and was elected to the Glasgow Council in 1906.<sup>131</sup> Though born in England, Pratt made strong pronouncements in favour of Scottish Home Rule during his election. Following his adoption as the Liberal candidate he addressed a meeting at Fauldhouse where the *EEN* reported that he said:

the three questions on which their attention was centred were land, housing, and education. In every one of those questions they had a set of conditions different in England to what they had in Scotland. These matters, he said, should be taken in hand not by poor Southerners who knew nothing about it, but by the people of Scotland themselves. (Cheers) When they got most of the affairs of Scotland transacted in Edinburgh a stream of democratic feeling, a stream of people's real need, would constantly be flowing through the national Chamber and, and would keep it sweet and pure.(Cheers) He was of the opinion that our foreign policy should be more often discussed in the Parliament at Westminster.<sup>132</sup>

It is these kinds of arguments for Scottish Home Rule which reflect the notion of nationalism adopted for the purpose of this thesis. With the help of the YSS Pratt won on a reduced majority of 521.

---

<sup>131</sup> 'Obituary', *The Times*, 29 Oct. 1952, p. 8.

<sup>132</sup> 'West Lothian Election', *EEN*, 28 Oct. 1913.

One of the primary successes of Scottish Home Rulers during the lead up to the war was the Scottish Home Rule demonstration held in the King's Theatre Edinburgh on 8 November 1913. The theatre which was able to hold approximately three thousand was reported to have been crowded with listeners. Roughly one third of the Scottish MPs attended, including six out of the nine Liberal MPs returned in Scottish by-elections following the December 1910 general election. Special attention was paid to John Pratt who had been elected earlier in the week. Accordingly, he gave a short speech in proclaiming his victory as one for Home Rule for both Ireland and Scotland. Speaking on the day the Lord Advocate, Robert Munro, said that it was to be a 'red letter day' in the history of Scotland and that he doubted whether even the very old and very young of the audience had lived, or would live to see, such a momentous day in the country's history.

The principal speaker was the Secretary for Scotland Thomas McKinnon Wood. He had previously declared himself in favour of Scottish Home Rule pegging it to Irish Home Rule during his 1912 by-election.<sup>133</sup> During his speech at King's Theatre, amid several suffragette interruptions, he spoke citing both practical and sentimental reasons to support it. The desire to ease parliamentary congestion featured prominently at the start of his speech and he was keen to insist that he was not seeking to reduce Scotland's share of the British Empire. 'We have done our full share in peopling the Empire and developing its resources, and in making money for it and for ourselves... the last thing we want is to diminish the share we have, and we are entitled to have.'<sup>134</sup> Having assured the audience of his convictions towards the British Empire he went on to discuss reasons for devolution. First turning to law he reminded the audience that there is no uniformity between English and Scottish law:

You have special laws made for Scotland, and made by a House of which 89 per cent. are not responsible to the people of Scotland, and know very little about special Scottish questions... I want to see a Minister looking after Scottish land on Scottish soil—(cheers)—but this is no use unless he is responsible to a Scottish Parliament that sits on Scottish soil.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> 'The Radical Candidature: Mr McKinnon Wood on Lord Tullibardine's "Lectures"', *The Scotsman*, 24 Feb. 1912, p. 10.

<sup>134</sup> 'The King's Theatre Meeting', *The Scotsman*, 10 Nov. 1913, p. 7.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*

He then went on to claim that if Scotland had been allowed to legislate for herself she would have developed a better system of land reform much sooner and easier. Turning aside from the practical reasons for implementing devolution he closed his speech with a section on national sentiment:

No one denies that the national sentiment which exists among Scotsmen is a profound feeling deep in their natures. Now it will have full scope and play. We shall be able to face our great and complex problem, problems which conflict and confront the nations in the present age, with Scottish courage and with Scottish caution. The power and responsibility will be with ourselves, and that ladies and gentlemen, will be a new inspiration to Scotsmen, a new claim upon that sense of duty which is strong within... Ladies and gentlemen, those who have taken so great a part in our Government, our Imperial Government at home and abroad, can surely be trusted to govern themselves.<sup>136</sup>

In spite of these favorable words he did not, however, make a definite commitment to passing the legislation within a set time frame. This oversight was not missed by the more advanced Scottish Home Rulers and it left many disappointed. While seconding a motion of thanks to MacKinnon Wood, Kenneth M'Iver said that Scotland had been loyal to the Liberal Party and that it deserved its attention above every other part of the UK. 'He was disappointed, but he was not discouraged. Let them see that every Scottish member of Parliament—at all events every Scottish Liberal member—was a Home Ruler first, and anything else afterwards.'<sup>137</sup> Afterwards, 'Scotus', writing to *The Scotsman*, complained that McKinnon Wood had only 'regaled us with truisms which had been well known to Scottish Home Rulers for the last quarter of a century'.<sup>138</sup> Hogge expressed a similar view in a letter to the *EEN* describing the event as 'a friendly pat on the back' to Scotland for its support of Liberalism before closing 'we are right to resent it, and resent it furiously'.<sup>139</sup> In many ways this event can be seen as a portrait of the position of Scottish Home Rule during the period between the formation of the SHRA and the outbreak of the First World War. Although the Scottish Home Rule demonstration at King's Theatre was enthusiastically organised and well attended by Scottish MPs, it was ultimately let down by the Government of the day. Typical of Asquith's tenure,

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule', *The Scotsman*, 13 Nov. 1913, p. 9.

<sup>139</sup> 'The Edinburgh Home Rule Meeting: Mr J. M. Hogge's Criticism', *EEN*, 11 Nov. 1912, p. 7.

the Liberal Party leadership offered polite praise of Scottish desire for devolution but offered very little by way of concrete commitment to introduce legislation.

### **Conclusion:**

The period between the December 1910 general election and the outbreak of war marks a fascinating time for the study of politics. Foreign relations were strained by a series of international conflicts which were only made more dangerous by the naval arms race. In domestic legislation reforms like the Insurance Act and land reform threatened to completely change the role of the state in providing support for its citizens. Constitutionally, the House of Lords had its powers significantly reduced by the Parliament Act while the very nature of union and empire was being questioned by Home Rule. The by-elections of the period afford several insights into what the issues of the 1915 general election might have been.

As mentioned at the start of the chapter gauging public opinion during this period was exceptionally difficult. There were no reliable public opinion polls. This chapter has focused on elections as a way of seeing what policies were being put in front of the electorate. By-elections in particular were chosen as a point of focus because they were an event which allowed a more distinct Scottish political culture to be vented than would have been possible during a general election. These elections have also offered an opportunity for campaign groups such as the YSS to pool their resources in order to ensure that their specific issue was seen and this was evidenced by the use of new and exciting technology such as automobiles as tools for generating interest. It has also attempted to help define the position of the YSS with regards to the Liberal Party. Although they were undoubtedly a Liberal group, as their commitment to Scottish Home Rule increased, we saw their relationship with the Liberal Party strained over the selection of parliamentary candidates. During the Kilmarnock election they exhibited electoral tactics noted by Hamer in *Politics of Electoral Pressure*, in order to prise commitment to their policies out of W.G. Gladstone.

It would be erroneous to suggest that Scottish Home Rule was the primary issue in these by-elections. In many cases it was eclipsed by issues such as the



Insurance Act, land reform, Irish Home Rule and reforming the House of Lords. However, this chapter has shown that the issue was being actively promoted, both by Labour and Liberal candidates and by pressure groups, most notably the YSS. Candidates from all of the parties were expected to discuss Scottish Home Rule and offer their stance. As the manifesto from the Scottish Unionist Association shows, had another general election occurred in 1915, they expected to have to provide a counter argument to keep the Liberals from making use of wide spread feelings of national sentiment that could be aroused on its behalf. While it is not the job of a historian to discuss hypotheticals it is certainly interesting to speculate what legislation might have been passed during the upcoming session had the political landscape not so violently challenged.

### **Chapter 3: 'Home Rule All Round'**

#### **Interactions between Irish, Scottish, and Welsh Home Rulers**

Not without reason, discussions of Scottish and Welsh Home Rule movements have often been eclipsed by discussions of Irish Home Rule. They were not as extensive. They were not as volatile. Certainly in terms of their effect on British politics and their popularity they pale into insignificance when compared to their Irish counterpart. It should be remembered that this criticism may also be levelled against almost every British political movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Discussions around nationalism and Home Rule usually focus on the reaction of one group attempting to separate, distinguish, or devolve away from another group. This chapter, however, will seek to discuss the connections between the various Home Rulers and, in some cases, nationalists within the UK in the decades preceding the outbreak of the First World War. Although these individuals and groups often sought to achieve their goals through a mutually beneficial method of federalism, or, as it was often described at the time, 'Home Rule All Round', there were still circumstances and jealousies that made collaboration difficult.

The chapter will be broken into two parts. The first will focus on interactions and conflicts between Irish and Scottish Home Rulers. The second will look at the nature of the relationship and cooperation between Welsh and Scottish Home Rulers. It is hoped that the division will allow for a more focused discussion of their interactions. The relationship between Scottish Home Rulers and Irish Home Rulers was not the same as the relationship between the Scottish and Welsh. This is perhaps partly explained by the position of influence the Irish Party occupied over Liberal governments. The great difficulty of approaching such a topic is the diversity, of the groups and individuals which make up such movements. Irish, Scottish and Welsh Home Rule was moved forward during this period by dozens, if not hundreds, of bodies and thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of individuals. When attempting to compare such groups and participants it is important to recognise that labels such as 'Home Ruler' and 'Nationalist' can accommodate a wide spectrum of ideology. The division between 'Parnellites' 'Anti-Parnellites' and 'Fenians' are multiplied

by the differences between the likes of the SHRA, the YSS and again by Cymru Fydd in Wales. Even among these individual groups there was great diversity both among members and as bodies over time. In the case of Fenians for example, E.W. McFarland, in her study of John Ferguson, has commented that as early as 1860s the term 'Fenian' had 'acquired remarkable elasticity'.<sup>1</sup> Caution has therefore been exercised when dealing with comparisons between the movements and attention has been focussed on interactions between groups and members.

Acknowledging the danger of defining such complex movements it is still required that some general descriptions be given. The Irish Home Rule movement reflected the alliance with the Liberal Party which would have provided Ireland with a parliament in Dublin to legislate on matters pertaining to Ireland while the Imperial Parliament would still serve to represent Ireland in the empire. As well as this desire for constitutional self government there was also the extra-parliamentary element which would have seen Ireland independent. The interaction between these two groups will be discussed later at greater length. In Scotland the desire for Home Rule was reflected almost entirely along the lines of devolution. Few, if any, of even the most extreme Scottish Home Rulers would have seen Scotland separated from the empire. In Wales desire for Home Rule was often coupled with the desire for specific legislation, specifically on disestablishment.

The temptation to compare the Scottish Home Rule movement to the efforts of the Irish Nationalists during the period is very great. Indeed, many of the Scottish Home Rule Bills that were debated in the House of Commons before the First World War were largely just adaptations of the various Irish Home Rule Bills with a few alterations, such as the maintenance of the Post Office, to match Scottish circumstances. Historians have frequently pointed out that Scottish Home Rule during the period paled in both significance and support to its Irish brother. This assessment, while largely true, does not however make the experience of Scottish nationalism during the period unworthy of study. This section will attempt to discuss the interactions between two movements which strove for similar goals and

---

<sup>1</sup> E.W. McFarland, *John Ferguson 1836–1906*, Tuckwell: East Linton, 2003, p. 35.

occasionally co-operated but ultimately were distinguished by their intensity, outcomes and tactics.

### **Home Rule All Round**

The term ‘Home Rule All Round’ appeared as early as the mid-1880s. In 1912 Charles Waddie claimed to be author of the phrase and the *Scotsman*, consented this to be entirely possible. However, the earliest use in the press found in the research conducted for this thesis, appears to have come in the December of 1885 by way of a letter from H. Stonehewer Cooper to the *Pall Mall Gazette*.<sup>2</sup> Cooper, who is now best remembered for his books on the Pacific islands, wrote in defence of Home Rulers:

The truth is we want a good deal more of Home Rule all round. The present “Imperial Parliament” is not Imperial at all, and in many respects is little better than a badly-managed vestry. If the Irish demand for self government brings about local assemblies for England, Scotland, and Wales as well as the sister isle..., and hastens the time for a confederation of the Empire and a really Imperial Council to discuss really Imperial matters, Mr. Parnell and his party will deserve the hearty thanks of all those, like the writer, whose boast it is that he is a citizen of the Empire of the Queen.<sup>3</sup>

Home Rule All Round was later adopted by the SHRA as a means of referring to the political objective of establishing legislatures in Scotland, Ireland, and possibly also England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. It would also feature in Dr G.B. Clark’s 1889 speech in support of his first House of Commons motion in favour of Scottish Home Rule.<sup>4</sup> The principal advantage of the scheme was that it would avoid the uncomfortable situation of deciding what to do about the imperial representation of delegates from countries with newly-devolved parliaments. This question plagued Gladstone’s Home Rule Bills, the first of which would have seen Ireland without representation in the Imperial Parliament. The second would have allowed for a reduced number of Irish MPs who would have been allowed to vote on matters relating to England, Wales or Scotland. This problem still exists today in Scotland in the form of the West Lothian Question, whereby Scottish MPs in the Westminster

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘The Late Mr Charles Waddie’, *The Scotsman*, 6 Feb. 1912, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> ‘Colonial Home Rule and Colonial Loyalty’, *Pall Mall Gazette*, 22 Nov. 1885, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 9 Apr. 1889, vol. 335, c. 73.

Parliament vote on matters which affect only England, Wales and Northern Ireland while legislation for Scotland is framed in Edinburgh.

One of the key difficulties of Home Rule All Round was how to accommodate England. The three most common plans were that England would receive a parliament of her own; Scots, Welsh, and Irish MPs would abstain from voting on English matters at Westminster; or, finally, that, after devolution the number of Scottish MPs in the Imperial Parliament would be reduced. The first two proposals created the impossible task of disentangling English issues from the imperial ones. The third was open to attacks that Home Rule would diminish Scottish, Welsh and Irish influence, a prospect which was unacceptable for most constitutional Home Rulers.

As Ewen Cameron has identified, Donald MacFarlane published an even more difficult scheme to address the question in 1880. MacFarlane's plan would have seen a House of Parliament and Royal Residence established in Dublin and Scotland too if she wished, which would take it in turns to host annual sessions.<sup>5</sup> A similar plan was produced in 1890 under the name of Patrick Hamilton.<sup>6</sup> Other proposals came in from freethinking MPs including Winston Churchill who suggested for a short time in 1911 that as part of a wider scheme of Home Rule All Round, England could receive a number of devolved parliaments to legislate for its various regions. It is tempting to dismiss these plans at once as they were fraught with difficulties. However, the very fact that such unworkable plans were even considered highlights the great difficulty of the question of English Home Rule, a difficulty whose legacy lives on a century later in the form of the West Lothian Question.

The theory of Home Rule All Round was nearly universally accepted by Scottish Home Rulers. It also received tentative support from many of the major political figures in the Liberal Party including Gladstone, Churchill and Asquith, specifically for its ability to widen support for Irish Home Rule. The dividing

---

<sup>5</sup> Cameron, *The Life and Times of Charles Fraser Mackintosh*. p. 209; Donald Macfarlane, *Ireland Versus England*, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Patrick Hamilton, *Home Rule a New Departure*, Upper Tooting: J.J. Gandy, 1890, pp. 1–2.

question among those in favour of Home Rule All Round was the issue of priority. The most devoted Home Rulers in each segment of the UK pushed the claim of their own nation to receive a parliament first or, in the case of Scotland and Wales, simultaneously. Negative response to Home Rule All Round was not limited to Unionists. There was also some hesitation from Irish Home Rulers, many of who were unwilling to support anything which might further delay their primary objective of Irish Home Rule.

### **Scotland and Ireland**

Before discussing the relationships between the various Home Rule movements around the turn of the twentieth century it might be worthwhile to briefly discuss the histories of the Unions which would ultimately lead to such debates. The Act of 1707 saw the separate kingdoms of Scotland and England join to form the United Kingdom. Although their monarchy had been united in 1603, article III of the Act dictated that the United Kingdom of Great Britain would be represented by one parliament styled the Parliament of Great Britain. Although claims of bribery, coercion and corruption still surrounded both Unions, the 1707 Act fundamentally protected several aspects of Scottish national life most notably in the enshrinement of its Church, education, and law. The Act of Union of 1800 followed a period of intense bloodshed during the Irish Rebellion of 1798. As Alvin Jackson has noted, one of the essential differences between the two Unions was the handling of the religious question.

In Scotland the position of the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland was established, assured and protected and as such the Kirk became a bulwark of the Union. Irish Catholics on the other hand 'were simultaneously denied emancipation (partly at the hands of a Scot), and presented with an augmented Protestant religious establishment'.<sup>7</sup> The key difference between the establishment of the Church of Scotland and the Church of Ireland was that in Scotland the established Church coincided with the predominate religion of the Scottish people, whereas in Ireland the Church represented an influential minority. Like the Union of 1707, the Union of

---

<sup>7</sup> Jackson, *The Two Unions*. p. 111.

1800 provided Irish representation in the newly styled Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Although many of the Penal Laws had been repealed in the late eighteenth century, an important distinction between the two Unions is to be made by the fact that in Ireland, members of the dominant religious group were barred from sitting in Parliament until the Roman Catholic Relief Act was passed in 1829.

It is perhaps not surprising that one of the earliest leaders of the Home Rule movement, if it may be called so at such an early stage, was himself a victim of the law debarring Catholics from the Imperial Parliament. Daniel O'Connell was elected for County Clare in 1828 although he was unable to take up his seat until the Roman Catholic Relief Act was secured the following year.<sup>8</sup> O'Connell would go on to use attempts to repeal the Union of 1800 to coerce concessions from Whig Governments in the 1830s.<sup>9</sup> O'Connell seems to have enjoyed some popularity in Scotland as well. Patrick Geoghegan, has noted that an estimated 200,000 turned out in Glasgow to hear him speak in 1835, where he praised William Wallace and criticised the House of Lords. Repeal of the Union of 1800 was discussed and it was met with great cheering from the audience.<sup>10</sup> John Kendle identified that O'Connell briefly flirted with the idea of federalism during the 1840s before deciding that it would appease neither the hardliners set on repeal or those in London hoping to placate and retain Ireland.<sup>11</sup>

The next prominent supporter of Irish Home Rule to be tempted by the idea of federalism was Isaac Butt. Butt, a barrister by profession and originally an Orange Tory differed from O'Connell over the issue of Repeal in the 1840s.<sup>12</sup> He would, however, go on to secure his advanced nationalist credentials by defending the leaders of the Fenian revolt of 1867.<sup>13</sup> In 1852, Butt was elected for the both English constituency of Harwich and Youghal, Ireland, which he held until 1865. Jackson has noted that Butt although conservative was a better proponent of reform than his

---

<sup>8</sup> Jackson, *Home Rule*, p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>10</sup> Patrick M. Geoghegan, *Liberator: The Life and Death of Daniel O'Connell 1830–1847*, Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2010, pp. 73–74.

<sup>11</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 10.

<sup>12</sup> Jackson, *Home Rule*, p. 23.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

successors and was influential in a major land bill of 1876.<sup>14</sup> Butt founded the Irish Home Government Association in 1870 which would become the Home Rule League in 1883. J.J. Golden has recently argued for increased recognition of protestant influence within the Home Government Association. Golden claims associational culture made progress in the 1860s as a result of the discussions surrounding and eventual disestablishment of the Irish Church. This led Irish Protestants to reevaluate their view of Union. Furthermore, it caused disappointment and anger and created a precedent of ‘opposing Westminster through associations and committees’.<sup>15</sup> It should be mentioned that Protestantism was not newly associated with Irish nationalism and the works of D. George Boyce demonstrate that Irish Protestantism and Irish nationalism have a shared history stretching back at least to the eighteenth century.<sup>16</sup> The Home Rule League which replaced the Home Government Association however seems to have thought of itself in the O’Connellite tradition and the group succeeded in holding celebrations for the centenary of his birth.<sup>17</sup>

Both Alvin Jackson and John Kendle have highlighted the difficulty of assessing Butt’s proposals for Home Rule in the federal sense because Butt was not explicit in defining the relationship between the envisioned Imperial and Irish parliaments.<sup>18</sup> This tactic of withholding details to avoid being bogged down by minuscule conflicts was also practised by Scottish Home Rulers during the 1880s and 1890s, and, perhaps some might argue, by the SNP today. However, with Gladstone’s conversion to Home Rule in 1886 it became apparent that these details would have to be hammered out. Interestingly, it was the representative question of what to do with Irish members at Westminster, a problem identified decades earlier by the likes of O’Connell and Butt, which served to cause the Grand Old Man such difficulty in his final years as Prime Minister.

The relationship between Scottish and Irish Home Rulers is very complex. John Ferguson had been born in Belfast and would eventually become Isaac Butt’s

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>15</sup> J.J. Golden, ‘The Protestant Influence on the Origins of Irish Home Rule, 1861–1871’, *English Historical Review*, 128 (2013), p. 1485.

<sup>16</sup> D. George Boyce, *Nationalism in Ireland*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, London: Routledge, 1991, p. 132.

<sup>17</sup> Jackson, *Home Rule*, p. 38.

<sup>18</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 12; Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule*, p. 33.



most useful supporter in Britain.<sup>19</sup> He was a prolific writer and estimated that by 1894 he had published over 1400 pieces.<sup>20</sup> Ferguson served as president of Scottish Home Rule League, or as it was sometimes referred to Association, in the 1870s. The organisation agitated in Scotland for Irish Home Rule, not to be confused with later association of the same name which was formed for the purpose of promoting Scottish Home Rule, of which Ferguson would later become an honorary vice-president. In 1892 his commitment to Scottish Home Rule was further displayed when he supported a motion at the fifth annual conference of the association. The motion stated:

That this meeting is of the opinion that no settlement of the Home Rule question is practicable which would not confer upon Scotland a separate legislature and executive for her national affairs, and at the same time maintain the unity and supremacy of the Imperial Parliament: and also that, in the ensuing general election in Scotland, no candidate should receive a vote unless he pledges himself to do all in his power to procure the restoration of national self-government in Scotland.<sup>21</sup>

This is quite a significant measure to have been supported by a man who for a time had represented the Irish Home Rule movement in Scotland. E.W. McFarland has noted that Ferguson became a target for hostility for his involvement with Irish politics. The press highlighted his more subversive statements. The less eloquent put bullets through the windows of his home.<sup>22</sup>

Interestingly, one of the early calls for Scottish Home Rule in the press can be seen in an editorial published in the *Freeman's Journal* in the October of 1876 almost a full decade prior to the creation of the SHRA. The *Freeman's Journal* was published in Ireland and although earlier in the century it had served as a mouthpiece of British politics, by the 1870s it was increasingly becoming an organ of constitutional Irish Nationalism. In 1876 it responded to a complaint raised by the Convention Royal Burghs of Scotland regarding the neglect of Scottish business in the Imperial Parliament. Although it was premature in suggesting that this would

---

<sup>19</sup> Naylor, 'Scottish Attitudes to Ireland', p. 14. It should be noted that the Naylor thesis also provides an excellent discussion of the interactions between Scottish and Irish MPs during the Parliamentary debates surrounding both Irish and Scottish Home Rule.

<sup>20</sup> McFarland, *John Ferguson*, p. 53.

<sup>21</sup> 'Scotch Home Rule', *The Glasgow Herald*, 4 June 1892, p. 9.

<sup>22</sup> McFarland, *John Ferguson*, p. 51.

amount to a great cry from the Scottish people in favour of Scottish Home Rule it is nevertheless noteworthy for its enthusiastic reply:

We need scarcely say that this movement will be watched with intense interest in Ireland, and that what has already occurred gives the best ground for hoping that the ancient people of Scotland will no longer tolerate the sacrifice of national interest on the altar of centralised Imperialism.<sup>23</sup>

The implications of this quote are quite interesting. On the one hand it supported the movement which it identified as growing in Scotland. On the other, it implied that Scotland had already acquiesced. Although this could in some ways be considered a slight to the Scottish nation it is worth noting that many of the Scottish Home Rulers of the following decades would, while using careful language to protect Scotland's position as equal partner in Union, complain of the apathy of their countrymen with regard to issues of national honour.

This attitude of cautious benevolence in the *Freeman's Journal* carried on for the next decade where it would mention Scottish Home Rule infrequently yet favourably. By 1886 the *Freeman's Journal* was discussing Scottish Home Rule more favourably than many Scottish papers. Speaking of Scottish Home Rule following the recent formation of the SHRA, the *Freeman's Journal* published; 'The movement is of the greatest interest and import, and we have an erroneous idea of the sturdy common sense as well as patriotism of the Scotch people if they do not flock to its support as one man.'<sup>24</sup> In the same month that the previous quote was published in Dublin, the *Dundee Courier and Argus* described Scottish Home Rulers as 'spoiled children' heedless of the consequences of their actions.<sup>25</sup> In 1888 the *EEN* took a discouraging view of the SHRA over its insistence that Scottish Home Rule proceed at the same time as Irish Home Rule.<sup>26</sup>

In 1889 Charles Waddie delivered a series of lectures in Ireland. In the week of his arrival the *Freeman's Journal* welcomed Waddie in very favourable terms

---

<sup>23</sup> 'The "Cry" of Scottish Home Rule', *Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, 27 Oct. 1876, p. 5.

<sup>24</sup> 'The Home Rule Question', *Freeman's Journal*, 14 Oct. 1886, p. 4.

<sup>25</sup> 'Home Rule for Scotland', *The Dundee Courier & Argus*, 28 Oct. 1886, p. 2.

<sup>26</sup> *EEN*, 10 Feb. 1888, p. 2.

promising him a ‘cordial reception wherever he goes’.<sup>27</sup> While in Dublin he attended meetings of the Protestant Home Rule Association and the central branch of the National League. At the latter he rose to speak amidst enthusiastic and prolonged applause.<sup>28</sup> In his speech he claimed to have been a believer in self-government for Scotland and Ireland for nearly thirty years. While his reception in Dublin may have been welcoming, it was not overly abundant and it seems that his first attempt at delivering a lecture in the Ancient Concert Rooms on 25 October was cancelled due to poor attendance. The lack of attendance was blamed on a lack publicity for the meeting and it was rescheduled for the following Monday. The lack of audience for the first meeting was reported in the *Dundee Courier*, *EEN*, and *Scotsman*.<sup>29</sup> The *Scotsman* published a lengthy editorial on the episode and went so far as to thank Waddie for becoming what they described as, ‘a touchtone for [Irish] Nationalist self-love and selfishness.’<sup>30</sup>

The rescheduled meeting appears to have gone better. The *Freeman’s Journal* reported that the Ancient Concert Rooms was crowded and the meeting succeeded in passing a resolution in sympathy with Scottish Home Rule. The meeting was chaired by Alfred Webb a Quaker and Nationalist and later MP for Waterford West. Webb had served as treasurer of the National League and was a close friend of Michael Davitt.<sup>31</sup> On his return to Scotland Waddie admonished the *Scotsman’s* report of his visit to Ireland pressing the fact that a resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule had been passed by his audiences in Dublin and Belfast. According to Waddie, the attendance at these meeting, was numbered at nearly fourteen hundred and two thousand respectively. The *Scotsman*, however, did not budge, and claimed that Waddie refused to acknowledge his failures. A claim which in this case appears fair; however, it might equally be said that if Waddie refused to recognise his failures, the *Scotsman* similarly ignored his success.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Freeman’s Journal*, 22 Oct. 1889, p. 4.

<sup>28</sup> *Freeman’s Journal*, 23 Oct. 1889, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> *The Scotsman*, 31 Oct. 1889, p. 4; *EEN*, 26 Oct. 1889, p. 3; *The Dundee Courier*, 28 Oct. 1889, p. 3.

<sup>30</sup> *The Scotsman*, 31 Oct. 1889, p. 4.

<sup>31</sup> Webb resigned his position as treasurer due to Parnell’s heavy-handed management of the League. Laurence Marley, *Michael Davitt: Freelance Radical and Frondeur*, Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007, p. 75.

While the issue of Irish primacy was always likely to be an issue between Scottish and Irish Home Rulers there were indications of cooperation. Gavin Clark took a strong interest in Irish Home Rule. Though closely attached to land reform, Clark was also interested in the development of Scottish Labour. He was one of the founders of the Scottish Labour Party, along with Keir Hardie, R.B. Cunninghame-Graham and John Murdoch, A.C. Morton, and Richard M’Ghee.<sup>32</sup> Through Clark there existed a connection between the Scottish Home Rule Movement and the Irish Home Rule. Clark was a founding member of the British Home Rule Association, which was founded in London in February 1886 for the ‘purpose of enabling, Englishmen Scotchmen, and Welshmen who are in favour of Home Rule for Ireland to express and propagate their opinions’.<sup>33</sup>

Other members of the short lived association included Justin M’Carthy and Joseph Cowen the Radical member for Newcastle Upon Tyne. Its president was Lord Ashburnham. Ashburnham was one of only forty-three peers who supported the Irish Home Rule Bill during its second reading in the House of Lords. After his death the *Manchester Courier* attributed his support of Irish Home Rule to his Jacobite, sympathies noting that he had founded the Order of the White Rose.<sup>34</sup> The British Home Rule Association merged with the United Kingdom Home Rule League to form the Home Rule Union in December 1886. During his 1891 motion in favour of Home Rule All Round, Clark further attempted to link the cause of Irish, Welsh and Scottish Home Rule citing, Daniel O’Connell and Isaac Butt as both federalists. Clark himself claimed to have been convinced of the necessity of Home Rule by Butt’s arguments in the 1870s.<sup>35</sup> His commitment to Irish Home Rule is reflected in his first parliamentary motion for Scottish Home Rule, in which he stated:

But I would keep back Home Rule in Scotland for half a-century rather than put off Home Rule in Ireland for a year. Ireland has much more need of it, she has suffered more, and the Irish evil is a national evil to be averted.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Ewen A. Cameron, ‘Clark, Gavin Brown (1846–1930)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47107>, accessed 10 Nov. 2013].

<sup>33</sup> ‘British Home Rule Association’, *The EEN*, 24 Feb. 1886, p. 4.

<sup>34</sup> ‘Jacobite Peer’, *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, 20 Jan. 1913, p. 6.

<sup>35</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 9 Apr. 1889, c. 74.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, c. 73.

Although, as will later be discussed, the opinions of the Irish leadership were far from decided in favour of Scottish Home Rule; the efforts of the likes of Clark and Ferguson suggest that there were real attempts by Scottish Home Rulers in both senses, to unite the cause of Irish and Scottish Home Rule in order to secure Home Rule for both on the basis of Home Rule All Round.

While the early years of the Scottish Home Rule movement were marked by modest tokens of favour from the Liberal leadership, by 1892 tension had arisen in the Scottish Home Rule movement. Gladstone had nominally supported various incarnations of Scottish Home Rule as early as 1871, his second attempt at passing Irish Home Rule frustrated many Scottish Home Rulers by failing to propose a Scottish legislature. This caused scorn from the executive of the SHRA. They even went so far as to send a petition to the House of Lords asking that it amend the Irish Home Rule Bill to fit a model of Home Rule All Round.<sup>37</sup> After Gladstone declined to meet with a deputation from the association, Waddie wrote to inform him of a resolution passed by the association, ‘No settlement of the Home Rule question is practicable which would not confer upon Scotland a separate Legislature and Executive for her national affairs, and at the same time maintain the unity and supremacy of the Imperial Parliament.’<sup>38</sup> Two weeks later four office bearers, including Waddie, wrote to Gladstone stating their inability to support his party at the upcoming general election. They claimed that giving Ireland Home Rule alone while allowing it representation in the Imperial Parliament was ‘an act of treachery towards the Scottish people’.<sup>39</sup> John Romans and William Mitchell resigned from their positions as conveners of their local Liberal Association. It is possible however that the SHRA lost more members from this spat than the Liberal Party. While the association claimed a body of several hundred, few, if any, outside the executive committee were willing to revolt against the Grand Old Man over an issue which many deemed unripe.

The Dumfries branch of the association went so far as to try and censure the executive. At a meeting the branch passed a resolution that by revolting against

---

<sup>37</sup> ‘A Scottish Home Rule Petition to Parliament’, *EEN*, 26 July 1893, p. 2.

<sup>38</sup> ‘Mr Gladstone and Scottish Home Rule’, *The Scotsman*, 15 June 1892, p. 7.

<sup>39</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 25 June 1892, p. 9.

Gladstone, the executive had taken an action which was not sanctioned by the annual conference of the association and, therefore, was not an official representation of Scottish Home Rulers. Referring to Irish Home Rule the resolution stated that although they would gladly see measures for Scotland and Ireland passed at the same time, if one measure had to take priority it should be Irish Home Rule. The meeting went further and accused the executive of the association of repeatedly breaking faith and loosing the confidence of the association.<sup>40</sup> Copies of the resolution were then sent to Gladstone, Clark and Waddie. Waddie replied as secretary of the association, and repudiated the vote of censure as it contravened the association's procedural rules. Regarding the claim that the executive had not acted in accordance with the annual conference he reminded readers that at that the conference, which the *Scotsman* had reported to have had an attendance of over one thousand, had passed a resolution making Scottish Home Rule a test question for all Scottish candidates.<sup>41</sup>

At a Gladstonian candidate's campaign meeting for Glasgow Camlachie, a representative of the SHRA attempted to distance his branch from the office bearers' letter, noting that it had not been sanctioned by the Glasgow secretary. The following year Sir John Leng publicly severed his connection with the association over its 'fatuous course' regarding Irish Home Rule.<sup>42</sup> Leng was a strong supporter of Home Rule All Round and had presented a paper supporting it before the National Liberal Club in 1890. For a group that had exerted such effort attempting to fill its roster with prominent figures, the loss of an MP must have been considerable.

The most noticeable expression of disapproval from within the association came from Rev. David Macrae. Macrae was a prominent member of the association. In 1892, Macrae, now in his mid fifties, had published on many religious and political topics. Other examples of his writing include American traditions and manners, national humour, and temperance. His temperance tale *Dunvarlich, or, Round About the Bush*, won a prize of £100 from the Scottish Temperance League.<sup>43</sup> In the late 1870s he had achieved national attention when he was expelled from the

<sup>40</sup> 'The Split Among Scottish Home Rulers', *The Scotsman*, 1 July 1892, p. 6.

<sup>41</sup> 'The Split Among Scottish Home Rulers', *The Scotsman*, 30 June 1892, p. 4.

<sup>42</sup> John Leng was MP for Dundee 1889-1906. 'Sir J. Leng, MP, and the Scottish Home Rule Association', *Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, 19 Sept. 1893, p. 5.

<sup>43</sup> 'The Late David Macrae', *The Scotsman*, 17 May 1907, p. 7.

United Presbyterian Church for heresy over his views on eternal damnation. Macrae was an experienced Scottish Home Ruler and had been attached to the SHRA since its foundation. He would go on to be instrumental in petitioning Victoria and later Edward VII over the misuse of national names and the King's title. The petition to Victoria received over 100,000 signatures. During the 1888 Dundee by-election, he addressed an audience on the importance of supporting a candidate 'who believes in Home Rule as a principle applicable to all the nationalities, and will support the demand for Home Rule for Scotland'.<sup>44</sup> Macrae loathed the indifference regarding the use of the terms 'England' and 'Britain' and extolled the virtues of nationality. Speaking to the electors of Dundee he said:

Love of home in its turn, so far from being hostile to the larger sentiment of patriotism, was the very root and nursery of it. In like manner, a noble patriotism, a high sense of national duty, national honour, national self-respect, furnished the best ground for international unions, and the best guarantee for such unions promoting the welfare of the race. Nationality, therefore, was a thing to be guarded and fostered.<sup>45</sup>

At the same meeting in 1888, Macrae even warned of the dangers of passing Irish Home Rule alone as it would afterwards deprive Scotland of a natural ally for securing Home Rule for herself.

Later in the year Macrae spoke in front of a great meeting for the release of John Dillon. Dillon had been arrested under the Coercion Act for making a speech. The *Dundee Courier* reported that there were between six and seven thousand in attendance at the meeting for his release. Speaking before the crowd Macrae criticised the Government for suppressing free speech. 'Ireland was coming and Home Rule for Scotland also, and when Scotland got it she would have to thank Ireland for fighting the first of the battle.'<sup>46</sup> In 1892, despite misgivings regarding Gladstone's proposal to pass Irish Home Rule alone, Macrae added his name to the list of Scottish Home Rulers who publically balked at the members of the SHRA's executive who withdrew their support from Gladstone.<sup>47</sup> Although he had expressed

---

<sup>44</sup> 'Rev. D. Macrae on Scottish Home Rule and the Duty of the Dundee Electors', *The Dundee Courier & Argus*, 30 Jan. 1888, p. 2.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> 'The Imprisonment of Mr Dillon', *The Dundee Courier and Argus*, 13 Aug. 1888, p. 3.

<sup>47</sup> 'Letters to the Editor', *The Dundee Courier & Argus*, 28 June 1892, p. 4.

concern at the difficulty which would be posed passing Scottish Home Rule without the impetus from an Irish movement he was hesitant to abandon Gladstone and leave government ‘into the hands of a party that is opposed to Home Rule altogether’.<sup>48</sup> Rather he resolved to put his faith in the party that ‘will be bound by its own principles, and will be strengthened and stimulated by Scottish support, to go on and do justice to Scotland also’.<sup>49</sup> Macrae is a quintessential example of an individual who strongly supported Scottish Home Rule from a spirit of nationalism, but was unwilling to split with the Liberal Party over the issue of the primacy of Irish Home Rule.

In 1892 Dr G.B. Clark introduced his third motion in the House of Commons for Scottish Home Rule. The debate was well attended by Scottish MPs, with sixty-one present, six paired and five, most notably Gladstone, absent. Had the vote been determined by Scottish MPs alone it would have passed forty to twenty-one. However, it was ultimately defeated by a vote of one hundred and sixty-eight against, one hundred and fifty in favour. Soon after the debate, the SHRA published a report of the debate. The report is notable for its criticism of the Irish MPs. Just less than half of the one hundred Irish MPs attended. In an introduction to the report Waddie suggested that had the Irish MPs attended in mass, the motion should have been carried by a large majority. Lamenting their absence Waddie remarked:

There is no truth more firmly established than that political parties have no gratitude for past favours. Hence we must not depend upon such Irish gratitude for our home rule, but insist upon simultaneous treatment.<sup>50</sup>

The difference of opinion between Waddie and Macrae is at once apparent, and serves to highlight the divide which was present even among advanced Scottish Home Rulers. How to overcome the inaction of those who were in theoretically in favour of the principle of Scottish Home Rule was the essential problem for Scottish Home Rulers before the First World War. Although many, including the Scottish Liberal Association, were agreeable to the idea of Scottish Home Rule, few

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> SHRA, *Report of the Debate: In the House of Commons Friday, 23<sup>rd</sup> of June on Dr GB Clark's Motion in Favour of Home Rule for Scotland*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1893, p. 1.



attempted to press Gladstone to meaningfully attach it to his schemes for Irish Home Rule, and those who did, did so at the risk of alienating their supporters.

The SHRA would publish later in that year a pamphlet entitled *Scottish Versus Irish Grievances* which included a host of reasons, some more plausible than others, as to why Scotland had equal, if not better, claim to Scottish Home Rule than Ireland. One of the more salient reasons listed was that far from destroying the empire, a Scottish Parliament would improve Scotland's relationship with the British Empire it had so loyally served.<sup>51</sup>

Other prominent Scottish Home Rulers also expressed a utilitarian view of Irish Home Rule as a method of securing a national parliament for Scotland. At the 1890 annual conference of the SHRA, John Stuart Blackie spoke adamantly on the issue despite some cries of 'No' from the audience. The *Scotsman* reported that:

he rose to say publicly that he belonged to an association for Scottish Home Rule and that alone. And why? Because he knew Scotland and he knew Scotsmen, that they were a sober minded and law-abiding people: but he did not know Ireland, and he suspected Irishmen very much.<sup>52</sup>

Professor Blackie, 1809-1895, was a professor of Greek at the University of Edinburgh. He was also essential in the campaign to establish the University's first chair of Celtic. While many deemed him eccentric, few then disputed his knowledge of Scottish cultural traditions. Blackie was followed by the socialist leaning Liberal MP for North West Lanarkshire, Robert Cunninghame Graham. Graham was one of the earliest members of the SHRA. Decades later Graham would become the president of the reformed SHRA, the National Party of Scotland and Scottish National Party, a post which he held until his death in July 1936.<sup>53</sup> Graham was one of the most fascinating characters of late nineteenth-century Scotland. Graham was a Perthshire laird, a socialistic MP, a rancher and a writer. A fair account of his life would require far more than the bounds which this chapter can afford, however, his involvement with both Home Rule movements in the pre-war period deserves some

---

<sup>51</sup> *Scottish Versus Irish Grievances*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1892, pp. 1-2.

<sup>52</sup> 'The Scottish Home Rule Association', *The Scotsman*, 25 Sept. 1890, p. 7.

<sup>53</sup> Cedric Watts, 'Graham, Robert Bontine Cunninghame (1852-1936)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33504>, accessed 2 Dec. 2013].

discussion. Speaking after Blackie in 1890, Graham also expressed apathy towards Irish Home Rule stating:

he was in favour of Irish Home Rule if it came up first, but otherwise as a Scotsman, he did not care a farthing about Irish Home Rule. He wanted Scottish Home Rule and was therefore ready to take the line which Dr Clark had so ably laid before them advancing on federal lines for the three kingdoms. (Cheers.) He believed that a great many of the Scottish members who voted with Dr Clark in his Scottish Home Rule amendment were not very sure what they were pledging themselves to. For himself he would say he was pledging himself to Scottish Home Rule, with a Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh or Linlithgow, and with full power to deal with Scottish affairs. (Cheers.)<sup>54</sup>

The statement that ‘he did not care a farthing about Irish Home Rule’ is perhaps worthy of some discussion. During his 1886 North West Lanark campaign he wrote to the *Daily Review* stating, ‘I hasten to assure you that I, for one, am a hearty supporter of the Government Bill, and to remind you that...I had expressed myself in favour of an Irish Parliament before Mr. Gladstone made public his Irish policy.’<sup>55</sup> He also seems to have enjoyed a complex relationship with Parnell. Although wary of the Labour movement developing any cult of personality resembling Home Rule’s attachment to Parnellism, his respect for Parnell seems to have grown from the latter’s involvement in the O’Shea divorce case and subsequent break from Liberalism. After the divorce case he made it a point to shake Parnell’s hand in front of the House.<sup>56</sup> Naylor has attributed Graham’s later disinterest with Irish Home Rule as a result of Parnell’s death; however, his statements before a meeting of the SHRA in 1890 suggest that there may be room for more analysis.<sup>57</sup>

The frustration over Ireland’s treatment was not reserved to the SHRA. Lord Rosebery had immense influence in Scotland at the time. Despite several attempts to woo him to the cause he remained cool on the subject of Scottish Home Rule. He was not however immune to the frustration caused by the congestion in Parliament while it struggled with Irish agitation. The extent of the frustration can be seen in

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Naylor, ‘Scottish Attitudes to Ireland’, p. 114; *Daily Review*, 10 June 1886.

<sup>56</sup> Naylor ‘Scottish Attitudes to Ireland’, p. 135.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 137.

1882 when he wrote to Edward Hamilton after Gladstone declined to take his advice to appoint a Scotsman to a vacant post of Junior Lordship of the Treasury:

But I confess I think Scotland is as usual treated abominably. Justice for Ireland means everything done for her even to the payment of the natives' debts. Justice to Scotland means insulting neglect. I leave for Scotland next week with the view of blowing up a prison or shooting a policeman.<sup>58</sup>

While certainly an exaggeration, this statement by the future Prime Minister clearly expressed the frustration that many Scottish politicians experienced at the time. This however was not enough to make him a Scottish Home Ruler.

If Scottish politicians were frustrated by the congestion of the House caused by the Irish Home Rule debates, the Irish MPs may be described as livid at the delays in securing it. Gauging Irish support for Scottish Home Rule is difficult, as it was almost always framed in reference to Irish Home Rule. Although on the surface there was plenty of scope for cooperation between the two groups, the issue of primacy threatened to cause conflict. In 1889 at the annual conference of the SHRA John Romans revealed that previous meetings had been disturbed by Irish hecklers scarcely allowing the meetings to be opened.<sup>59</sup> While the theory of Home Rule All Round served as a potential tool for relieving some of the difficulties posed in Gladstone's Home Rule Bills few, if any, were willing to risk delaying Irish Home Rule by tying it to a complicated process of establishing separate parliaments for the various countries or even regions of the United Kingdom. This line of thought was displayed by the prominent Irish MP Justin McCarthy when he was invited to attend the SHRA's annual conference in 1895:

I do not see how I as an Irish Nationalist member of Parliament, could well take part in the proceedings. The third Resolution, recommending the members of Parliament from Scotland, Ireland and Wales to unite as one Party, with a common Leader, to enforce the just demands of the three countries for Home Rule, is one to which I could not possibly give my assent. I quite admit the just claims of Scotland, Wales—and of England, too—for Home Rule in national and domestic legislation, and these claims shall always have my earnest advocacy. But I cannot consent to submerge the national cause of Ireland in any other Movement. We shall do all we can to

---

<sup>58</sup> Quoted in R.R. James, *Rosebery: A Biography of Archibald Phillip, 5<sup>th</sup> earl of Rosebery*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963, p. 130.

<sup>59</sup> 'The Scottish Home Rule Association', *The Dundee Courier*, 26 Sept. 1889, p. 3.

help you in your national movement--you, I know, will do all you can to help us in ours. But we must do battle as allies, and under our separate national flags.<sup>60</sup>

Waddie's reply to McCarthy, on behalf of the SHRA, indicated that several other Irish members had replied in a similar vein. Waddie, whose talent lent itself better to patriotism than conciliation, indicated that their 'innate modesty' would allow Home Rule Bills to be passed for Ireland, England, Wales and Scotland in that order so long as they were enacted at the same time. He closed his letter with the affirmation that the SHRA stood as a true friend to Ireland.<sup>61</sup>

The extent to which this friendship was requited deserves some discussion. The Irish leaders at the time appear to have had varied views on Scottish Home Rule. Parnell was the leading figure within the Irish Home Rule movement during the 1880s. He led the Irish Parliamentary Party from 1882 until 1890 when he became embroiled in a divorce case which led to the Party splintering. Parnell is quoted by William Mitchell, treasurer of the SHRA, as having said 'Scotland has ceased to be a nation'.<sup>62</sup> In 1889 Parnell was awarded the freedom of Edinburgh. On the occasion a commemorative book was produced, *Scotland's Welcome to Parnell*. Parnell's statement regarding Scotland, along with the fact that he did not respond to their correspondence, led to the executive of the SHRA to vote to avoid sending any letter of congratulations. The motion proved unpopular with the annual conference of the Association and the executive was left with the task of reminding the meeting that it had previously passed resolutions that it would support no candidate who would not pledge himself to Scottish Home Rule and Parnell, however admirable as an Irishman, had not done anything for Scottish Home Rule.<sup>63</sup> Naylor has ably noted the significance of this book. It contained one hundred and forty-six speeches from various groups across Scotland extending their welcome. Most were from Liberal Association's and extended congratulations over his vindication regarding the Pigott forgeries. Eight of them however made specific reference to Scottish Home Rule following Irish. Naylor also points out that while letters from eight Liberal

---

<sup>60</sup> 'Mr Justin McCarthy and the Scottish Home Rule Conference' *Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*, 22 Oct. 1895, p. 4.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule Association', *The Dundee Courier*, 26 Sept. 1889, p. 3.

<sup>63</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule Association', *The Dundee Courier*, 26 Sept. 1889, p. 3.

Associations may not seem like much there was obviously some feeling of support as later that year the annual conference of the whole Scottish Liberal Party adopted a resolution for its support. Notably the Highland Land Restoration League expressed criticism of Parnell for engaging in Party politics which resulted in some ‘serious’ and ‘ungrateful’ blows to land restoration and Scottish Home Rule. The letter however concluded ‘As men of principle we help all reformers. Whether they help us or no.’<sup>64</sup>

Michael Davitt, who was a founder of the Irish National Land League, appears to have been more sympathetic. In 1889 the SHRA mailed Davitt a copy of an address in favour of Federal Home Rule by William Jacks. Davitt replied, praising Jacks for his businesslike arguments in support of Home Rule All Round. The letter closed:

At the next general election it is to be hoped that Scotland will win a Bannockburn victory in the great cause of Home Rule for each of her sister countries; and judging from the statesmanlike address in which Mr. Jacks has embodied his views, his native land will do well and wisely to send him on a mission to Westminster, which will have for object the bringing back to Scotland of her native Parliament.<sup>65</sup>

Of all the Irish Nationalists Davitt seems to have been the most encouraging towards Scottish Home Rule. Although the story of his life has already been told well by his biographers T.W. Moody, Carla King, and most recently Laurence Marley, his involvement with opinions on Scottish Home Rule make him worthy of some attention.<sup>66</sup> Davitt was born in County Mayo in 1846. His family immigrated to England when he was four and a half years old. Life was hard for newly arrived Irish in England most of whom had left Ireland to escape famine. Davitt was no exception and in 1857 when Davitt was just eleven years old he lost his right arm while working in a cotton mill. As Moody and Marley have noted, this disaster, along with the help of a philanthropic benefactor, allowed Davitt to pursue education in a manner that would not have been available to him had he remained working in the

---

<sup>64</sup> Quoted in: Naylor, *Scottish Attitudes to Ireland*, p. 44.

<sup>65</sup> *Mr. Davitt and Federal Home Rule in The House of Lords and Federal Home Rule*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1889, p. 1.

<sup>66</sup> T.W. Moody, *Davitt and Irish Revolution 1846-42*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982; Carla King, *Michael Davitt*, Dundalk: Dundalgan Press for the Historical Association of Ireland, 1999; Marley, *Michael Davitt*.

mill.<sup>67</sup> Davitt joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood in 1865 and in 1870 was convicted of arms trafficking. While in prison he became something of a popular figure for his statements regarding conditions and treatment. He was released in December 1887 and travelled to America the following summer. There he was introduced to Henry George, the author of *Progress and Poverty*. Although Marley has demonstrated that Davitt's conversion to land nationalisation was the culmination of several factors, his introduction to George was crucial in shaping his views.<sup>68</sup>

Back from America Davitt was instrumental in organising land agitation. His Radicalism made him popular in both Scotland and Wales. As both Kenneth Morgan and Marley note, it was the Radical Davitt instead of the 'aristocratic Parnell' who received the first approach from Wales to an Irish politician because he was the personal embodiment of land agitation outside of Ireland.<sup>69</sup> This reputation was not entirely undeserved and the biography by Marley has emphasised his role as a 'freelance radical' who was far to the left of the leader's position. Moody has noted the difficulty of reconciling his ideas regarding land nationalization, often described as internationalist, with his nationalist aspirations for Ireland. For Moody the two concepts were contradictions.<sup>70</sup> However, as Marley contends, Davitt did not recognise that the two concepts were in conflict.<sup>71</sup> In a letter which was subsequently published in the press Davitt elucidates the relationship between land reform and nationalism:

I am a firm believer in the principle of national self-government wherever it can be applied to the satisfaction of national wants and aspirations: and assuming that the people of Scotland believe they can administer their own local affairs in Edinburgh better and more economically than they are now attended to in Westminster, it would be most selfishly unreasonable on my part to say "You must not demand this advantageous change as your doing so will postpone the attainment of a similar change for Ireland." The Irish question should be made to block the way against reactionary or coercive proposals, but not against progressive or democratic reforms. The strength of the

---

<sup>67</sup> Moody, *Michael Davitt*, p. 17.

<sup>68</sup> Marley, *Michael Davitt*, p. 131.

<sup>69</sup> Kenneth O. Morgan, *Wales in British Politics: 1868–1922*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1963, p. 70; Marley, *Michael Davitt*, p. 177.

<sup>70</sup> Moody, *Michael Davitt*, p. 525.

<sup>71</sup> Marley, *Michael Davitt*, pp. 223–225.

Land League over previous Irish agrarian movements consisted to a large extent in the international character of its principles and propaganda. What is demanded for Ireland is also demanded for the crofters of Scotland and the farmers of Wales and the prevalence of advanced ideas of land reform in England, Scotland, and Wales to-day is largely, if not mainly, due to the Radical land reformers of Ireland.<sup>72</sup>

Notably his letter concluded with the line ‘Home Rule for Ireland is a good thing—but “Home Rule All Round” is better.’<sup>73</sup> This is an impressive statement from a man who frequently served as an MP for Irish constituencies. Although Davitt was often distant from the leadership of the Irish Party he was an incredibly influential character. His attachment to the idea Home Rule All Round further demonstrates the appeal the idea held for the then far left of British politics, including the likes of Dr Clark, Cunninghame-Graham, and Keir Hardie.

This acceptance of Home Rule All Round was not universal among prominent nationalists. John Redmond’s opinion of Scottish Home Rule reflected a cautious tendency of unwillingness to do anything that might endanger the position of Irish Home Rule. In 1892 the *Glasgow Herald* published a letter said to have been received from a Glasgow gentleman from Redmond. In the letter Redmond approved of the idea of federalism whereby England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales would receive legislatures for dealing with local affairs leaving the Imperial Parliament free to be truly imperial. While he reserved Ireland’s right to be dealt with first, he still maintained that when a similar measure for Scotland came before the House he would do everything possible to assist Scottish Home Rulers.<sup>74</sup> It is possible that Redmond believed in 1892 that Ireland’s case was closer to resolution than it would prove. By 1895 his attitude appears to have hardened. During Henry Dalziel’s 1895 amendment in favour of Home Rule All Round, Redmond said that:

He distrusted and disliked the Resolution from the Irish point of view... Anything which tended to strengthen the idea that Home Rule could wait either for Welsh Disestablishment, Local Veto, or any other British domestic concern on the one hand, or for great constitutional changes, such as the abolition of the House of Lords or the concession of federalism to various parts of the United Kingdom,

---

<sup>72</sup> ‘Michael Davitt on Home Rule For Scotland’, *EEN*, 13 Nov. 1888, p. 4.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> *Glasgow Herald*, 27 Jan. 1892, p. 9.

on the other hand, he regarded as absolutely fatal to the prospects of the Irish cause. He objected in the strongest possible way to the wording of the Resolution which placed Home Rule, which was urgent and pressing, in the same category as the cause of federalism in Great Britain, which could not be regarded at this moment as within the range of practical politics.<sup>75</sup>

Redmond's promise to vote against the amendment was immediately criticised by the leader of the anti-Parnellites John Dillon. Dillon argued for Irish support of the motion so long as it allowed that the case of Ireland was special and deserved priority. Dillon appeared especially concerned with maintaining a cooperative relationship with allies of Irish Home Rule when he stated:

If anything was to be won for Ireland it must be on the principle of voting against those who were the enemies of Ireland, and assisting those who were friends of that country. Was there any man in that House who supposed that the people of Ireland were so stupid, or so incapable of understanding the elements of politics, as to believe that they would be serving the interests of Ireland or advancing the hour of victory for Home Rule by telling their Welsh allies, after 15 years of faithful alliance and friendly co-operation, that they would not give a vote for Welsh Disestablishment this year?<sup>76</sup>

Whether or not this speech had any immediate effect on Redmond is impossible to say but it is worth noting that Redmond voted in favour of principle of Home Rule All Round in 1908, 1912 and 1913.

After a gap of sixteen years Dalziel again opened a House of Commons debate for Scottish Home Rule. In pressing his claim he reminded Parliament:

Scotland has always been loyal to the Irish demand. Scotland is loyal now, and will remain loyal until Ireland has achieved her purpose and desire. We believe that in bringing forward a measure of this kind, and in making our claim, we are strengthening the Irish position.<sup>77</sup>

The only other member to speak in the debate was Henry Craik, Aberdeen and Glasgow Universities, who opposed it. The Bill survived division gaining one hundred and seventy-two votes in favour against, seventy-three opposed. As Naylor

---

<sup>75</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 29 Mar. 1895, vol. 32, cc. 534–560.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, cc. 542–544.

<sup>77</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 16 Aug. 1911, vol. 29, c. 1930.



has noted, it managed to get votes from four prominent Irish MPs, J.J. Clancey, William O'Brien, Tim Healy and T.P. O'Connor.<sup>78</sup>

The greatest conflict between Scottish and Irish Home Rulers was due to the competing methods of securing Home Rule. An expression of this conflict was displayed in Edinburgh in a speech by David Hyslop at a branch meeting of the United Irish League in response to a meeting recently held by the Scottish National Committee with the objective of organising support for Scottish Home Rule:

the majority of those who addressed the meeting were far too anxious to profess their loyalty to the Government and to apologise for being present, while one of the speakers at least advocated that Home Rule for Scotland should come simultaneously with that for Ireland. That certainly sounded very much like opposition to Irish Home Rule. He (the speaker) was a strong advocate of self-government for Scotland but he could not for the life of him see why a new movement in this country could expect to have the same consideration from the Government that Ireland should receive, the people of which had been agitating for the management of their own affairs ever since the Act of Union with England was passed.<sup>79</sup>

This speech very aptly sums up the position of many Irish Home Rulers towards Scottish Home Rule. Hyslop was not opposed to Scottish Home Rule itself. Indeed he recognised that Scotland did not receive fair treatment and should be given self-government, however he was not willing to risk it subverting the primacy of Irish Home Rule. While Scottish Home Rulers had almost to a man accepted Home Rule All Round as the preferred solution, Irish Home Rulers were far more sceptical of the theory. One of the strongest methods of Unionist opposition to Home Rule was scrutinising and debating the details of any plan to implement it. Although devolving parliaments to each of the constituent countries would have served to relieve the 'in out' dilemma of Gladstone's plans for Irish Home Rule it would raise the equally difficult task of convincing England it needed a parliament of its own.

There was also the question of whether to devolve the parliaments simultaneously or begin with Ireland and then subsequently devolve parliaments for Scotland, Wales and possibly England. Historians such as John Kendle and Patricia Jalland have convincingly argued that Redmond and Dillon were unwilling to accept

---

<sup>78</sup> Naylor, *Scottish Attitudes to Ireland*, p. 94.

<sup>79</sup> 'Scotland Must Wait for Home Rule', *EEN*, 1 May 1911, p. 2.

plans for further devolution in other areas of the United Kingdom if it meant Ireland would have to wait for simultaneous treatment.<sup>80</sup> Scottish Home Rulers were almost uniformly in favour of Home Rule All Round and with a few notable exceptions they were willing to allow Ireland to proceed first. It is therefore easy to imagine a great deal of sympathy between Irish and Scottish Home Rulers, however, matters were considerably complicated by the fact that Home Rule was to be settled in London, framed by the Liberal elite, and beset by Unionists. John Kendle has noted the Irish position was aptly stated by T.P O'Connor in 1910 in a letter to John Dillon, 'Our policy is quite clear... fight through thick and thin with the liberals until we get the veto question tackled and settled, and then...get them to propose home rule immediately or break with them.'<sup>81</sup> Alvin Jackson has noted that the Irish secretary, Augustine Birrell was the 'mouthpiece of the Irish nationalists within cabinet' and he worried that Home Rule All Round would complicate and delay Irish Home Rule.<sup>82</sup> Birrell would 'pave the way for Home Rule (on more or less Gladstonian lines), and to do all that in me lay [sic] to make any other solution of the problem impossible'.<sup>83</sup> Interestingly, and as those such as Pirie were keen to remind him, he had seconded James Dalziel's 1894 House of Commons resolution for the devolution of a Scottish Parliament. In doing so Birrell stated:

All purely Legislative business in which Englishmen really did not take any interest should be left in the hands of Scotchmen, who, he submitted, had a right to demand that they should be allowed to pass those laws which only operated within the jurisdiction of Scotland.<sup>84</sup>

The only great difficulty in Home Rule All Round that Birrell saw in this speech was that the devolution of an English Parliament could 'interfere with the present system of Cabinet Government'.<sup>85</sup> Eighteen years later as Irish secretary it seems that his concern that Home Rule All Round should not disturb a Cabinet Government appears to have grown dramatically. Ultimately, plans were put aside by Asquith's

---

<sup>80</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 140 and Jalland, 'United Kingdom Devolution', p. 768.

<sup>81</sup> T.P. O'Conner to John Dillon 31 Jan. 1910, John Dillon Papers, MS 6740:164, quoted in: Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 106.

<sup>82</sup> Jackson, *Home Rule*, p. 133.

<sup>83</sup> Pencilled cabinet note by Lloyd George, headed Home Rule. Suggestion, 27 Feb. 1911, Lloyd George Papers C/12/2, quoted in Jalland, 'United Kingdom Devolution 1910-14', p. 676.

<sup>84</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 3 Apr. 1894, vol. 22, c. 1297.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

Cabinet and the Home Rule Bill of 1912 was for Ireland alone. While the promise that Scottish Home Rule would follow was renewed so too was the avoidance of committing it to a definite time frame. This was a great disappointment to many Scottish Home Rulers. MacCallum Scott went so far as to introduce his own private members bill for Home Rule All Round on 3 July 1912. It was supported by Munro Ferguson, Charles Price, and notably the Welsh MP E.T. John. It passed its first reading with a majority of fifty-two. The *Scotsman* derisively noted that Asquith walked out of the House and the Secretary for Scotland followed five minutes later.<sup>86</sup> Jalland had noted that federalists were among the strongest critics the weakest components of the Irish Home Rule Bill, namely, the financial provisions and Ulster.<sup>87</sup>

Duncan Pirie went so far as to announce that he would vote against the Government's Irish Bill. At a crowded meeting with his constituents in North Aberdeen he expressed his disappointment as one of the many Scottish members who hoped to see Scottish Home Rule mentioned in preamble of the Bill. Although he claimed to have been a lifelong Home Ruler he felt that the current Bill, with its proposals relating to customs and excise and its plan to give Ireland control of the its post, made it incompatible with later plans of establishing Home Rule for Scotland on the federal basis.<sup>88</sup> While these cases should be taken as exceptions rather than the norm they do highlight that there were at least some cases of Scottish Home Rulers who were unwilling to support Irish Home Rule Bills if they felt they would be injurious to Scottish Home Rule.

Earlier examples of parliamentary protest by Scottish Home Rulers against Irish Home Rule bills can be seen in the debates of the 1890s. John Kendle has identified one such instance during the second reading of the 1893 Irish Home Rule Bill.<sup>89</sup> In this debate John Leng, an active Scottish Home Ruler, and at that point still a member of the SHRA, spoke in favour of Gladstone's Bill. Citing the example of the United States and Canada, Leng offered that the price of securing the loyalty of

---

<sup>86</sup> 'Home Rule Bill Scene', *The Scotsman*, 4 July 1912, p. 7.

<sup>87</sup> Jalland, 'United Kingdom Devolution', p. 771.

<sup>88</sup> 'Mr. Pirie on Home Rule Bill: Reasons for Hostile Voting', *The Scotsman*, 12 Dec. 1912, p. 9.

<sup>89</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 77.

the Irish in Ireland was only that which could be obtained in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, which as he saw it, was a bill outlining what were to be defined as Irish and imperial affairs in the way that the United States Constitution outlined what were state and Federal affairs. Leng supported the 1893 Bill's retention of the Irish members excluded in the 1886 Bill, 'because it involved recognition of the Federal principle, and theoretically he should prefer that the principle should be thoroughly applied all through—to Scotland, Wales, and England, as well as to Ireland. In other words, he was for Home Rule all round'.<sup>90</sup> The reverse was true of Dr Donald Macgregor, the crofter MP who had succeeded Charles Fraser Mackintosh for Invernesshire. Whereas Leng supported the Bill because he thought it was compatible with future instalments of Home Rule All Round, MacGregor was disappointed with the Bill for failing to establish separate parliaments for Wales and Scotland at the same time. Speaking against the Bill MacGregor said that:

There could be no doubt that the 9th clause of the Bill constituted a great difficulty, and he believed the only solution of the problem respecting the retention of the Irish Members was to be found in the adoption of the principle of Federal Home Rule, or Home Rule all round. He much regretted that the Prime Minister, after the long consideration he had given to the question, had not seen his way to the introduction of a Bill dealing concurrently with Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. If Home Rule were a good thing for Ireland, why was it not a good thing for Scotland? He presumed that it would be generally conceded that Scotchmen were fairly capable of managing their own affairs... He hoped it would never be necessary for Scotchmen to resort to violent methods to obtain recognition of their national rights once more. In saying this he made no reflection on the tactics which his Celtic cousins had found necessary to obtain recognition of their nationality; on the contrary, he thought other nationalities owed them gratitude for the example of constancy and courage they had set them. Why should England, the reputed mother and cradle of liberty, continue to play the tyrant over weaker nations? As he listened to the exposition of his country's wrongs by the hon. Member for North-East Cork, he felt that every word might apply with equal force to that other branch of the Celtic race in the Highlands of Scotland...let the Government come back next Session with an all-round Home Rule Bill dealing simultaneously with the various sections of the United Kingdom, and he ventured to predict that such a measure would be received with ten times greater popular enthusiasm than the present

---

<sup>90</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 19 Apr. 1893, vol. 11, cc. 682–689.

lop-sided attempt to satisfy national aspirations and national demands for self-government.<sup>91</sup>

Macgregor also was a Scottish Home Ruler who attended meetings of the SHRA and spoke on behalf of James Dalziel's 1895 motion in favour of Home Rule All Round.

It must, of course, be conceded that the actions of backbenchers do not constitute a powerful movement; however, it does suggest that the sentiment was not merely confined to the eccentric characters of the SHRA whose patriotism was often the butt of jokes. Although letters from the likes of Charles Waddie, John Romans, and William Mitchell, were unlikely to trouble Gladstone or Asquith, votes of dissent from Liberal MPs must have been most unwelcome for Bills which were so closely divided.

### **Scotland and Wales**

Having thus far dealt with the interactions between Irish and Scottish Home Rulers it might be useful to next turn to the relationship between Scotland and Wales. In many ways the two nations occupied a similar position within the British political landscape. Both were predominately Liberal and on occasion were in a role of relative significance when their votes could make or break a Liberal Government with a narrow majority. Both had been forced to wait for legislation which had been delayed by the gridlock associated with the question of Irish Home Rule. The next section will attempt to discuss the interactions between the Home Rulers that these conditions produced with the hope of elaborating on the condition of the respective Home Rule movements within the UK.

During the second half of the nineteenth century Wales was experiencing a national revival of its own. The Third Reform Act saw a massive increase in the Welsh electorate. The county vote was increased from 74,936 to 200,373. The reformed electorate was overwhelmingly Liberal before the First World War. This was a useful boon to the Liberal Party as they represented a minority of seats in England between 1886 and 1906. Therefore following the damaging effects of Gladstone's Home Rule Bills the Celtic Fringe was in an uncharacteristic position of

---

<sup>91</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 18 Apr. 1893, vol. 11, cc. 616–619.

influence within the Liberal Party. Kenneth Morgan has noted that issues of land reform, education, temperance and church disestablishment all made ‘spectacular progress’ during the period 1886-1892.<sup>92</sup> The other achievement of Welsh politics during this period was the formation of a Welsh Parliamentary Party. In his study of nineteenth-century Welsh politics and national identity Mathew Cragoe has noted that the persistent strategy from the 1860s onward was to use constitutional reform to bring Welsh legislation under more direct Welsh control. This, he says was possible either by the extension of franchise or through Welsh Home Rule.<sup>93</sup> Ultimately, the primary focus of the Welsh Party centred on the colossal issue of disestablishment. Although the large scale achievements of the Welsh Party are limited it was however very successful as a method of reminding the Liberal front bench of the desires of Wales and it could be used to apply pressure to secure influence.

Welsh desire for Home Rule manifested itself in the Cymru Fydd movement. Although it originally embraced a range of cultural and political objectives Cymru Fydd increasingly took on a political nature. For many supporters, most notably Tom Ellis, Welsh Home Rule seemed the natural outcome of a Welsh national movement. Home Rule for Wales even featured as the final item on his 1886 election address.<sup>94</sup> Ellis served as MP for Merionethshire 1886 until his death in 1899. He served as deputy whip and chief whip for Gladstone and Lord Rosebery respectively. Although an early and enthusiastic proponent of Welsh Home Rule, his incorporation into the Liberal Party seems to have tempered his views of Welsh Home Rule. In 1888 a monthly journal sharing its name with the movement was created and for three years it strongly advocated traditional Welsh Liberal politics such as disestablishment, land reform, temperance, and notably Welsh Home Rule.<sup>95</sup> These issues were similar to those that dominated Scottish politics at the time.

As early as 1888 G.B. Clark received a communication from Wales regarding the desire for Welsh Home Rule on the basis of Home Rule All Round. In 1890

---

<sup>92</sup> Kenneth O. Morgan, *Rebirth of a Nation Wales 1880–1980*, Oxford: Oxford University, 1881, p. 29.

<sup>93</sup> Mathew Cragoe, *Culture, Politics and National Identity in Wales 1832–1886*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 47.

<sup>94</sup> Morgan, *Wales in British Politics*, p. 72.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

there was a series of meetings between Welsh and Scottish Home Rulers who sought to collaborate in order to promote Home Rule All Round.<sup>96</sup> The first meeting was held 25 February 1890 at the National Liberal Club in London. The conference was attended by representatives of the North and South Welsh Liberal Federation, Cymru Fydd Society, and the SHRA. Several MPs were present including Dr Clark, Alpheus C. Morton, Peterborough; Peter Esslemont, Aberdeen East; John Leng, Dundee; John Philipps, Lanarkshire; Samuel Evans, Glamorganshire Mid; Alfred Thomas, Glamorganshire East; Seymour Keay, Elgin and Nairnshire; and Robert Cunninghame-Graham, Lanarkshire North West. Dr Clark occupied the chair. Waddie noted that the meeting was the result of an invitation extended to the SHRA from the South Wales Liberal Federation executive committee. It must have been a satisfying affirmation of his association's work to have been invited. The initial plan for the meeting came from a resolution passed the previous December that efforts should be made to keep Welsh Home Rule consistently in front of the electorate and to commend the Scottish Home Rulers for their efforts.<sup>97</sup> Following that resolution the idea was further bolstered during the annual meeting of the federation in February 1890.

In opening the meeting Dr Clark remarked that although the Scottish question was distinct from the Welsh question and also from the Irish question, there was a great similarity in their cause for Home Rule. In both cases he deemed that it was impossible for Scots and Welsh to get desirable legislation out of the present Parliament.<sup>98</sup> At the first opportunity, Mr. Tilston of the North Wales Liberal Federation stated that at a preliminary meeting of that body's delegates they had passed a resolution that, 'in order to set themselves right with the conference, that they entered upon the clear understanding that nothing should be done to prejudice the position of Irish Home Rule and Welsh Disestablishment in the programme of the Liberal Party'.<sup>99</sup> This threatened to be a stumbling block for the conference as Dr Clark stated that, while a strong supporter of disestablishment himself, the Scottish Home Rule movement, of which he was a party, was not unanimous on the topic. In

---

<sup>96</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule', *Western Daily Express*, 19 Sept. 1888, p. 8.

<sup>97</sup> 'Home Rule for Wales', *Liverpool Mercury*, 24 Feb. 1890, p. 6.

<sup>98</sup> 'Home Rule Conference in London', *Glasgow Herald*, 26 Feb. 1890, p. 9.

<sup>99</sup> 'Conference on Welsh and Scottish Home Rule', *The Scotsman*, 26 Feb. 1890, p. 8.

spite of this the conference succeeded in passing a resolution in favour of home rule for the two countries and a committee with twelve representatives from each country was appointed.<sup>100</sup>

The committee met in April and further resolved that the Home Rule question should be settled for and agitated for on federal lines.<sup>101</sup> In May another conference was held, with John Leng presiding, and a resolution was passed that ‘in the final settlement of the Home Rule Question a Legislature should be granted to each of the four nationalities—England Ireland, Scotland and Wales’.<sup>102</sup> The potential implications of the words ‘final settlement’ were not missed by the meeting and the mover of the resolution, A.C. Morton was required to clarify that the resolution would allow Irish Home Rule to be passed first. Interestingly, an amendment to the resolution had been proposed that the word ‘nationalities’ be replaced with the word ‘countries’. In supporting his amendment J.V.G. Porter claimed there were not four nationalities in the United Kingdom. The amendment met with heavy opposition and Samuel Evans argued that ‘if they eliminated the word nationality they would omit the very word which expressed the spirit of the movement’.<sup>103</sup> Although the meetings appear to have amounted to relatively little in the long run it is worth noting that Dr G.B. Clark’s third attempt at Scottish Home Rule before the House of Commons was seconded by one of the Welsh representatives from these meetings, Sir Samuel T. Evans.<sup>104</sup>

Evans was not the only Welsh MP to second a Scottish Home Rule amendment in a House of Commons debate in the nineteenth century. David Lloyd George seconded Henry Dalziel’s 1895 amendment expressing the desirability of establishing devolved legislatures for England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. Lloyd George had entered into Parliament as a Gladstonian Liberal in 1890 by winning the closely-contested Caernarfon by-election. From the start Lloyd George pressed leaders of the Liberal Party for Welsh disestablishment. This came to a head when he

---

<sup>100</sup> ‘Scotch and Welsh Home Rule’, *The Morning Post*, 26 Feb. 1890, p. 3.

<sup>101</sup> ‘Scottish and Welsh Home Rule’, *EEN*, 29 Apr. 1890, p. 4.

<sup>102</sup> ‘The Scottish Welsh Home Rule Question’, *The Scotsman*, 7 May 1890, p. 7.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>104</sup> It is worth noting that in seconding the motion he complained that Clark had not made better references to Wales.



and a few other Welsh MPs led a revolt against Liberal whips. By 1895 their efforts were rewarded and Welsh Disestablishment Bill was moved in the House of Commons. Home Rule politics played a significant role in Lloyd George's early career. He had very nearly turned from Gladstone during the First Irish Home Rule Bill. Shortly prior to his election to Parliament he and members of the North Wales Liberal Federation became spokesmen for Cymru Fydd and attempted to make Welsh Home Rule part of the Liberal platform.<sup>105</sup> In 1894 Lloyd George helped create the Cymru Fydd League and the following year it merged with the North Wales Liberal Federation. After the fall of the Liberal Government in 1895 only five Welsh Liberal MPs, Lloyd George, Brynmor Jones, Herbert Lewis, Pritchard Morgan, Samuel Smith, featured Welsh Home Rule in their election addresses.<sup>106</sup> His biographer John Grigg has shown that Lloyd George still held to the idea in the lead up to election. Grigg effectively quoted a speech given at Blaencwm which illustrated the enthusiasm found in the future Prime Minister's language:

Wales should be ruled by her own sons and daughters and not by "groups of Englishmen three hundred miles away... whose knowledge of Wales was drawn entirely from their morning perusal of *The Times* or from an occasional flying visit to Llandudno or Tenby, when, because they could be served a chop steak without resorting to the device of drawing a picture of a cow and a frying-pan, they rushed back to England with the cry that Welsh was no longer spoken."<sup>107</sup>

This quote is interesting for three reasons. First, it shows that Lloyd George was against the idea of Welsh legislation being framed in England by Englishmen. Second, it highlights the issue of Englishmen representing Welsh constituencies. This complaint was also raised in Scotland, most notably by the SHRA and the YSS. Finally, it demonstrates his sensitivity to the place of Welsh language. The three taken together represent some of the fundamental nationalist concerns.

Ultimately Lloyd George's plans for a united Welsh Liberal Federation failed in January 1896 after he was unable to unite the conflicting personal differences between the leadership as well as the differing regional interests of the rural North

---

<sup>105</sup> Morgan, *Rebirth of a Nation*, p. 315.

<sup>106</sup> Morgan, *Wales in British Politics*, p. 159. Morgan and Smith lost their seats in 1900 and 1906 respectively. Jones, Lewis, and Lloyd George would go on to vote in favour of both Scottish and Federal Home Rule Bills thirteen years later.

<sup>107</sup> John Grigg, *The Young Lloyd George*, rev. edn, London: Eyre Methuen, 1978, p. 167.

and with cosmopolitan South Wales represented by the South Wales Liberal Federation. In a last attempt to make Home Rule All Round an official aspect of the Radical agenda he called a meeting of the Radical Committee of the Liberal Party. It was attended by fifty-six MPs including, Haldane, Henry Dalziel, Dr Clark, Augustine Birrell, John Leng, Henry Labouchere, and Charles Dilke; however, the idea was ultimately left to rest as it appeared futile given the Unionist's large majority.<sup>108</sup> As Kendle noted, following these setbacks in 1896 Lloyd George increasingly turned his attention to the wider sphere of British politics.<sup>109</sup>

With the exception of a brief debate in March 1898 the next serious attempts to achieve Home Rule for Wales did not come until after the second general election of 1910 when E.T. John attempted a first reading for his Home Rule Bill of 1914. Like the Scottish Home Rule Bills leading up to the First World War, it offered an attractive method for Liberals to address the potential misbalance which might have existed after establishing an Irish parliament. Also like the Scottish Home Rule Bills, it was not met with much enthusiasm from the upper ranks of the Liberal Party. E.T. John was returned as a Liberal MP for Denbighshire Eastern in the December 1910 general election. In the previous months he had been in contact with Scottish Home Rulers on the Scottish National Committee.<sup>110</sup> Immediately following their August 1910 Scottish Home Rule manifesto he issued a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* which called for:

remitting to a body elected exclusively by the Welsh constituencies the control of education and licensing, the administration of the Poor Law, municipal and rural self-government, the maintenance of roads, the conservation and development of the nation's resources by afforestation, the creation of land banks, the multiplication of light railways, the protection in the interests of the community of the potential energy represented by our mountain streams, the value of our watersheds.<sup>111</sup>

For his part, John desired that Welsh MPs would emulate the example set by the Scottish National Committee.<sup>112</sup> The secretary of the Scottish National Committee,

---

<sup>108</sup> Kendle, *Ireland and the Federal Solution*, p. 83.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> J. Graham Jones, 'E.T. John and Welsh Home Rule', *Welsh History Review*, 13 (1987), p. 454.

<sup>111</sup> *Manchester Guardian*, 8 Apr. 1910.

<sup>112</sup> Jones, 'E.T. John', p. 455.

W.H. Cowan, replied favourably to John's letter to the *Guardian* and encouraged him to sustain a 'vigorous campaign of correspondence in the columns of the Welsh provincial press'.<sup>113</sup> John followed this advice and launched a one man movement for Welsh Home Rule. The Welsh press served as an outlet for his proposals and published many of them either at length or in condensed form.<sup>114</sup> He also conducted a speaking tour of several universities in 1911 where he spoke on topics including: federal home rule, nationalism and economics, and national evolution.<sup>115</sup> He even managed to convince the Liberal Associations of Anglesey, Denbigh Boroughs, and Eifion Constituency to pass resolutions in favour of federal home rule.<sup>116</sup>

John was certainly not only interested in a creating a Welsh parliament for the sole purpose of increasing parliamentary efficiency. National sentiment could feature strongly in his speeches:

It is only by the most liberal measure of self-government combined with an adequate share in the wider arena of Imperial and International affairs, that Wales can render to humanity all the notable service of which it is unquestionably capable. There is among us fervour and a unity which comes, as Mazzini said of Italy, of the fact that "we speak the same language, we bear about us the impress of consanguinity, we kneel beside the same tombs, we glory in the same tradition." We "live, think, love and labour for all" without any-deep-seated division of class or creed. Whether we regard our common heritage of a spirited and strenuous past, the substantial unity and eager hopefulness of the present, the purpose and ideals of the future, we are as truly a nation as any, fitted, without doubt, to "fulfil a special function in the work of civilization," to contribute some distinctive note of human harmony to the great chorus of humanity declared to be "the highest ideal reality to which mankind attains."<sup>117</sup>

This came from a series of speeches which he gave before Welsh undergraduates. With his patriotic rhetoric and his calling up of Mazzini, John sought to inspire his countrymen to call for self-government on nationalist lines.

---

<sup>113</sup> N.L.W., E.T. John Papers 23: W.H. Cowan to E.T. John, 16 Aug. 1910, in Jones, 'E.T. John', pp. 154–155.

<sup>114</sup> Jones, 'E.T. John', p. 456.

<sup>115</sup> E.T. John, *Home Rule for Wales, Addresses to 'Young Wales'*, Bangor: Jarvis and Foster, 1912, p. 1.

<sup>116</sup> Jones, 'E.T. John', p. 456.

<sup>117</sup> E.T. John, *Home Rule for Wales*, pp. 5–6.

Like the vast majority of Scottish Home Rulers he advocated Welsh Home Rule on the basis of Home Rule All Round. Speaking to the Oxford Cambrian Society in the November of 1911 John cited the German Empire and the United States as triumphs of federalism. ‘The Federal method happily combines the maximum opportunity for the operation of the deep-seated sentiment of nationality, with the greatest facility for the transaction of the national business—it may at one and the same time be the ideal of the enthusiast and the readiest resource of the practical politician.’<sup>118</sup> Here John aptly summarises the unique position which the Home Rule Movements of both Wales and Scotland found themselves in during the generation before the First World War. Home Rule offered an outlet for nationalistic sentiments which felt that legislation should be framed along ethnic lines, while at the same time offering a practical solution for the difficulties which faced an overburdened and congested Imperial Parliament. It was this dynamic between national sentiment and political pragmatism that led Home Rule groups like the YSS to embrace eccentric, if not fanatical, nationalists like Charles Waddie while at the same time respectable, albeit occasionally troublesome, MPs like James Hogge.

Despite John’s earnest attempts, he failed to enlist many supporters among Welsh MPs. Outside of Parliament a grassroots pressure group called the Welsh Nationalist League was formed in January 1911. In August of that year they passed a resolution authorising cooperation with the YSS to help bring about Home Rule All Round.<sup>119</sup> E.T. John accepted the position of president of the League. Unsurprisingly, he declined the group’s other suggestion that he declare himself an independent Welsh nationalist and leave the Liberal Party.<sup>120</sup> In accepting his position as president of the League John said that, ‘neither Scotland or Wales was prepared to accord preference to Ireland, but emphatically demanded similarity of treatment simultaneously with Ireland’.<sup>121</sup> He went on to implore the Irish Nationalists to drop attempts to achieve Irish Home Rule alone and focus on a scheme of federal home rule for the four nations in 1913. This point of view failed to deter the Irish

---

<sup>118</sup> E.T. John, *Home Rule for Wales*, p. 5.

<sup>119</sup> Jones, ‘E.T. John’, p. 463.

<sup>120</sup> Jones, ‘E.T. John’, p. 462.

<sup>121</sup> ‘Federal Home Rule: Welsh Member’s Suggestion to the Irish Party’, *The Scotsman*, 10 Apr. 1911, p. 10.

Nationalists, and the Liberals introduced a Third Home Rule Bill in April 1912 which did not pass its third reading until January of 1913. E.T. John remained critical of the Bill and in a letter he sent to every member of the House of Commons he again urged MPs to drop Irish Home Rule in favour of federal home rule. 'By 1916 we could have for the first time a really Imperial Chamber, virtually dealing exclusively with Imperial business; while England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales would deal with their respective domestic problems precisely as each nation desired.'<sup>122</sup> When it became apparent that the Government had no intention of heeding his advice he introduced his own Welsh Home Rule Bill in 1914 which proposed Home Rule on federal lines. Although the bill never achieved a second reading it bore the support of nine Welsh Members and two from Scotland, Henry Watt and William Cowan. Both were members of the Scottish National Committee.

It is worth noting that Welsh MPs shared a history of supporting Scottish Home Rule Bills. Indeed, several of them were even seconded by Welsh MPs including, G.B. Clark's 1891 motion seconded by Samuel Evans of Glamorganshire Mid and Henry Dalziel's 1895 resolution was seconded by Lloyd George. In both cases the Welsh MPs' speeches focussed heavily on the case of Wales. Lloyd George specifically focussed on the difficulty of attaining good legislation for the individual nations:

Did not the existence of that demand and the demand for the Disestablishment of the Church show that Wales had special grievances and was entitled to special treatment? There was also a special demand for temperance legislation in Wales, and the Principality had also education questions of its own. One regrettable result of the present system was that before a small nationality in the kingdom could get its grievances attended to it had to resort to something in the nature of lawlessness. Nearly all the legislation of the last ten years for the benefit of the Celtic nationalities had been the result of some kind of insubordination. Instances of this were afforded by the Scotch Crofters' Bill, the Irish Arrears Bill of 1887, and the settlement of the tithe agitation in Wales. No one who favoured law and order could reasonably desire the continuance of a system which forced every small nationality in the country to infringe the law when it wished attention to be paid to its grievances.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> 'A Welsh Radical on Home Rule', *The Scotsman*, 25 Dec. 1913, p. 5.

<sup>123</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 29 Mar. 1895, vol. 32, cc. 533–535.

As was highlighted by the pamphlets of the SHRA and the speech of Rosebery having to resort to lawlessness was something that was resented by Scots as well. Welsh MPs also displayed a fairly strong record of voting in favour of Scottish Home Rule Bills before the Great War. Eleven out of thirty-four supported Henry Dalziel's 1911 bill for Scottish Home Rule. Nineteen voted in favour of Dr Chapple's 1912 scheme calling for the creation of a Scottish Parliament following the granting of Irish Home Rule as a part of a greater plan for federal devolution and a further sixteen voted for MacCallum Scott's motion for federal home rule that same summer. William Cowan's 1913 Bill, which passed its second reading, was also supported by sixteen Welsh MPs.

Scottish Home Rulers, especially in Parliament, were careful not to frustrate plans for Irish Home Rule. In his first home rule motion Clark had said that he 'would keep back Home Rule in Scotland for half a-century rather than put off Home Rule in Ireland for a year'.<sup>124</sup> In Dalziel's 1895 motion he echoed Clark clarifying 'Friends from Ireland that if he had thought that the inclusion of Ireland was calculated even in the smallest degree to injure, retard, or postpone by a single day or hour the realisation of their hopes he should have hesitated before he undertook the responsibility of including it.'<sup>125</sup> A similar sentiment is expressed in Cowan's 1913 motion, he was careful to state that now that the Irish Home Bill is secure it is safe to move the Scottish Home Rule bill.<sup>126</sup> These three examples demonstrate a concern that Scottish Home Rule should not interfere with Irish Home Rule, however their timing also indicates that they are keen to strike while the iron is hot in order to secure their own separate objective of a devolved parliament for Scotland.

## **Conclusion**

In the case of the Welsh and Scottish Home Rulers, intense action on behalf of the Scottish Nationalists often led to alienation of their connections to those with political influence. This often left them in the precarious position of either supporting plans for Irish Home Rule with the only vague promises of future concessions, or

---

<sup>124</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 9 Apr. 1889, vol. 335, c. 73.

<sup>125</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 29 Mar. 1895, vol. 32, c. 524.

<sup>126</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, c. 472.

opposing them at the risk of losing the support of moderates. Had Irish Home Rule not been interrupted by the war, one can only speculate what would have happened to commitment to Home Rule All Round. This chapter has attempted to show that while Irish Home Rule was essential in establishing a momentum behind plans for Home Rule All Round, Home Rulers in Scotland and Wales were also interested in receiving devolved parliaments in order to achieve their own distinct legislative desires. It is tempting to think of Irish, Welsh, and Scottish Home Rulers as natural allies, and there was indeed a great deal of sympathy between many of those involved in the three movements. In spite of this there was also conflict. Although parliamentary Home Rulers such as Clark, Daziell and Cowan were cautious to present their plans as complimentary to Irish Home Rule, leaders of the SHRA like Waddie, Blackie, and Mitchell could be more critical plans for Irish Home Rule that would not provide commitment for Scottish Home Rule. However, as the speech before the SHRA in 1888 from Macrae indicated, Scottish Home Rulers owed much to the early efforts of the Irish to press the Government for Home Rule. The same probably cannot be said of the reverse. Although the defeat of Gladstone's first two Home Rule Bills highlighted the difficulty of proceeding with Irish Home Rule alone, the parliamentary clout of the Irish Nationalists meant that Irish Home Rule would be afforded primacy above or within all other schemes of Home Rule from the Liberal Party leadership. It was perhaps this disparity of influence over the Liberal Party which best explains the scope for conflict between Scottish and Irish Home Rulers. Gladstone and Asquith were just as unwilling as Parnell and Redmond to risk delaying a solution to the Irish Question by insisting on simultaneous devolution of parliaments. Most Scottish Home Rulers were willing to allow Ireland precedence. There was however division among them as to how firm a commitment was needed in exchange for their support that Irish Home Rule would only be the first step towards Home Rule All Round. This was reflected in the censure of the SHRA executive over their widely reported correspondence with Gladstone. It is reflected in Parliament by the fact that Scottish MPs brought in their own bills for Scottish Home Rule, usually via Home Rule All Round, concurrently with the Government's Irish Home Rule Bills.

## **Chapter 4: International Dimensions of the Scottish Home Rule**

### **Movement**

‘And thus was the ice broken! The demand for a Parliament in Scotland comes no longer from a country, but from a race.’- F.J. Robertson 1913<sup>1</sup>

These were the words of the founder of the International Scots Home Rule League following his journey across America enlisting support for Scottish Home Rule. While the veracity and the duration of this demand deserves qualification the claim does show that Scots at home were eager to enlist Scots living abroad in their efforts to secure Scottish Home Rule. The statement also brings us to the precarious and often provocative word ‘race’. As Colin Kidd has noted the term race had, and perhaps continues to have, several and sometimes overlapping meanings.<sup>2</sup> It could be used simply to mean nationality or as frequently the case race could also refer to ethnicity. During the decades preceding the Great War academics including, not least among them historians and geographers, gave serious attention to the study of ethnic foundations of various peoples and nations. Scottish nationalists were also interested in the idea of race and were willing to challenge historians over claims regarding the supposed ethnic backgrounds of the Scottish people.<sup>3</sup> As the claim by F.J. Robertson shows, Scottish nationalists, like their continental counterparts, were not indifferent to ideas of race and where possible they attempted to use the support Scots abroad to support their own claims for Scottish Home Rule.

Robertson’s tour of North America was not the first time that Scottish Home Rulers had attempted to enlist support from those outside Scotland. Indeed, in 1888 the colonial secretary of the SHRA set out on a similar journey across America and Canada with the aim of raising support and funds. Although these attempts met with

---

<sup>1</sup> F.J. Robertson, ‘The Call of A Race’, *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1913), p. 4; Colin Kidd, ‘Race, Empire, and the Limits of Nineteenth-Century Scottish Nationhood’, *The Historical Journal*, 46 (2003), pp. 873–892.

<sup>2</sup> Colin Kidd, ‘Race, Empire, and the Limits of Nineteenth-Century Scottish Nationhood’, *The Historical Journal*, 46 (2003), pp. 873–892.

<sup>3</sup> The best example of this can be found in an article written by T.D. Wanliss in the patriotic journal *Scotia*. Here Wanliss strongly criticises the historian J.R. Green for what he deemed ‘Anglo-Jingoism’, suggesting that Green placed undue importance on the role of the Engles to the detriment of the other ancient British peoples; T.D. Wanliss, ‘Are England and Scotland Territorial or Racial Terms’, *Scotia*, 1 (1907), pp. 146–147.



mixed results they demonstrate interesting ideas regarding how nationalists identified themselves. Simply by making these appeals to Scots living abroad it shows that they felt that Scottishness was a property that one was born with and that it could be transplanted across the globe and still endure. It also suggests that it was a property which could be inherited. Those who were Scottish by way of ancestry were readily welcomed into the fold provided they demonstrated what was perceived as Scottish character, which, in the opinion of Scottish nationalists, went hand and hand with desire for Scottish Home Rule.

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, both Scottish and Irish Home Rulers sought international support for their respective movements. When we compare the results, especially financially, the contributions from Scots abroad pale into insignificance when stood next to their Irish counterparts. To an extent this is to be expected given that even among a large portion of Scottish Home Rulers the urgency of Irish Home Rule was recognised as being greater. However it is still worth taking the examination of the contribution of Scots abroad, further. As historians such as Tanya Bueltman and Eric Richards have shown the formation of Scottish associations was a frequent habit of Scots abroad. Through these associations Scots perpetuated Scottish traditions of literature, song, dance, food, and sport. But what of the other great expression of national life, politics? This chapter will attempt to assess the extent which Scottish Home Rulers were able to capitalise on ties of attachment to Scotland which existed among Scots abroad in order to gain support for Scottish Home Rule. Significant attention will be paid to attempts to set up Scottish Home Rule groups and associations abroad. As the establishment of a group does not necessarily equal vitality, the activity of such groups will also be analysed to determine the extent which they survived and contributed to the discussion. The primary argument of the chapter being that although significant contributions were made to the cause of Scottish Home Rule from individuals, and occasionally small groups, in the form of contributions to the Home Rule periodicals and resolutions to Westminster, the movement was never able to garner the widespread and determined support which was offered to supporters of Irish Home Rule.

In support of this argument the chapter will be broken broadly into four sections. The first will attempt briefly to discuss some of the trends in Scottish emigration and identity during the period. The second will focus on the attempts made by Scottish nationalists in Scotland to gain support from outside Scotland, the critical question being to what extent they were successful in gaining meaningful support. The third section will focus on Australia and New Zealand. Although this geographic division may still fall under the concept discussed in the previous section Australia has been singled out to allow for the discussion of two distinct features. First, the role of Scots born abroad who subsequently came to Scotland and had great impact in the movement. Second, the role of imperial federation played within the debate surrounding Australian federation at the end of the nineteenth century. The final section will attempt to survey the relations and reports of the Scottish Home Rule Movement in the colonial and American press.

### **Emigration and Association**

Emigration trends in the nineteenth century saw millions of Scots take up residence abroad. Tom Devine has recently calculated that over 2,900,000 people left Scotland during the period between 1825 and 1938. As many as 600,000 Scots went south across the border to England. The United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and, to a lesser extent, South Africa were the predominant overseas destinations.<sup>4</sup> Canada served as long-term favourite destination for emigration. Between 1871 and 1914, 320,000 Scots immigrated to Canada.<sup>5</sup> During the longer period of 1820-1930, 726,000 Scots entered America.<sup>6</sup> Scottish prevalence in New Zealand has also been noted. Although New Zealand received a comparatively small number of Scottish migrants, they made up at least twenty per cent of the country's migrant population during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>7</sup> This of course is a simplification of the figures and there exists a wide range of literature

---

<sup>4</sup> Tom Devine, *To the Ends of the Earth: Scotland's Global Diaspora*, London: Penguin, 2011, p. 85.

<sup>5</sup> Marjory Harper and Stephen Constantine, *Migration and Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 12.

<sup>6</sup> Devine, 'To the Ends of the Earth', p. 142.

<sup>7</sup> Tanja Buelman, *Scottish Ethnicity and the Making of New Zealand Society, 1850-1930*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011, p. 2.

dealing with the topic extensively.<sup>8</sup> When desire for Home Rule began to grow in Scotland, so too did the desire to appeal to the patriotic aspirations of Scots who had grown up outside of Scotland.

The topic of Scottish emigration has received a lot of attention from scholars. R.A. Cage's collection of essays, *The Scots Abroad*, provides a varied examination of Scots contributions throughout the British Empire, including in England. As with many of the studies of the Scottish Diaspora, particular emphasis is given to Scots' role in the economic development of their adopted homelands.<sup>9</sup> David Forsyth has convincingly discussed the way in which Scottish national identity was able to find expression in the Empire, noting that many Scottish religious and educational missionaries were acutely aware of their Scottishness.<sup>10</sup> Forsyth maintained that 'even at the height of imperial involvement there remained a quite distinct Scottish national identity' during the nineteenth century.<sup>11</sup> John MacKenzie has further argued that far from stifling Scottishness it was the Empire which allowed a venue to 'establish a distinctive identity which reflected back upon the survival of her religious, intellectual, legal and ethical civil culture'.<sup>12</sup> Through the empire myths of Scotland were nurtured and societies were formed by those eager to maintain a cultural identity in their new homeland.<sup>13</sup> While it would be challenging to argue that Scottish nationalism held a place of prominence within all of these societies it does indicate that at least some Scots abroad still strongly identified themselves as being Scottish. It was therefore to these Scots which nationalists, like members of the SHRA and the International Scots Home Rule League, sought to appeal and the results of which will be discussed in this chapter.

Significant attention has been paid to the development of Scottish societies, such as St. Andrew Societies, Caledonian Clubs, and Burns Clubs throughout the

---

<sup>8</sup> See: Devine, *To the Ends of the Earth*; Jeanette Brock, *The Mobile Scot: Emigration and Migration, 1861–1911*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1999.

<sup>9</sup> R.A. Cage (ed.), *The Scots Abroad: Labour, Capital, Enterprise, 1750–1914*, London: Croom Helm, 1985.

<sup>10</sup> David Forsyth, 'Empire and Union: Imperial and National Identity in Nineteenth Century Scotland', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 113 (1997), pp. 6–8.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> John M. MacKenzie, 'Empire and National Identities: The Case of Scotland', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, 8 (1998), p. 230.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 230–231.

United States and the colonies. From the second half of the eighteenth century through the early decades of the twentieth century, hundreds of these societies and clubs sprang up. When studying Scots in Australia, historian Eric Richards noted that from the mid nineteenth century until the first decades of the twentieth, many Scottish societies were formed to perpetuate a Scottish identity, distinct from English. However, he also noted that in the long run these efforts faded away as both Scots and English blended into the Australian psyche.<sup>14</sup> Tanja Bueltmann has studied Scottish societies in New Zealand and concluded that expressions of Scottishness could be ‘both emotional and functional’.<sup>15</sup> In cases such as Burns Clubs and Highland Games Association, they offered a way of remembering a Scottish history, culture, and mythology. There were also the more practical endeavours of the Caledonian Societies which sought to give assistance to new immigrants from Scotland in order to help them establish themselves in their new home.

If the roles and activities of the various Scottish associations and clubs varied amongst themselves it should also be mentioned that they could function differently around the globe. In looking at Scottish migrant ethnic identities, Angela McCarthy has noted that the motivation behind joining these societies could vary from country to country. While in northern England a Scot might join a Scottish society to engage in intellectual discussion and good company, in South Africa societies offered practical advantages such as assistance with housing, education, employment, and financial relief for widows.<sup>16</sup>

John M. Mackenzie has noted that in South Africa after the Boer War there was an ‘extraordinary energy in the desire for Scottish associations’ which allowed Scots in South Africa to connect with their homeland and ‘people of supposed fellow ethnicity’, through dinners, literature, poetry, music and support, while at the same time providing a means of establishing valuable business contacts for Scottish elites

---

<sup>14</sup> Eric Richards, *The Land of Exiles: Scots in Australia*, Edinburgh: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1988, pp. 38–39.

<sup>15</sup> Tanja Bueltmann, “‘No Colonists are more Imbued with their National Sympathies than Scotchmen’”: The Nation as an Analytical Tool in the Study of Migrant Communities’, *New Zealand Journal of History*, 4 (2009), pp. 169–170.

<sup>16</sup> Angela McCarthy, ‘Scottish Migrant Ethnic Identities in the British Empire since the Nineteenth Century’, in John MacKenzie and Tom Devine (eds), *Scotland and the British Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 126.

and relief for the destitute.<sup>17</sup> The International Scottish Home Rule League was founded with the distinct purpose of tapping into the large number of Scots abroad by appealing to their notions of a shared identity and past for the practical and political purpose of supporting the movement to establish a devolved legislature for Scotland.

The historiography of Scots abroad demonstrates that across the globe Scottish identity and culture was kept alive through participation in various groups, societies and associations. To Scottish Home Rulers this body of Scots abroad who still felt a connection to Scotland represented potential body of support. The next section of the chapter will assess the attempts by Scottish Home Rulers to tap into this memory and fondness for Scotland to gain support for the political cause on the margins of a political system several thousand miles away.

### **Support from Abroad**

Charles Waddie, writing in the *Glasgow Herald* in 1887, proudly boasted that the association had received letters in support of Home Rule from Scots living in Canada, America, Brazil, South Africa, and Australia.<sup>18</sup> *The Scottish Patriot*, which was edited by John Wilson, ran monthly reports of Scots living abroad and focused on the growth and activities Scottish societies in the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. These accounts described almost entirely cultural and charitable activities, such as the participation in highland games, Burns suppers, or the erection of statues to Scottish historical figures. Although the restoration of a Scottish Parliament was listed in the objects of *The Scottish Patriot*, there seems to be no reference to its presence in the Scottish societies abroad.

The International Scots Home Rule League was founded in May of 1913 with the objective of uniting ‘Scots Home Rulers throughout the world in promoting the establishment of a National Parliament in Scotland’. The League was set by Hector

---

<sup>17</sup> John M. MacKenzie and Nigel R. Dalziel, *The Scots in South Africa, Ethnicity, Identity, Gender and race 1772-1914*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007, pp. 244–248.

<sup>18</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 1 Nov. 1887, p. 8.

Macpherson, J. Lorne Macleod, D.W. Kemp, and F.J. Robertson.<sup>19</sup> The reasons for attempting to gain international support were numerous. The Irish Home Rule movement had shown that expatriates could lend valuable support most notably in the way of funds. It also was a chance to perpetuate their perceived patriotic notions of Scottishness. While clan societies and participation in Scottish cultural activities show that there was widespread participation in Scottish traditions abroad, getting the public to engage in the practical politics of Scotland was a challenging task. This ultimately reflected the difficulties faced by Home Rulers in Scotland, whereby nationalistic ideas were expressed by small bodies struggling to awaken their countrymen from apathy.

The International Scots Home Rule League claimed to have distributed 41,000 leaflets in its first month and reported that sixty-three honorary presidents had accepted office including the Lord Provosts of Glasgow, Dundee and Elgin, and the Provosts of twenty-six burghs.<sup>20</sup> In the following November the League established a periodical, *The Scottish Nation*, which ran monthly until 1915 and bimonthly until 1917. It was edited by Hector Macpherson, former editor of the *Edinburgh Evening News*, 1894-1908. From an early age Macpherson had been instilled with a respect for education. His grandfather, James Macpherson, instructed him to ‘Get lear,[sic] it costs little and is easily carried with you.’<sup>21</sup> His early career involved writing on a variety of political philosophical and religious topics including several biographies of William Ewart Gladstone, Herbert Spencer, and Thomas Carlyle. In 1885 John Morley wrote to him suggesting that he make a career in journalism writing, ‘That is nowadays a most important function. The leader-writer can do plenty of good, and if he is up to his work, he is sure of employment. It is, if industriously and systematically pursued, a calling worthy of the most serious and thoughtful among us.’<sup>22</sup> It would seem he took the advice to heart and his writing shows a strong

---

<sup>19</sup> There was a strong Edinburgh basis to the league. Hector Macpherson had been the editor one of the city’s principal newspapers *The Edinburgh Evening News*. Robertson was an Edinburgh councillor and Macleod would go on to become the Lord Provost of the city in 1917. Kemp had served as president of the Leith Burghs Liberal Association and served took an active role in the Convention of Royal Burghs through his position as assessor for Dornoch.

<sup>20</sup> ‘The International Scots Home Rule League’, *The Scotsman*, 28 June 1913, p. 8.

<sup>21</sup> Macpherson, *Hector Macpherson*, p. 2.

<sup>22</sup> Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 10.

commitment to discussing political thoughts and ideologies. An early admiration of Gladstone had convinced him of Liberalism and throughout his career he remained committed to free trade and although sympathetic to the working class conditions he was wary of socialism. He was anti-imperial and supported the Greeks during the Turko-Greek War of 1897. According to a biography written by his son Dr Hector Macpherson, he received a letter of thanks signed by the Greek King.<sup>23</sup> In Scotland he was not always shown the same gratitude. He was a founding member of the YSS. The society opposed the Boer War and the jingoism associated with it. During the Boer war his effigy was thrown into Leith Docks alongside one of Kruger.<sup>24</sup>

Macpherson's anti-imperialism carried into the First World War. Though he had opposed militarisation he hoped that the Great War would enlighten the world to the importance of the rights of small nations:

Even in these days of carnage when Germany has turned Europe into a shambles, it is permissible to hope that from out the welter of war will rise clear and inspiring the doctrine of Nationalism. Peace on earth, and goodwill among free independent nations, will be the result of the long, toilsome, evolutionary process.<sup>25</sup>

Macpherson blamed the war on German Imperialism. He focused on the Kaiser specifically and frequently compared him to Napoleon. In order to distinguish Britain's role in the War he portrayed it as the defender of the rights of small nations like Belgium. He suggested that Scotland's reward for the part it played in the War should be increased rights of her own. This rationalisation allowed him to patriotically support the interest of a global power like Britain while at the same time squaring it with his own ideas regarding the rights of small nations, most notably Scotland. Although Scotland's success as an imperial partner has often been commented on, Macpherson stands as a strong example of a pre-war anti-imperialist. For Macpherson, devolution of a Scottish Parliament could serve as an early step whereby colonies at the periphery could join in a larger Imperial Parliament including representatives from the constituent nations of the UK.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Hector Macpherson, 'The Progress of Nationalism', *The Scottish Nation*, 2 (1915), pp. 313–314.

In 1914 *The Scottish Nation* reported a circulation of over ten thousand.<sup>26</sup> By 1915 it claimed to be sold by retailers in roughly forty international cities in the Americas, Europe, Africa, and Australia. While it is difficult to ascertain its distribution within these countries it might be noted that in 1915 it claimed that over three hundred issues of the January overseas edition had been sold in St Louis alone.<sup>27</sup> The periodical ran a wide range of articles focusing on Scottish topics from political notes and Scottish education to Scottish contributions to science, literature, philosophy and music. It benefited from contributions by many MPs including, J.M. Hogge, A.W. Ponsonby, R. Munro Ferguson, W.R.M. Pringle, A. MacCallum Scott, C. Price, J.W. Pratt, A.F. Whyte, T.D. Holmes, P.A. Molteno and Welsh MP E.T. John. As mentioned, the primary goal of the organisation was to appeal to Scots abroad for support of Scottish Home Rule. In the Autumn of 1913, prior to the launch of *The Scottish Nation*, the League's secretary F.J. Robertson carried out a North American tour speaking on the topic of Scottish Home Rule and setting up branches of the League. Robertson was an Edinburgh councillor and played an active role in the local liberal association. He also served as a convener of the YSS' parliamentary committee 1907-1910. *The Scottish Nation* claimed that his tour was mentioned in over four hundred US publications and his meetings attended by over ten thousand people. Robertson later claimed that two thousand people had attended his meeting in Chicago. Sixteen thousand leaflets were said to have been distributed across the continent.<sup>28</sup> While it is possible some of these numbers were inflated, branches were successfully established in Toronto and Vancouver, Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle, St. Louis and Albany and aligned with the New York Scottish Home Rule Association.<sup>29</sup>

During his 12,700 mile tour Robertson advocated Scottish Home Rule as a part of a greater scheme of Home Rule All Round. Unlike some of the prominent members of the earlier SHRA, Robertson and the International Scottish Home Rule

---

<sup>26</sup> It should be noted that these circulation figures from periodicals of this time are notoriously unreliable. There existed then, as there does now, a strong tendency to overstate circulation in order to give the appearance of significance which might in turn lead to an increase in circulation. *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 140.

<sup>27</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 2 (1915), p. 242.

<sup>28</sup> 'First Annual Report of the International Scots Home Rule League', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 75.

<sup>29</sup> Coincidentally J.M. Hogge's Uncle served as president of the Toronto branch.



League took a more cooperative approach to Irish Home Rule. Robertson began his tour proclaiming that Irish Home Rule had been settled and claimed, ‘There is no doubt that Irish Home Rule will be granted within a year.’<sup>30</sup> From the existing reports of Robertson’s speeches in the North American press he focussed on easing the congestion of the present Parliament and increasing administrative efficiency. *The New York Times* reported that he said the people of Scotland were ‘practically unanimous for a change’ and he claimed that Scottish Home Rule had the support of sixty Scottish MPs.<sup>31</sup> Robertson lamented that the current arrangement of the Union was strangling the country:

Industry, prosperity, and natural development are throttled. Tens of thousands of the best young men of the country are leaving yearly because of these disadvantages, particularly, because they cannot get access to the land, large tracts of which are held for sport and other private and selfish interests against the public policy.<sup>32</sup>

Like many of the Scottish Home Rulers of the period Robertson argued that a National Legislature in Edinburgh would serve as a panacea to solve all of Scotland’s political and social problems. He later argued for it from a patriotic stand point proposing that ‘A Parliament in Edinburgh would revive the ancient glories of the capital, and infuse new life into the country. This is not a mere political question, it is a patriotic proposition in which Scots all over the world are legitimately interested.’<sup>33</sup>

As with many political movements, funding was frequently a problem for Scottish Home Rule groups. Irish Home Rulers had shown how effective those living outside Ireland could be at supplying funds to further their nationalist ambitions. Charles Stuart Parnell was able to raise £72,000 in North America in the opening three months of 1880.<sup>34</sup> It is not surprising that Scottish Home Rulers should try and imitate their success. James Hunter mentioned that John Murdoch had had previous success raising funds to support his paper *The Highlander*. Murdoch is said to have received a £2,000 donation from Dr William Carroll of Philadelphia in the hope of converting protestant Scotland and ultimately Ulster to Celticism and Home

---

<sup>30</sup> ‘Scotch Envoy Here to Boom Home Rule’, *The Sun*, (New York) 17 Aug. 1913, p. 7.

<sup>31</sup> ‘Tells Why Scots Want Home Rule’, *The New York Times*, 27 Sept. 1913, p. 22.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> F.J. Robertson, ‘America and Scotland’, *The Scottish Nation*, 2 (1915), p. 299.

<sup>34</sup> Jackson, *Home Rule*, p. 48.

Rule.<sup>35</sup> This loan put Murdoch in connection with American Fenians. Andrew Newby has noted that this connection with Fenianism stuck with Murdoch for several years and that in the 1880s highland connections with Irish agitation were largely condemned by the British public.<sup>36</sup>

Complaints about ‘American gold’ funding Irish Nationalism were made by Unionists throughout the Home Rule movement. One such complaint was lodged by the Unionist candidate, J.H. Watt, during the 1911 Glasgow Tradeston by-election.<sup>37</sup> Another can be seen two years later in an editorial featured in the Scotsman which exposed the danger of the alleged danger caused growing militancy of the Irish Nationalists.<sup>38</sup>

In 1887 the *Glasgow Herald* published letter received by Charles Waddie from Rio de Janeiro. The letter was signed by eleven Scotsmen living in the Rio and claimed satisfaction at hearing of the formation of the SHRA. The letter indicated that it had been accompanied by a donation to the association. It also claimed the sympathy of ‘the majority of Scotchmen in these parts, with the object aimed at’.<sup>39</sup>

The final sentence of the letter read:

With best wishes, therefore, that the day may not be far distant which Scottish legislation shall be conducted by and in the country (legislation which shall then be freed from the hindrance, delay and, to some extent, unnecessary expense from which it has so long suffered) which has always been, and we hope always shall be, noted for its patriotic and loyal subjects-loyal always to the best interests of the empire, whether in war or in peace, at home or abroad, and in the Parliament of Westminster or the Parliament of Edinburgh.<sup>40</sup>

It might here be worthy to note the difficulty associated with verifying such claims. Of course the claim that the majority of Scotsman in Rio support Scottish Home Rule should be treated with the scepticism which is applied to any statement of a small group claiming to speak on behalf much larger body. But there is also the difficulty presented by the source itself. The letter published in the *Glasgow Herald* was

---

<sup>35</sup> Hunter, ‘The Gaelic Connection’, p. 185.

<sup>36</sup> Newby, *Ireland, Radicalism and the Scottish Highlands*, pp. 38–40.

<sup>37</sup> ‘Tradeston By-Election Candidates on Home Rule’, *The Scotsman*, 28 June 1911, p. 10.

<sup>38</sup> *The Scotsman*, 15 June 1914, p. 8.

<sup>39</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 1 Nov. 1887, p. 8.

<sup>40</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 1 Nov. 1887, p. 8.

provided by Charles Waddie. Although there is no evidence to suggest that this letter is in anyway fraudulent it must be conceded that it would be incredibly difficult to verify its authenticity. Were the letter to be deemed fraudulent it still would provide valuable proof of Waddie's desire to represent an international element to the Scottish Home Rule movement.

In 1888, the SHRA sent Thomas M'Naught, the group's honorary colonial secretary, on a tour of the US and Canada for this purpose. His journey included New York, Salt Lake City, San Francisco, and parts of Canada.<sup>41</sup> He was successful in establishing branches in at least New York and Toronto. Although it is difficult to gauge the success of his journey, it at least received attention from the press and was announced in papers across the US and as far abroad as New Zealand.<sup>42</sup> The *New Zealand Tablet*, reported that the Association was hoping to raise the unlikely sum of £100,000 in order to contest every seat in the upcoming General Election.<sup>43</sup> The desire to raise funds abroad can also be seen in the nationalist literature created by the SHRA. Many of them contained an appeal addressed 'to the Scot who, enjoying himself the blessings of home rule may assist in restoring it to the dear fatherland'.<sup>44</sup> Appeals of this nature were also sent out to the empire and subsequently published in newspapers abroad:

In appealing to our countrymen scattered all over the world for pecuniary aid to enable us to fight our battle for political freedom, it is only reasonable we should state facts to justify our appeal. They might well say why should we be asked to contribute? Is Scotland not rich enough to bear her own burdens? We admit that Scotland, according to her population, is a rich country, but the common people who have begun the great struggle for National Self-Government are poor. We have to fight a battle, not only with the richest country in the world, but with nearly all the nobility and well-to-do classes in Scotland arrayed against us. Scotsmen, do you love your country?-- We know you do! Are the name and fame of this nursery of brave men to be extinguished? Colonies, we have sent to you strong men

---

<sup>41</sup> 'Condensed Telegrams', *The Los Angeles Daily Herald*, 6 Sept. 1888, p. 6.

<sup>42</sup> 'The San Francisco Mail', *Otago Daily Times*, 16 Oct. 1888, p. 3.

<sup>43</sup> 'American Notes', *New Zealand Tablet*, 26 Oct. 1888, p. 3. The *New Zealand Tablet* in particular seems to have taken a keen interest in Scottish Home Rule. The *New Zealand Tablet* was a Catholic periodical which was published weekly from 1872 through to the mid 1990s. The paper's founder Patrick Moran was the first Catholic Bishop of Dunedin and during his time as editor Irish Nationalism received generous attention.

<sup>44</sup> William Mitchell, 'Is Scotland to be Sold Again?', Edinburgh: SHRA, 1892, p. 1.

with strong brains, and they have made their mark wherever they have gone--can you do without them, well would the world be richer or poorer by the extinction of Scottish nationality?<sup>45</sup>

Appeals to Scots living abroad by the SHRA had at least some modest effect. In 1892 the Scottish National Association of Victoria (previously known as Scottish Home Rule Association of Victoria), formed by Theodore Napier in 1891, sent £205 to the SHRA.<sup>46</sup> Napier was born in Australia during the mid 1840s. As a young man he moved to Scotland where he attended the University of Edinburgh before he temporarily returned to Australia. At the founding of the Victoria-based association Napier personally pledged £100 annually.<sup>47</sup>

The International Scots Home Rule League also appealed to Scots abroad for funds, most notably to Andrew Carnegie, who is said to have interviewed Hector Macpherson to discuss the issue in 1913.<sup>48</sup> Andrew Carnegie had long experience dealing with Home Rule. His biographer Joseph Wall has noted that as early as 1886 he was encouraging the idea of federal home rule in conversations with Gladstone.<sup>49</sup> In his autobiography Carnegie claimed to have always suggested that Britain follow America's example:

one Parliament and local legislatures (not parliaments) for Ireland, Scotland and Wales. These should be made states like New York and Virginia. But as Britain has no Supreme Court, as we have, to decide upon laws passed, not only by state legislatures but by Congress, the judicial being the final authority and not the political, Britain should have Parliament as the one national final authority over Irish measures. Therefore, the acts of local legislature of Ireland should lie for three months' continuous session upon the table of the House of Commons, subject to adverse action of the House, but becoming operative unless disapproved. The provision would be a dead letter unless improper legislation were enacted, but if there were improper legislation, the it would be salutary. The clause, I said, was needed to assure timid people that no secession could arise.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule Association', *North Otago Times*, 21 July 1891, p. 4.

<sup>46</sup> Graeme Morton, 'Returning Nationalists, Returning Scotland: James Grant and Theodore Napier', in Mario Varricchio (ed.), *Back to Caledonia: Scottish Homecomings from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012, p. 126.

<sup>47</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule: Formation of Local Association', *The Argus*, 19 Sept. 1891, p. 12.

<sup>48</sup> 'Tells Why Scots Want Home Rule', *The New York Times*, 27 Sept. 1913.

<sup>49</sup> Joseph Frazier Wall, *Andrew Carnegie*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 440.

<sup>50</sup> Andrew Carnegie, *Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920, pp. 327–328.

This was an interesting solution to the question of Home Rule. It is likely that it would have satisfied the desires of many of the Scottish Home Rulers of the pre-war period. Although most would have preferred the devolved legislature be titled a parliament, very few, a notable exception being Marion Smith of the New York Scottish Home Rule Association, called for pure sovereignty. John Morley, Chief Secretary for Ireland 1886 and 1892-1895, and intimate of both men informed Carnegie that such similar terms had been offered to Parnell, but they had been rejected.<sup>51</sup> In September 1887 he spoke of Home Rule on very similar grounds at a meeting held at St Andrew's Hall Glasgow. The speech was reproduced in pamphlet form under the title, *Home Rule in America*. In this document Carnegie focussed on the applicability of the American system of federalism to the United Kingdom. Although the speech was centred on democratising the House of Lords and relieving the difficulties of the Irish Question, Carnegie did not fail to mention Scotland; and noted that when Scotland and Ireland received Home Rule they must have 'the control of the highest function, and the very essential<sup>52</sup> of all Government, namely the right to execute justice and administer the laws among her own citizens'.<sup>53</sup> His discussion was followed by a speech of thanks by the Rev. David Macrae, who also speaking of Home Rule said, 'we need it for Ireland, and we want it for Scotland'.<sup>54</sup> Macrae rejoiced that Carnegie's time in America had 'not taken away his love for the old country and the glorious old nationality which we boast'.<sup>55</sup> This love of Scotland and preservation of nationality is exactly the feelings which the SHRA and the International Scots Home Rule League sought to tap into when recruiting in America.

On at least two occasions in 1902 he won the appreciation of many patriotic Scots by protesting against the misuse of the term England for Britain.<sup>56</sup> Whether or not Macpherson was able to obtain material support from Carnegie a decade later is

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 328.

<sup>52</sup> \*Possible typo in original.

<sup>53</sup> Andrew Carnegie, *Home Rule in America: A Political address delivered in St. Andrew's Halls on Tuesday, 13 September 1887*, Glasgow: Glasgow Junior Liberal Association, 1887, pp. 33-34.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., p. 44.

<sup>56</sup> 'Freedom of Perth to Mr Carnegie', *The Scotsman* 9 Oct. 1902, p. 8; 'St Andrews and Distinguished Scotsmen', *The Scotsman*, 19 July 1902, p. 11.

not immediately evident but it may be mentioned that Carnegie's praises were highly sung in an article featured in *The Scottish Nation* the following spring.<sup>57</sup> In May 1914 the International Scots Home Rule League reported only modest contributions from branches abroad including £5 from Albany and £20 from the Scottish Home Rule Association of New York.<sup>58</sup> Shortly after, its fundraising efforts were mobilised for the War and relief of those injured whether through combat or dislocation.<sup>59</sup> Even these were done on what might be considered nationalistic lines. Following the revelation that the Prince of Wales Relief fund would be governed by a London Committee *The Scottish Nation* advised that those wishing to support Scottish veterans should donate to the Scottish Veterans Garden City Association which is exclusively Scottish. In the spring, *The Scottish Nation* proudly reported that in New York, Albany and Colorado Springs, Scottish Societies had succeeded in raising funds for this scheme.<sup>60</sup> The following month an appeal for the Association was used as the cover image for *The Scottish Nation*.<sup>61</sup>

While financial contributions to the International Scots Home Rule League from abroad may have been modest, overseas members contributed intellectual support by supplying articles for *The Scottish Nation*. The secretary of the Scottish Home Rule Association in Melbourne, J.M. Watson, served as a frequent contributor to *The Scottish Nation*. In the midst of the First World War he wrote:

Amidst carnage and death, the War has given new life to old ideals. Nothing could be finer than the spontaneous display of practical patriotism throughout the Empire[.]...Shall the reward for this unstinted sacrifice be merely a country depleted of its best manhood, and therefore less able to assert itself against its numerically stronger co-partner? Shall the principle for which the War is fought apply only to Belgians, Serbians and Poles? Shall trust and confidence and loyalty only characterise the far distant sections of our Empire... The Empire will be stronger when each section ministers to its own local

---

<sup>57</sup> Hector Macpherson, 'Dr Andrew Carnegie: Pioneer of International Peace', *Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), pp. 83–84.

<sup>58</sup> 'International Scots: News from Afar', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 110.

<sup>59</sup> The three associations which received the most publication space were the Scottish Veterans' Garden City Association, The Russian Jews Relief Fund and the Russian Flag Day Fund. Full page advertisements for these groups appeared in almost every issue of *The Scottish Nation* for the rest of its duration.

<sup>60</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 3 (1916), p. 355.

<sup>61</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 3 (1916), p. 357.

needs, and there stirs within it the healthy promptings of racial aspiration.<sup>62</sup>

Notions regarding the rights of small nations are one of the central themes of several of the horrible conflicts of the twentieth century. The world was so virulent that war could be waged in the name of protecting Belgium's of the world. But it could also be used within a country as means of justifying violence for the sake of independence. This point was made in Ireland in 1916 with chilling effect. *The Scottish Nation* was not insulated from the event and asking for opinions on the matter claimed that 'Something of that spirit is developing in Scotland to-day, but on saner lines.'<sup>63</sup> What was meant by the expression 'saner lines' is certainly open to interpretation but it may be said with almost certainty that in Scotland there was no danger of violence emerging from the desire from Scottish Home Rule. As Hanham has noted Erskine Mar, who edited *Guth na Bliadhna* backed the Dublin rising.<sup>64</sup> The lethal activities and plots of some Irish nationalists in North America during the late nineteenth century has recently received useful discussion by Nial Whelehan.<sup>65</sup> These events serve as a striking example of how differently nationalism may be expressed even within one country. In the case of Scotland the threat of riot or violence over Scottish Home Rule would have been more likely to draw laughter than fear. But nevertheless these speeches and pamphlets by Scottish Home Rulers show that they were aware of the greater outside movement for the rights of small nations and sought to express Scotland's claim for self government within this framework.

The hope that the War would spark a new level of patriotism and desire for Scottish Home Rule was not uncommon in the pages of *The Scottish Nation*. By 1917 Hector Macpherson claimed that the war had 'instead of making the Home Rule demand less urgent, has made it more urgent. We have seen London encroaching more and more upon the liberties of Scotland With disastrous results. Scotland is being treated as a suburb of England...'.<sup>66</sup> A regular contributor of

---

<sup>62</sup> J.M. Watson, 'Local Self-Government: The Race Spirit', *The Scottish Nation*, 3 (1915), p. 323.

<sup>63</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 3 (1916), p. 394.

<sup>64</sup> Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 136.

<sup>65</sup> Niall Whelehan, *The Dynamiters Irish Nationalism and Political Violence in the Wider World, 1867-1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

<sup>66</sup> Hector Macpherson, 'The Imperial Outlook', *The Scottish Nation*, 4 (1917), p. 401.

‘Political Notes’, Ian Leng, said ‘If it is necessary to fight for the independence of Belgium, it is quite as necessary to work for the independence of Scotland.’<sup>67</sup> James Hogge echoed the sentiment asking, ‘We are fighting on the plains of Flanders to restore nationality to small countries. We ask you to fight to restore Scotland’s political nationality.’<sup>68</sup> After the War Hogge would argue that:

The experience of war, particularly of the control of various government departments over Scottish business itself, has probably made more converts to a system of Scottish home rule than all the speeches that have ever been made on Scottish platforms; or by decisions we have taken here (in the House of Commons).<sup>69</sup>

In the December of 1915 the *Edinburgh Evening News* made a similar claim stating that ‘Many more Scottish home Rulers have been made by the War than in the times preceding it.’<sup>70</sup> Evaluating the validity of this claim would be a difficult task. One might point to the reestablishment of the Scottish Home Rule Association in 1918 as evidence supporting the argument. Whatever the effects of the War on Scottish Home Rulers was, it was not enough to carry *The Scottish Nation* and the periodical which had reduced itself to bi-monthly publication in 1916 ceased publication altogether in 1917.<sup>71</sup> The New York Scottish Home Rule Association met a similar fate and suspended its activities 14 November 1917.<sup>72</sup>

The effect of the War on the Scottish Home Rule movement is interesting. As mentioned above by Robertson, in the spring of 1914 it seemed the passage of Irish Home Rule was almost a certainty. Home Rule All Round, was a logical follow through and was supported by a large majority of Scottish MPs. Yet after the War this pre-war success was not consolidated. There were of renewed signs of life, such as the formation of the Scottish Home Rule Association, but the devolution of a Scottish Parliament, which in 1914 seemed imminent, was not to come for decades. Although a topic so embracing as the effects of the Great War on Scottish nationalism is too large to be dealt with here it is worth mentioning that pre-war

---

<sup>67</sup> Ian Leng, ‘Political Notes’, *The Scottish Nation*, 2 (1915), p. 310.

<sup>68</sup> James Hogge, ‘The Scottish National Club’, *The Scottish Nation*, 3 (1916), p. 353.

<sup>69</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 19 Apr. 1920, vol. 128, c. 2076; quoted in Richard Finlay, p. 71.

<sup>70</sup> ‘The Parliament Bill’, *Edinburgh Evening News*, 10 Dec. 1915.

<sup>71</sup> Another pre-war patriotic periodical, *The Thistle*, ceased publication shortly after *The Scottish Nation* in 1918.

<sup>72</sup> *The Caledonian*, 17 (1917), p. 380.



Scottish Home Rulers remained active for the early years of the War. As far as many of the most active were concerned, the experience of the War added to Scotland's claims rather than diminished them. Of course the cessation of their activities demonstrates that they were unable to maintain themselves, but it should not however be assumed that individual interest was lost. It is interesting to think that while the Great War was touted as the great struggle for the rights small nations, for those who desired Scottish Home Rule, it swept away their most realistic chance of securing it in their lifetime.

It is difficult to assess the activity of the newly established branches of the International Scots Home Rule League. It is likely that many of them were not very active and relied heavily on the individual efforts of a few members. Many of them passed resolutions in favour of Scottish Home Rule which were subsequently delivered to the Prime Minister, Scottish Secretary or the Lord Advocate. The Vancouver branch even succeeded in gaining the support of other local Scottish Societies. The secretary of the branch, John Grant, reported resolutions in favour of Scottish Home Rule being adopted by Vancouver branches of the Sons of Scotland, Gaelic Society, Orkney and Shetland Society, Ayrshire Society, Clan Maclean Society, St Andrews Society, Scottish Borderers' Union and the Caledonia Society.<sup>73</sup> The St. Louis branch also showed signs of activity especially in the case of its secretary Walter Macintyre. In an article submitted to *The Scottish Nation* he put forth the case for Scottish Home Rule along the traditional lines promising that if successful, Scotsmen in America and Canada would rejoice as deeply as those living in Scotland:

A wave of rejoicing will go all over the world when Scotland is actually free to go into business on her own account, free to repair, remodel, improve, or abolish any part of the business in need of such attention, and be amenable to her own people only, instead of the conditions existing now and in the past, where the neighbours are in charge, and their permission and approval are the foundations of all movement. This condition has existed so long that generations have lived and passed, without, apparently, recognizing the fact that, though nominally free and unrestricted, they were unequally yoked

---

<sup>73</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 64 and 1 (1914), p. 94.

with their neighbours, and that all the advantages of the Union were on the other side.<sup>74</sup>

He went on to describe the situation as ‘unjust’ to Scotland and equally injurious to England. He also mentioned the easing of parliamentary congestion as a benefit of establishing a Scottish legislature. While the ultimate influence of Macintyre’s article on the establishment of a Scottish legislature may have been negligible, it is worth noting because it is an example of a Scottish-American thinking and writing about the Scottish nationalist ideas. Although it would perhaps not merit Robertson’s claim that the call for a Scottish Parliament no longer came from a country but a race, it would have been a welcome endorsement of the League’s efforts to make Scottish Home Rule an issue to Scots living abroad.<sup>75</sup>

The New York Scottish Home Rule Association was particularly active. It was formed in July 1912 and thus predated the International Scots Home Rule League.<sup>76</sup> When Robertson conducted his North American tour the Association chose to affiliate with the league. In September 1912 one of their meetings received a speech by Dr William Chapple.<sup>77</sup> His motion for Scottish Home Rule had won a majority of ninety-eight earlier that year.<sup>78</sup> It was reported in the *New York Times* under the title ‘Scotland’s Champion to Speak Here’.<sup>79</sup> He spoke on Scottish Home Rule and argued that even if there were not parliamentary congestion, Scotland would still deserve a parliament on national grounds. He claimed that Scots had their own characteristics, point of view, and temperament, and thus deserved to have legislation framed by Scots. Furthermore, he argued that if Scotland had its own parliament it would lead the world in social reforms and would not suffer from many of the ‘social evils’ of the day.<sup>80</sup>

It seems that Dr Chapple kept in touch with the Association. He wrote to them months later to say that the movement was progressing favourably ‘but a little

---

<sup>74</sup> Walter Macintyre, ‘Scottish Americans and Scotland’, *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 39.

<sup>75</sup> Robertson, ‘The Call of A Race’, p. 4.

<sup>76</sup> *The Caledonian*, 12 (1912), p. 154.

<sup>77</sup> Dr William Chapple was an MP for Stirlingshire 1910-1918 and Dumfriesshire 1922-1924.

<sup>78</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule in New York’, *The Thistle*, 4 (1912), pp. 181–182.

<sup>79</sup> ‘Scotland’s Champion to Speak Here’, *The New York Times*, 9 Sept. 2012, p. 20.

<sup>80</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule in New York’, pp. 181–182.

cash would assist them very materially at the present moment'.<sup>81</sup> A committee to secure funds for such purpose was established and circulars were sent but it is not evident how much money was able to be raised. At one point the group held monthly meetings at Hotel M'Alpin in New York City. Although the attendance of such meetings was usually reported in vague terms, at least one meeting in 1916 was alleged to have had about three hundred present.<sup>82</sup> Such high attendance may have been benefitted by accompanying entertainment and refreshments. The group frequently hosted concerts and other performances of Scottish culture. There is also evidence that the group met with and delivered talks before other Scottish Societies in the area, such as the Clan MacDuff Society and the New York Highlanders.<sup>83</sup> It also arranged to sell copies of *60 Points for Scottish Home Rule* for five cents a copy at subway newsstands.<sup>84</sup> In 1915 there was even some discussion of establishing a Scottish theatre to promote Scottish plays with funding from wealthy backers in the association.<sup>85</sup> The plan was led by Duncan MacDougall, an actor and theatrical instructor, with the hope of establishing a 1,200 seat theatre, but it seems the plan was quietly abandoned.<sup>86</sup>

The group also took an active part in the 1914 Bannockburn 600<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration in New York. It was reported, in the *New York Times*, that the event overflowed Carnegie Hall and left hundreds on the street outside gathered to listen to sound of bagpipes.<sup>87</sup> The event was organised by a Bannockburn Committee, composed of members from various Scottish organisations in New York including: the New York Scottish Highlanders, Caledonian Club, New York Scottish Society, Celtic Society, Skye Association, the Lewis Association and the New York Scottish Home Rule Association.<sup>88</sup> American poet and active member of the International Scots Home Rule League, James Kennedy, delivered a patriotic poem which was well received and much of which was subsequently published in *The New York*

---

<sup>81</sup> *The Caledonian*, 12 (1913), p. 443.

<sup>82</sup> *The Caledonian*, 16 (1916), p. 88.

<sup>83</sup> *The Caledonian*, 12 (1912), p. 184 and 12 (1912), p. 389.

<sup>84</sup> *The Caledonian*, 13 (1913), p. 71.

<sup>85</sup> 'New York to Have Scotch Theater', *The El Paso Herald*, 10 Apr. 1915, p. 2.

<sup>86</sup> 'Scotch Theatre in New York?', *New-York Tribune*, 4 Apr. 1915, p. 2.

<sup>87</sup> 'The Scots Here to Celebrate the 600<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Bannockburn', *The New York Times*, 21 June 1914, (section 5) p. 2.

<sup>88</sup> 'The Scots Cheer Bannockburn', *The New York Times*, 25 June 1914, p. 9.

*Times*. Kennedy was also a member of the New York Scottish Home Rule Association and president of the New York Burns Society. A well known Scottish singer Hamish Mackay appeared dressed in costume and sang patriotic songs which included “Scots Wha Hae”. Mackay had taken a keen interest in Scottish Home Rule and *The Scottish Nation* was very disappointed to announce his death aboard the *Lusitania*.<sup>89</sup> Letters and telegrams of support were also read from Scottish MPs, and the YSS.<sup>90</sup>

The New York Scottish Home Rule Association’s most outspoken member was its secretary Marion A. Smith. Miss Smith was not afraid to appeal for Home Rule passionately on patriotic and emotional grounds. Some of her statements would not have been uncharacteristic of the antics of the eccentric Jacobite Scottish Home Ruler Theodore Napier. In 1914 she wrote a letter to *The New York Times* decrying her perceived misapprehension as to the Scottish nature of the King’s own Scottish Borderers, calling them ‘the scum of regiments’ for their role in pursuing Bonnie Prince Charlie after the ‘45 uprising.<sup>91</sup> This claim was subsequently challenged in the paper by the president of the Scottish Home Rule Association of New York, Dr Angus Sinclair. Writing also to the editor of the *New York Times*, Dr Sinclair claimed that although they may have pursued the Jacobites, which he referred to as a ‘miserable crowd’ it was in the direct line of duty in defence of the British People.<sup>92</sup> This exchange highlights the way in which memories of historical events could be interpreted very differently, even by the secretary and president of a Scottish Home Rule group. The President of the SHRA and the Jacobite Scottish Home Ruler Theodore Napier had a similar disagreement over their interpretation of the Stuarts. Responding to a favourable biography of Napier published in *The Scottish Patriot*, Waddie remarked:

Napier’s eccentricities have done incalculable harm to the cause of Scottish Home Rule. One example will be enough for my purpose. Not long ago he placed a wreath on the statue of Charles II in Parliament Square. Those who know anything of history know what a

---

<sup>89</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 2 (1915), p. 286.

<sup>90</sup> Unfortunately the names of whom were not reported subsequently reported, *The Caledonian*, 14 (1914), p. 167.

<sup>91</sup> ‘Scot Regiment Not Scotch’, *The New York Times*, 29 July 1914, p. 5.

<sup>92</sup> ‘The Scottish Borderers’, *The Scotsman*, 31 July 1914, p. 8.

profligate wretch he was—the worst monarch that ever sat on the British Throne, and a cruel tyrant to the Scottish Covenanters, the patron of the Bloody Clavers. There is only one weapon which the enemies of Scottish Home Rule can use and that is ridicule...<sup>93</sup>

Marion Smith continued to press for Scottish Home Rule during the war years. Although she left the Scottish Home Rule Association of New York in 1916 she continued her activity within the International Scots Home Rule League. In 1917 she established a Scottish Nationalist Committee. The committee proposed to launch a nationwide campaign ‘devoted to the cause of the independence of Scotland’. Acting as the group’s secretary she announced:

Our purpose is to associate ourselves whole-heartedly with Scots in the homeland who for their common object the reassertion of the sovereign rights<sup>94</sup> of the ancient Scottish nation. It is planned to present a national protest at the International congress to be held after the war, which will embrace the following: Protest against the exclusion of Scotland, which, notwithstanding any pretended act to the contrary, is now, as she ever was, a sovereign State, and, as such has an indefeasible right to send her own representatives to any international congress... Protest against the pretended right of England to appear and speak, in name, and in behalf of Scotland at any international congress.<sup>95</sup>

Reports of the initial formation of the campaign reached as far as Texas however the Committee’s subsequent activities, if existent, appear to have gone unnoticed by the press. Smith also served as a secretary of the League for Small and Subject Nationalities.<sup>96</sup> The league was established in 1917 following Presidents Wilson’s pronouncements in favour of a League of Nations. The League for Small and Subject Nationalities’ president was the Commissioner of Immigration of New York City and former Ohio State Senator, Dr Frederick C. Howe. The chief aim of the League was to ‘establish a permanent congress of small and subject nationalities, to assert their right to separate representation at international conferences, and to emphasize the importance of granting their rights as an indispensable condition of world peace in

---

<sup>93</sup> ‘Correspondence’, *The Scottish Patriot*, 2 (1904), p. 60.

<sup>94</sup> It is worth noting that Smith uses the word Sovereign here. This work is unusual in the Scottish Home Rule movement and many, such as Waddie, would not question the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament within the United Kingdom.

<sup>95</sup> ‘Urges Scots to Unite: Committee Plans Wide Propaganda In Favour of Nationalism’, *The Scotsman*, 27 July 1917, p. 9.

<sup>96</sup> ‘Scots Work for freedom’, *El Paso Herald*, 27 July 1917, p. 9.

the future'.<sup>97</sup> From the outset the League was accused of being pro-German and its first conference attracted negative attention when several of the speakers scheduled backed out amid claims of pro-Germanism.<sup>98</sup> This reputation seems to have persisted after the war and several of its members including Fredrick C. Howe were included in a list published by the Senate Judiciary Sub Committee of individuals who had been against US entry into the war and subsequently were subject to close surveillance throughout the war by the Bureau of Military Intelligence and the Justice Division of International Relations.<sup>99</sup>

Marion A. Smith defended the league against such accusations and claimed the accusations were the result of a typographical error by a printer, which claimed that a speaker would discuss 'Independence for Alsace-Lorraine' instead of 'Justice for Alsace-Lorraine'.<sup>100</sup> Smith claimed that the purpose of the league was not to urge the independence of any nation, Scotland included, but rather to hear from their representatives their grievances and their hopes for the future. In Scotland, Hogge made a similar claim:

Our best chance as Scotsmen to secure self-government for Scotland would arise as part and parcel of the great Imperial Conference which is to be called together after the war. It was absolutely impossible to give Australia or New Zealand—countries that had a less population than Scotland—the right or the honour to govern the British Empire if Scotland still remained governed from London.<sup>101</sup>

This statement again reflects the notion of some Scottish Home Rulers, that the War had affirmed the rights of small nations. President Wilson was seen as a source of hope for those who sought self-government or self determination. When Wilson arrived in Europe to discuss peace at the close of 1918 he was met with claims from Albanians, Croatians, Estonians, and Ukrainians. Catalan and Irish Nationalists also petitioned for independence from Spain and Britain respectively.<sup>102</sup> Scottish Home Rulers were also keen to press Scotland's case. One of the first acts of the newly

---

<sup>97</sup> 'Today's Events', *The Public Ledger*, 29 Oct. 1917, p. 2.

<sup>98</sup> 'Quit Convention for Small Nations', *The New York Times*, 29 Oct. 1913, p. 9.

<sup>99</sup> 'Senators Name Educators who were Anti-War', *The Sun* (NY), 15 Jan. 1919, p. 3.

<sup>100</sup> 'Quit Convention for Small Nations', *The New York Times*, 29 Oct. 1913, p. 9.

<sup>101</sup> 'Mr Hogge Says Neglect of Scottish Affairs is Due to Scotland's Hospitality', *Dundee Courier*, 30 Sept. 1916, p. 2.

<sup>102</sup> Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Movement: Self-Determination and Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 59–60.

reformed Scottish Home Rule Association was to send a memorial to Wilson on the subject of Scottish Home Rule. The memorialists appreciated the promotion of self-determination which they saw in Wilson's famous Fourteen Points:

You base the political relationships of nations or peoples upon the free acceptance of that settlement, by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a difference settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery. Scotland is one of the oldest States in Europe, and although the Parliaments of Scotland and England were incorporated in 1707, neither country gave up its nationality or sovereignty. For many years the Scottish people have felt the need for the restoration of the Scots Parliament, and recent events have shown this to be a vital necessity for the future welfare and progress of the Scottish people.<sup>103</sup>

This statement is notable for several reasons. First, we again see the use of the word 'sovereignty' which had been conspicuously absent from discussions of Scottish Home Rule before the First World War. It also shows that Scottish Home Rulers were aware of wider political and nationalist movements and they sought to put forward Scotland's claim in similar form to nationalists of other European countries at the time, although it might be claimed with less of a popular mandate. Finally a word should be said about the memorialists themselves. The document was signed by, Joseph F. Duncan, the hon. Secretary of the Scottish Farm Servants Union, Thomas Johnston, the editor of the progressive Labour magazine *Forward*, W.H. Kirkwood, James Maxton, and Robert Smillie President of the Miners Federation of Great Britain.<sup>104</sup> The *Aberdeen Daily Journal* scornfully described them as bolshevists. While the merits of that claim could warrant long discussion, their names do indicate a transition in the Scottish Home Rule movement. While Labour members such as Keir Hardie, Robert Smillie, and even Ramsay MacDonald had all taken part of the previous SHRA, they were only occasionally active. This memorial, however, seems largely to be at the behest of men closely attached to the Labour Movement.

Although the arguments of International Scottish Home Rulers, like Marion A. Smith featured evocative language that played on notions of patriotism, they

---

<sup>103</sup> 'Scottish Home Rule: A Memorial to President Wilson', *Aberdeen Daily Journal*, 26 Dec. 1918, p. 3.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

could also made mention of practical issues like depopulation in the Highlands. In a speech before the New York Scottish Home Rule Association Marion Smith said, 'Scotland has seen her stalwart sons depart, and her hills no longer echo to the sound of the children's voices.'<sup>105</sup> As far back as the Crofters' Movement of the mid 1880s a link can be seen between Scottish Home Rulers and land reform. G.B. Clark was a president of both the SHRA and the Highland Land Law Reform Association. Scottish education was another practical issue of concern for Marion A. Smith. Again speaking before a meeting of the New York Scottish Home Rule Association in 1916 she also advocated Scottish Home Rule as a method of giving control of its education back to Scotland and proposed setting up a Scottish history reading group as it was felt that an understanding of history would help better understand the present movement for Scottish Nationality.<sup>106</sup> Miss Smith kept in frequent contact with the International Scots Home Rule League and *The Scottish Nation* often published her articles and correspondence. In one such article she urged Scots living abroad to take up the cause saying:

We have prided ourselves on the positions which we Scots have held not only throughout the British Empire, but throughout the world...Unless we are true Scots, we are not good citizens in any land. To us, Home Rule in Scotland is not a political, but a moral issue... We ask every Scot at home and abroad to stand together for this reform. Think not it is for the generation of to-day who people Scotland. No, it is to preserve the Scotland of the past that is dear to us in song and story, and for the sake of giving Scotland of the future the right to work out her own destiny.<sup>107</sup>

*The Scottish Nation* agreed with this sentiment, one month publishing the excess of births over deaths next to the excess of emigrants over immigrants in 1913 finding an increase of only 1309. The author blamed the current handling of Scotland's affairs and posited, 'Surely a fact like this ought to wake up every true Scotsman to feverish energy for a Home Rule Parliament.'<sup>108</sup> It is worth noting that this figure from *The Scottish Nation* was quoted in the May 1914 second reading of

---

<sup>105</sup> Marion A. Smith, 'The Scot Abroad', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 58.

<sup>106</sup> Reported in: *The Scottish Nation*, 3 (1916), p. 355.

<sup>107</sup> Smith, 'The Scot Abroad', p. 58.

<sup>108</sup> Ruther Craik, 'Thistledown', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1913), p. 104.



James Macpherson's Government of Scotland Bill.<sup>109</sup> James Macpherson attached similar significance to the figures stating:

This alarming flow of emigration must be stopped. It is draining the country of its best blood. The vast majority of these people have no desire to leave their country, and if land legislation were passed in accordance with the long expressed wish of the Scottish people and along Scottish lines, as it could undoubtedly be in a Scots Parliament, we should not now be confronted with the deplorable facts such as these. Not only are they not encouraged to attach themselves to the land of their fathers, but the industrious population who toil valiantly by sea suffer by the depredations of the illegal trawler.<sup>110</sup>

Although these interpretations of forced emigration have been increasingly challenged by historians from the late twentieth century onwards they were very much alive at the time. In his 1912 motion for Scottish Home Rule Dr Chapple also spoke passionately on the topic saying:

[Scotland] has seen her country depopulated by an outward stream of emigration owing to her iniquitous land laws. I am one of those who believe that people ought to be free to migrate as they will and where they will, but I believe, also, that no people should be forced to leave their country because of the injustice of the laws under which they live. There has been an unwilling and a reluctant emigration from the country districts of Scotland. She has seen depopulation going on, but she has been powerless to stop it. She has seen deer take the place of men. She has seen her education system, which is her pride, hampered by a bureaucratic control in London instead of being controlled by a local Parliament in Edinburgh.<sup>111</sup>

This theme also appeared in William Cowan's Government of Scotland Bill 1912.<sup>112</sup> It featured during Dr G.B. Clark's first resolution in favour of Scottish Home Rule in 1889, when the socialist leaning MP Robert Cunninghame Graham, replied to the suggestion that emigration be used as an effective solution land question. Graham said that if any candidate who went in front of an audience of his constituency and suggested that the crofters emigrate en masse would be 'met by the suggestion that some of the landlords and capitalists of the country could be emigrated with much greater benefit to the country'.<sup>113</sup> Research by such eminent historians as Tom Devine has convincingly shown that that by this period (1875-

<sup>109</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 1475.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>111</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, c. 1449.

<sup>112</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, c. 477.

<sup>113</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 9 Apr. 1889, vol. 335, c. 89.

1914) Scottish emigrants to America were frequently drawn by higher wages and economic opportunity rather than by coercion, ‘grinding poverty’ or a subsistence crisis which characterised highland emigration in the earlier part of the century.<sup>114</sup> Nevertheless, it is still interesting to see how perceptions of emigration featured in arguments for Scottish Home Rule. Another notable aspect of the 1914 debate regarding the international side of Scottish Home Rule was James Macpherson acknowledging that in the three weeks prior to moving the Bill be read for a second time, he had received resolutions from voteless societies in Vancouver and elsewhere in Canada and America urging the Government to give Scotland Home Rule.<sup>115</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, published one such resolution which was passed by the New York Scottish Home Rule Association about six months earlier:

That we deem it our duty as it is our privilege to raise our voice in protest against the continuance of this condition and, in common with our countrymen at home and abroad, we earnestly recommend that the local affairs appertain to Scotland devolve on a legislative body to be established in that country, and the work of such body to be confined to questions that shall alone concern the better government of Scotland, always having in mind the unity and integrity of the British Empire, and to accomplish this end we pledge ourselves to exert every laudable effort becoming those of the people of Scotland who have gone abroad and who have experienced the benefits to be derived from a ready and elastic Federation of States each with its local Parliament and each contributing to the upbuilding and sustaining of a great and prosperous and united people.<sup>116</sup>

Although the impact of these resolutions may certainly be called into question they do serve to indicate that societies in the United States and Canada had taken an active interest in the political relationship between Scotland and the rest of the United Kingdom.

### **Australia and New Zealand**

Having discussed Scottish Home Rule efforts in North America it is worth discussing Australia’s contributions. Malcolm Prentis has demonstrated that Scots in Australia played a crucial role in the political life of the country. Indeed he argues

---

<sup>114</sup> T.M. Devine, *To the Ends of the Earth: Scotland’s Global Diaspora*, London: Penguin, 2011, p. 144.

<sup>115</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 15 May 1914, vol. 62, c. 1476.

<sup>116</sup> *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 44.

that Scots or people of Scottish origin made up a disproportionate number of representatives, relative to their population, in the respective house of Parliament for New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria.<sup>117</sup> He partly attributed this feature to the fact that ‘the Irish were clustered at the lower end of the socio economic scale’.<sup>118</sup> As Murray Pittock and H.J. Hanham have noted an enthusiasm for Scotland’s great patriotic figure of the fourteenth century William Wallace rekindled in Scotland during the mid-nineteenth century and eventually spread to Scots in the colonies. A monument erected in 1889 to William Wallace in Ballarat, Australia was said to have cost £1000, and went on to become a ‘focal point for Scottish Nationalism in Australia’.<sup>119</sup> The two most obvious Australian figures of Scottish nationalism during this period were T.D. Wanliss and the eccentric Theodore Napier. Wanliss was from Ballarat and had been a politician in Victoria before coming to Scotland. His journal, *The Thistle*, ran from 1909 to 1918. Although *The Thistle* did not rise to the Jacobite heights of its contemporary periodical, *The Fiery Cross*, Wanliss was not above portraying the English in a negative light. This can be seen clearly in the antagonistic language used in the fourth item of the programme of nationalism advocated in *The Thistle*:

1. To Uphold the National Honour of Scotland
2. To foster and encourage, as the chief means thereto, the patriotism of the Scottish people at Home and Abroad
3. To secure for the Scottish people the entire control of their own Scottish affairs, under the aegis of the British Constitution. In other words, HOME RULE FOR SCOTLAND.
4. To expose, resent, and resist by every legitimate means the insidious and continuous encroachments that are made year by year, and day by day, by insolent, arrogant, and ignorant Englishmen on the National Rights and the National Honour of Scotland, as established by the treaty of Union of 1706.<sup>120</sup>

The language of these objectives clearly demonstrates a nationalistic impulse behind its call for Scottish Home Rule. Phrases such as ‘upholding National Honour’ fit well

---

<sup>117</sup> Malcolm D. Prentis, *The Scots in Australia: A study of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, 1788-1900*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1983, p. 136.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 137.

<sup>119</sup> Murray Pittock, *The Invention of Scotland*, London: Routledge, 1991, p. 116.

<sup>120</sup> *The Thistle*, 4 (1912); also quoted in Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 129.

with the definition of nationalism provided by Kennedy which described nationalism as a project which ‘seeks an arrangement in which the status of the nation is politically and/or culturally enhanced.’<sup>121</sup>

Like Wanliss, Napier also published a nationalist paper. The *Fiery Cross* ran from 1901 to 1912 and advocated Scottish Home Rule on a federal or Home Rule All Round basis. It was unique for the way in which it blended contemporary politics with ideas which were considered archaic, even by the nostalgic standards of SHRA. In the paper’s long list of objectives, the restoration of a Scottish Parliament appears just below the demand for the restoration of the Stuart heir, Princess Ludwig of Bavaria or, as Napier referred to her, Queen Mary III of Scotland, England, France and Ireland. The land question in the Highlands is dealt with in similar fashion by suggesting a return to the ancient clan system. Napier’s unconventional ideas could cause division within Scottish Home Rule circles; however, his charisma could occasionally be highly effective. In 1898 his petition over the misuse of national nomenclature has claimed to have received over 100,000 signatures, many from, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Transvaal, India and the Americas, particularly Canada.<sup>122</sup>

Napier also attempted to raise support for Scottish Home Rule specifically within Australia. As mentioned above he was largely responsible for the foundation of the Scottish National Association of Victoria. The primary object of the association was to: ‘support the great patriotic movement in Scotland to obtain Local National Self Government’.<sup>123</sup> Napier published pamphlets in Australia supporting Scottish Home Rule. These read very much the same as those published by the SHRA at the time. An outline is given of the perceived historical grievance with the claim that Scotland was deprived of her parliament in exchange for English gold. Financial grievances are also included with the claim that Scotland contributes too much in tax and receives too little in expenditure. Special attention, however, is given to the colonial point of view:

---

<sup>121</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 16.

<sup>122</sup> Morton, ‘Returning Nationalists’, p. 118.

<sup>123</sup> Theodore Napier, *Scotland’s Demand for Home Rule: Or Local National Self-Government: an Appeal to Scotsmen In Australia*, Melbourne: M.L. Hutchinson, 1892, p. 19.

Here in Australia each colony manages its own affairs, but we have no common federal body. That is to come, and it must come soon. In the United Kingdom they have a united incorporating Parliament with representatives from all the four nations; but the wishes of the smaller nationalities are repeatedly over-ridden and set aside by the towering English majority in the House of Commons....It is surely a worse than dog-in-the-manger- policy for Scotsmen to refuse to Scotland herself what they themselves are enjoying in the Australasian colonies. We Scotsmen in Australia have been reaping all the advantages of local self-government. We elect representatives to make such laws as we desire for the benefit of our respective colonies; and we alter or amend these laws when we wish to do so. Shall we then act the intensely and selfish part of denying to the land of our fathers the freedom we ourselves possess in the way of local self-government?<sup>124</sup>

It is interesting to note here that Napier still clearly considered those living in Australia Scotsmen, and the appeal is made to them to look after the interests of the 'land of our fathers'. The minimum annual subscription for membership was of the Association was five shillings but more notable was the additional requirement: 'All Britishmen and persons of Scottish decent are eligible as members.'<sup>125</sup> This final stipulation highlights an unfortunate characteristic of Napier's nationalism. As Morton has noted Napier was not without some of the prejudices which were unfortunately common at the time.<sup>126</sup> At the Seventh Annual Peace Conference of Great Britain and Ireland he remarked, 'They [Australians] knew the danger was that once they allowed the Asiatic races to come in the country, the country would be flooded. The result would be a mongrel Australia. They wanted to keep it white.'<sup>127</sup> A negative view of other races or ethnicities was not completely unknown in the Scottish Home Rule movement. John Wilson's periodical *The Scottish Patriot*, occasionally published articles which descended into anti-Semitism. However it was by no means universal, and completely absent from most writings on the subject. Hector Macpherson was frequent defender of and *The Scottish Nation* ran frequent ads in order to raise funds for Jewish refugees caused by the Great War.

---

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., pp. 15-16.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>126</sup> Morton, 'Returning Nationalists', p. 120.

<sup>127</sup> *The Scotsman*, 16 June 1911, p. 9. Further details of this are discussed in, Morton, 'Returning Nationalists'.

The theme of Scottish nationalists who grew up outside of Scotland has received recent attention from Graeme Morton who looked at the life of Napier and James Grant.<sup>128</sup> James Grant had been a soldier before he co-founded the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights in 1852. This group identified and protested against perceived grievances which would characterise the arguments of the more sentimental Scottish Home Rulers during the pre-war period. Morton identifies the period as time when nationalism was embodied within individuals rather than the whole of the general public. In this situation, credibility, charisma, influence, and authority were closely linked, indeed, Morton suggests that Grant and Napier's status as returned migrants amplified their 'charismatic authority'.<sup>129</sup> Although this charisma as returned migrants may have increased their status in Scotland it was not enough to overcome their own identities. James Grant public life was marred when he was named in divorce proceedings. Napier's own Jacobitism and eccentricities led him to the fringe of what was already a narrow political movement for Scottish Home Rule.

There were also a few Scottish nationalists who were born outside of Scotland but within the UK. The three best examples of this can be seen in Charles Price, William Spiers Bruce and D.W. Kemp. All three of whom had Scottish parents. Charles Price came from Shropshire, England, and came into politics after retiring as a partner in the firm biscuit making firm McVitie and Price.<sup>130</sup> He was an earlier member of the YSS and a strong advocate of Scottish Home Rule. At the YSS twelfth annual meeting he pronounced that he was a Home Ruler because he was a nationalist.<sup>131</sup> Such was his commitment to Scottish Home Rule that even *The Scottish Nation*, which was prone to rail against non Scottish born Scottish MPs, could not find fault in him. In August 1914 *The Scottish Nation* spoke very harshly of non Scots born MPs:

What nation in God's Great world ever achieved victory on the field  
of battle whose battalions were dotted over with the breed of aliens?  
Our old land will never come out triumphant until she has purged her  
representation and sent her mongrel members about their business.

---

<sup>128</sup> Morton, 'Returning Nationalists', p. 118.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110.

<sup>130</sup> 'Mr C.E. Price Honoured: Freedom Of Edinburgh', *The Scotsman*, 25 June 1919, p. 5.

<sup>131</sup> 'Demand for Scottish Home Rule', *Aberdeen Daily Journal*, 6 May 1912, p. 6.

The test prescribed for Gideon's army must be applied. Only those who have lapped at the wells of patriotism and drunk of the spirit of Scottish independence can bear her arms in this sacred cause. The Ainsworths,<sup>132</sup> and the Harmsworths,<sup>133</sup> the Mackinders,<sup>134</sup> and the Warings,<sup>135</sup> the Gladstones,<sup>136</sup> and the Barrans<sup>137</sup> must be sent over the Border, and carefully deposited in the House of Lords, the lumber room for parliamentary back numbers. Do they and others of their ilk, consider that their accursed inactivity and languid indifference to the transcendent reform to which their constituents are attached, constitute fair and adequate representation of their interests at Westminster/. Who are these men that they should sit in our safe seats and fiddle while the country bids them fight/. Scotland may call loudly to these golden calves with foreign hall-marks on their forehead, who have deteriorated her political stock; but they will not answer. It is up to the constituencies to clear out these cumberers of the ground, and reliance them with Scots who have consecrated their lives to the high ideal of securing for their native land the recognition of her political independence, the watchword of Wallace and Bruce, who fought to set Scotland free.<sup>138</sup>

It is worth noting that the test for the MPs was not that of birth but rather subscription to the desired cause. This is what allowed MPs like Price and a few others who were born outside Scotland to be excluded from the list of MPs who should be sent south. Indeed one of the International Scots Home Rule League founders was born outside of Scotland. D.W. Kemp was born in Wrexham, North Wales of two Scottish parents.<sup>139</sup> Kemp played an active part in Leith politics and was the president of the Leith Burghs Liberal Association. He was very active in the Convention of Royal of Scottish Burghs and spoke on behalf of establishing a Scottish Parliament.<sup>140</sup> Kemp also was a long term advocate of increasing the status

---

<sup>132</sup> Sir James Ainsworth was the Liberal MP for Argyle 1903-1918.

<sup>133</sup> Sir Robert Harmsworth defeated crofter MP for Caithness G.B. Clark in the 1900 election and held the seat until it was combined with Sutherland in 1918 and then for an additional four years as the MP for Caithness and Sutherland. Clark had been the president of the Scottish Home Rule Association and was responsible for the first Parliamentary motion for Scottish Home Rule.

<sup>134</sup> Sir Halford Mackinder, Unionist, held Glasgow Camlachie from January 1910 until 1922 when he was defeated by the socialist Campbell Stephen.

<sup>135</sup> Major Walter Waring was the Liberal MP Banffshire 1907-1918 followed by Blaydon, 1918-1922 and Berwick and Haddingtonshire, 1922-1923.

<sup>136</sup> W.G. Gladstone was the grandson of William Gladstone and was returned as a Liberal in the 1911 Kilmarnock Election. As mentioned in chapter two his election was initially opposed by the Young Scots Society due to his Englishness but they were largely placated by his promise to support Scottish Home Rule. He died in action during the First World War.

<sup>137</sup> Sir John Barran was the Liberal MP for Hawick Burghs, 1909-1918.

<sup>138</sup> Ian Lang, 'Political Notes', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), p. 148.

<sup>139</sup> 'The late Mr D.W. Kemp, J.P.', *The Scotsman*, 1 Mar. 1922, p. 8.

<sup>140</sup> 'Scottish Burghs and Home Rule', *Aberdeen Daily Journal*, 8 Apr. 1914, p. 8.

of the Secretary for Scotland.<sup>141</sup> In 1913 representing Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland he seconded a motion to secure funds for to celebrate the 600<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the battle of Bannockburn.<sup>142</sup> There was also the polar explorer William Speirs Bruce. Bruce was born near London to Scottish parents. He was educated in Edinburgh and came to be a fervent nationalist. His Scottish National Antarctic Expedition as to be a major achievement for Scottish contributions to science and he commented ‘While “Science” was the talisman of the Expedition, “Scotland” was emblazoned on its flag.’<sup>143</sup> His appeals for more funding were supported by many pro-Scottish Home Rule groups including the YSS, the Scottish Patriotic Association and the International Scots Home Rule League. The ready adoption of these Scottish Nationalists across the border from Scotland show that Scottish Home Rulers were happy to adopt non-native Scots if they were willing to advance the position of Scotland and more specifically the cause of Scottish Rule.

The federation of Australia in 1901 offers a unique point at which to assess the position of Australian ideas about the composition of empire. John Kendle has noted that plans to federate Australia stretch back to the first half of the nineteenth century when the third Earl Grey supported the idea in the 1830s. It would not be until the closing decades of the century that federation became a realistic possibility. Nicholas Aroney has convincingly demonstrated that the framers of the Australian constitution drew on a vast body of theories of federation from both Europe and North America.<sup>144</sup> The theories of prominent intellectuals such as Dicey, Freeman and Bryce were essential to the discussion.

For imperial federalists Australian federation offered a possible step towards the representation of imperial nations under a truly Imperial Parliament. Although the efforts of the Imperial Federation League and later the Round Table movement have been discussed in the earlier chapters it is worth mentioning that many Scottish Home Rulers also sought to utilise the idea to support Scotland’s claim to a separate parliament. William Mitchell, treasurer of the SHRA, offered this as a solution to the

<sup>141</sup> ‘The Scottish National Committee’, *The Scottish Nation*, 4 (1917), p. 450.

<sup>142</sup> ‘Sexcentenary of Battle of Bannockburn’, *Aberdeen Daily Journal*, 20 Oct. 1913, p. 4.

<sup>143</sup> Quoted in Speak, *William Speirs Bruce*, p. 97

<sup>144</sup> Nicholas Aroney, *The Constitution of a Federal Commonwealth: the Making and Meaning of the Australian Constitution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 73.



growing demands on Westminster and the difficulty of handling both local and imperial governance.<sup>145</sup> Graeme Morton has noted that the SHRA was in contact with the Imperial Federation League of Victoria.<sup>146</sup> The latter were said to have been in sympathy with the objectives of the former.<sup>147</sup> In his pamphlet *The Arrogance of Englishmen: a Bar to Imperial Federation*, Theodore Napier argued that it was not a British Empire which Scottish and Irish Home Rulers were rejecting but rather an English one.<sup>148</sup> One of the best distributed Scottish Home Rule pamphlets, *60 Points for Scottish Home Rule* makes explicit comparison to the Canadian federal system. It argues that ‘Nova Scotia (New Scotland) with half the population of Glasgow, has full control of its own affairs under the Dominion of Canada, but Old Scotland lacks self-government.’<sup>149</sup> While it is easy to see why Scottish Home Rulers should be interested in imperial federation as a means of supporting their goal, the extent which Australians were interested in such schemes is worthy of some discussion.

During the late nineteenth century ideas surrounding imperial federation were being discussed in Australia. In the late 1880s a Canadian, George Parkin, conducted a lecture tour of Australia in promotion of the scheme. W.G. McMinn has argued that this tour had a meaningful effect on Henry Parks, who was the five time Premier of New South Wales, and who is often referred to as the ‘father of [Australian] federation’.<sup>150</sup> For Parks, who died five years before the creation of the Australian Commonwealth, federation was simply a step in the direction of greater imperial federation.<sup>151</sup> This is slightly at odds with the more republican, and frequently xenophobic, brand of nationalism which had begun to develop largely centred around the heterogeneous group of writers associated with the Sydney based journal *The Bulletin*. McMinn however has sought to downplay the effect that such

---

<sup>145</sup> William Mitchell, *Home Rule for Scotland and Imperial Federation*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1892, p. 1-2.

<sup>146</sup> Graeme Morton, ‘Identity within the Union State, 1800-1900’, in T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 477.

<sup>147</sup> ‘Scottish Home Rule Association’, *Glasgow Herald*, 10 June 1895, p. 6.

<sup>148</sup> Theodore Napier, *The Arrogance of Englishmen: a Bar to Imperial Federation*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1895.

<sup>149</sup> Young Scots Society, *60 Points for Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Alex McClaren & Son 1914, p. 9.

<sup>150</sup> W.G. McMinn, *Nationalism and Federalism in Australia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 131.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 136.

thinkers had on the founders of Australian federation arguing that although these men set out to form a new nation, it was a British nation.<sup>152</sup> Although the model of federation adopted more closely resembled the American example than the more recent Canadian federation, the creation of the Australian Commonwealth was not a break with Empire. Nicholas Brown has commented on the significance of the used in the constitution. Rather than referring to Australians as citizens instead the term ‘subjects’ was adopted. Brown goes on to note that for the framers of the constitution to be a British subject harkened back to the success of British institutions and was something to be valued.<sup>153</sup>

If Australian politicians were proud of their part in the British Empire they were also aware of the difficulties associated with closer association. The early governments of Australia struggled with the admiralty to find the right balance between financial contributions and control of the naval forces which would defend the island.<sup>154</sup> This struggle was brought to the foreground by the second Australian Prime Minister Alfred Deakin. Deakin is an interesting figure in the study of national identity and John Hirst has noted that his struggles with the Colonial Office were not in the pursuit of a more independent Australia but rather a more inclusive empire.<sup>155</sup> Imperial federation received good discussion in the Australian press following a pronouncement against it in 1902 by Salisbury before the Primrose League’s annual meeting:

Considering the difficulties as regards the burdens of finance, the duties of defence, and the rights of decision which the motherland could retain, I look with apprehension on any attempt to force the various parts of the Empire into a mutual arrangement for subordination for which they are not ready, as being calculated to produce a reaction in favour [sic] of the old state of things. If we are patient and careful a tremendous destiny is before us... There is no danger that appears to me more serious for the time that lies before us than an attempt to force the various parts of the Empire into a mutual arrangement and subordination for which they are not ready<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., pp. 96, 113, and 136.

<sup>153</sup> Nicolas Brown, ‘Government, Law and Citizenship’ in Alison Bashford and Stuart Macintyre (eds), *The Cambridge History of Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 412.

<sup>154</sup> John Hirst, ‘Nation Building: 1901-1914’, in Alison Bashford and Stuart Macintyre (eds), *The Cambridge History of Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 31.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., p. 32.

<sup>156</sup> ‘Imperial Federation: Speech by Lord Salisbury’, *The Brisbane Courier*, 18 June 1902, p. 8.

This wait and see attitude expressed in Salisbury's speech appears to be typical of the Premier's foreign policy in the final stages of his career. T.G. Otte's has noted that although it was increasingly contested by members of his own Government, to Salisbury 'planlessness in foreign policy was a virtue to be cultivated' because it allowed for flexibility.<sup>157</sup> Many papers such as the *Evening News* (Sydney) and the *Sydney Morning Herald* expressed sympathy with the Prime Minister when he argued that the call for a closer relationship between Britain and the Colonies must originate from the latter.<sup>158</sup>

### **Publishing Scottish Home Rule Abroad**

The extent to which Scottish Home Rule captured the minds of the North America and Australasia can perhaps be reflected in the way in which it was reported in the press. In North America, even more than in Scotland, the matter was left to the personal efforts of a few individuals rather than a large body of public support. That is not to say that there was no public interest. The Scottish Home Rule debates in Parliament usually received coverage. While reports of events, like the Commons Debates and Scottish Home Rule demonstrations were not uncommon, editorials and opinion pieces were the exception instead of the rule. However, when they did appear they could put the argument forward very strongly. In 1888 *The Washington Post* spoke favourably of the movement's reception in America and claimed, 'There are no Scotchmen in the United States who will not favor the movement. There is no true American who will not sympathise with it.'<sup>159</sup> Decades later in 1915 *The Toronto Globe* ran a piece discussing Scottish Home Rule and Highland depopulation. It referenced *The Scottish Nation*, and claimed that depopulation had robbed the Highlands of 'its principal crop-men and women' at a time 'when men with fighting blood in their veins are needed, as they never have been in the history of the British Isles'.<sup>160</sup> It went on to write that the solution will take the 'form of a demand that Scotland shall be left to attend to her own local affairs in her own way

---

<sup>157</sup> T.G. Otte, 'A Question of Leadership: Lord Salisbury, the Unionist Cabinet and Foreign Policy Making, 1895–1900', *Contemporary British History*, 14 (2000), p. 15.

<sup>158</sup> *Evening News* (Sydney), 9 May 1902, p. 4 and 'Imperial Federation', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 9 May 1902, p. 6.

<sup>159</sup> 'Home Rule For Scotland', *The Washington Post*, 14 Apr. 1888, p. 4.

<sup>160</sup> Republished in: 'Why Scotland Wants Home Rule', *Brandon Daily Sun*, 15 June 1915 p. 4.

through a legislature sitting in Edinburgh, where it will be in close touch with the problems of Scottish Life'.<sup>161</sup> It is perhaps no coincidence that the editor of *The Toronto Globe*, J.A. Macdonald, was an honorary president of the League.<sup>162</sup>

In North America Scottish Home Rule also received published attention by a monthly Scottish magazine, *The Caledonian*. It was edited by Douglas MacDougall and ran from 1901 through to 1922. *The Caledonian* ran articles on all sorts of Scottish topics but the bulk of the articles were on: Scottish history, Scottish societies, and biographies of notable Scots such as Lord Rosebery. It received correspondence and written contributions from the heads or secretaries of many North American Scottish societies and associations. It also received letters and articles from those associated with the Scottish Home Rule movement in Scotland including R. Erskine of the *Scottish Review*, John Wilson of *The Scottish Patriot*, and Hector Macpherson and F.J. Robertson of the International Scots Home Rule League. After 1911 the magazine paid increasing attention to Scottish Home Rule and it frequently reported the activities of the New York Scottish Home Rule Association. Robert E. May, who served as the magazine's literary editor, noted that 'owing to the circular letters which have been mailed to every known Scottish Society throughout the world' the question was beginning to be discussed at societies. He urged societies who received such letter to bring up the topic and to give it full discussion.<sup>163</sup> The same issue also published a condensed version of *60 Points for Scottish Home Rule*.<sup>164</sup>

A survey of Australian papers reveals a different picture than in North America. Papers in Australia appear to have run more articles on Scottish Home Rule than their North American counterparts. The impact of personal influence was still present. *The Argus* serves as a good example. The paper was published in Melbourne and, as a result, featured many articles on one of the city's most curious public figures, Theodore Napier. Many Australian papers such as *The Sydney Morning Herald*, *The Advertiser* (Adelaide), and *The Mercury* (Tasmania) ran

---

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> 'Home Rule for Scotland', *The Daily News* (Perth), 9 July 1914, p. 10.

<sup>163</sup> Robert E. May, *The Caledonian*, 12 (1912), p. 37.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., pp. 38–39.

accounts of the various Scottish Home Rule debates in the House of Commons. These records rival the attention which was paid to the group by the Scottish press. Following the creation of the International Scots Home Rule League several Australian papers published correspondence with Hector Macpherson and Councillor Robertson.<sup>165</sup> Whether or not these letters were able to strike a chord with the average Scot living abroad is questionable; though it is likely that to those who already subscribed to the idea they served as a welcome affirmation of at least the appearance of progress.

The position of Scottish emigrants in New Zealand has received valuable discussion by Tanja Bueltmann. She noted there were very few examples of Scottish Home Rule rhetoric originating from New Zealand at the time. *The Scottish Nation*, which frequently published articles from international correspondents, did not appear to receive contributions from New Zealanders. The press at least paid casual interest to developments in the movement in Scotland. *The New Zealand Tablet* in particular seems to have given some attention to the matter. It frequently published statements of Scotland's claim for Scottish Home Rule.<sup>166</sup> It also reported a public debate on the topic held by the Dunedin Catholic Literary Society in 1892. At that meeting the society passed a motion in favour of the granting of Scottish Home Rule when 'autonomy is demanded by the Scottish people'.<sup>167</sup> Reports were given in the newspapers of the various Bills for Scottish Home Rule when they appeared in Parliament, especially those after 1910, and notice was given of the formation of the Scottish National Committee, a body of Radical Scottish MPs formed in 1910 to promote Scottish Home Rule in Parliament.<sup>168</sup> Theodore Napier's petition to the Queen over the misuse of term 'English' for 'British' also appeared in the press as was the occasional speech in favour of Scottish Home Rule from John Stuart Blackie.<sup>169</sup> In spite of this interest from the press, Bueltmann notes that that agitation

---

<sup>165</sup> These include: *The Mercury* (Hobart); *The Daily News* (Perth); *The Advertiser* (Adelaide); *Colac Herald* (Victoria).

<sup>166</sup> 'Current Topics', *New Zealand Tablet*, 24 July 1891, p. 1; the *New Zealand Tablet* was a Catholic Weekly Periodical published by Patrick Moran.

<sup>167</sup> 'Dunedin Catholic Literary Society', *New Zealand Tablet*, 16 Sept. 1892, p. 25.

<sup>168</sup> 'Home Rule For England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales: A Problem Discussed', *The Evening Post* (Wellington, NZ), 9 Aug. 1910, p. 7.

<sup>169</sup> 'English or British', *Ohinemuri Gazette*, 29 Jan. 1898, p. 2; 'Scottish Home Rule: Characteristic Speech by John Stuart Blackie', *Timaru Herald*, 21 June 1893, p. 4; *West Coast Times*, 22 July p. 4.

for Scottish Home Rule in New Zealand was mostly confined to one man, Richard McCallum. McCallum was born in Marlborough in 1863 after his father Archibald emigrated from Glasgow.<sup>170</sup> In 1892 after being introduced to Scottish Home Rule by an Australian friend, McCallum published a series of articles in the *Marlborough Daily Times* which supported Scottish Home Rule. McCallum noted the potential importance of Scottish emigrants and their place as both moral and financial supporters of the cause:

when Scottish colonists after an absence of 20 or 30 years revisit their mother country speedily again forsake her shores and bring back tidings that the country districts have retrograded and have not at all kept pace with their adopted country, many holdings firmly that the country districts seem fifty years behind the times.<sup>171</sup>

### **Conclusion**

The Scottish nationalists' attempt to spread the movement across the globe sheds some insights regarding their ideas of what it meant to be Scottish. They continually sought to perpetuate the idea that love of liberty and justice were essential characteristics of the Scottish race, which were instilled by birth just as much as by upbringing. Furthermore they attempted to locate their own movement within a global phenomenon respecting the rights of small nations. It seems that the status of Scottish Home Rule outside of the UK mirrored its position at home. There were undoubtedly individuals who subscribed to nationalistic ideas and took an active role in pursuing what they hoped would lead to a great awakening of Scottish national sentiment. However, these individuals were rare, and while they could use patriotic language to capture the emotions of large audiences who had gathered to participate in Scottish cultural events the attention was short lived and it never managed to take root the way Irish nationalism was able to. This is perhaps one of the most interesting results of this chapter. Although the historiography of Scottish associational culture demonstrates that many Scots abroad celebrated cultural aspects of Scottish identity abroad, their interest in promoting Scottish Home Rule appears minimal when compared to the Irish example.

---

<sup>170</sup> Tanja Buelmann, *Scottish Ethnicity and the Making of New Zealand Society: 1850–1930*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011, p. 197.

<sup>171</sup> Richard McCallum, *Home Rule for Scotland*, Fitzroy, 1925, p. 23; quoted in: Buelmann, *Scottish Ethnicity*, p. 198.\*

That is not to say that there was no wider interest in the issue. Discussions in magazines such as the *Caledonian* show that Scottish Home Rule was discussed in a wider forum of Scottish societies, and often in a favourable light. Occasional reports of Scottish societies such as the Vancouver branches of the Gaelic Society, Ayrshire Society, Clan Maclean Society, St Andrews Society, suggests that these groups were at times agreeable to the idea. However, as the Liberal Party so ably demonstrated within the UK, agreeing to the principle or desirability of an idea is not the same as actively pursuing it. Ultimately the Scottish Home Rulers of the period would have to rest with the support of a few kindred spirits; their widespread movement was still a long time off.

## **Chapter 5 Science, Art, History, and expressions of Scottish Home Rule**

Thus far this thesis has primarily focussed on political expressions of support for Scottish Home Rule. This has been largely confined to the efforts of politicians and the activities of members of groups like the SHRA, the YSS and the International Scots Home Rule League. This chapter, however, will focus on the link between cultural and scientific expressions of Scottish distinctiveness and their relationship with the Scottish Home Rule debate. The mid to late nineteenth century saw a flourishing of several Scottish historical and scientific societies. In the field of history we see the foundation of the Scottish Historical Society in 1886, and several Burns Societies which included in their aims the promotion of Scottish history. The Scottish Meteorological Society was founded in 1855 and the Royal Scottish Geographical Society was established in 1884. These groups represent an institutionalised effort to ensure that Scotland was represented in the respective fields. It should be noted that these groups were frequently founded in a spirit of co-operation with their London based counterparts, quite often with members holding positions in both societies. However, in both cases the struggle to secure funds for their various projects, especially in the distribution of Government grants, would sometimes lead to jealousy and claims of neglect in giving adequate support to Scottish endeavours. The claim that Scotland was being neglected financially had a long history and was present in the grievances of the mid nineteenth-century National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights. As will be seen later, endeavours such as the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition led many involved to believe that Scotland was not receiving fair treatment. The expedition leader, William Speirs Bruce, was a strong Scottish Home Ruler and his difficulties securing funding for the expedition brought him into contact with Scottish MPs in favour of Scottish Home Rule, such as Charles Price and James Hogge. They badgered Asquith in the commons on behalf of Bruce and suggested that such a state of affairs would not exist with a Scottish Parliament. This sentiment was pounced on by Scottish Home Rulers who sought to utilise the feeling in order to galvanise support for Scottish Home Rule. Two decades earlier the SHRA had complained, ‘Our Universities, and Scientific, Art, and other Institutions are starved, and grants are



given to us with a stinted hand and doled out in a most niggardly manner.’<sup>1</sup> While groups such as the SHRA were willing offer Scottish Home Rule as a panacea for any ailment affecting Scotland, this chapter will demonstrate that individuals closely associated with other interests and bodies were at times willing to link their particular interests to Scottish Home Rulers to help support their claims for more resources or greater prominence. The *Scottish Patriot* and *Scotia*, which normally primarily focussed on cultural issues, such as the promotion of art, history, music, and literature, used instances of perceived neglect of such cultural and scientific endeavours to press for the political aim of Scottish Home Rule.

This chapter, although broken into sections based around a very diverse collection of groups and endeavours in the subject areas of science, art and the teaching of history, will pay particular attention to their creation and how they responded to adversity or informally as in the case of the Ben Nevis Observatory, its birth and its death. In each case, whether it is the establishment of the Scottish National Gallery or the creation of the Scottish Royal Geographical Society, we see a desire to cater to Scottish distinctiveness or at least promote Scotland’s contributions in the respective fields. That so many of these groups and endeavours be formed on a Scottish basis rather than simply as Scottish branches of the pre-existing British societies is in itself an interesting feature of the period and demonstrates the desire that Scotland should be represented at the national level. It should be noted that these bodies were not necessary separatist or incompatible with British institutions, rather they sought to promote Scotland’s position within the Empire and indeed the world. In most cases the overt connection to Scottish Home Rule only occurred at times in which there was a conflict with a British institution, frequently Parliament and the Treasury. The extent which Scottish Home Rulers were able to co-opt conflicts of those involved in Scottish cultural and scientific endeavours in order to gain support for Scottish Home Rule was varied.

Around the turn of the twentieth century there were many in Scotland who were concerned with promoting Scotland’s contributions to the understanding of science, art, music and history. Although these endeavours were strongly proclaimed

---

<sup>1</sup> *Home Rule and Political Parties in Scotland*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1889, p. 8.

within their own various realms of knowledge there were also attempts by those outside of these groups to call attention to their achievements in order to help boast Scotland's standing in the world. The Scottish nationalist periodicals such as *The Scottish Nation*, *The Scottish Patriot*, *Scotia*, and *The Thistle*, were all concerned with this practice. *The Scottish Patriot* paid particular attention to the preservation of Scottish music, song and history. One of its most frequent contributors was Charles W. Thomson. Thomson was the Rector of Larkhall Academy and had been a founding member of the Scottish Patriotic Association, the organization responsible for *The Scottish Patriot*. A brief biography of Thomson published in *The Scottish Patriot*, recounts that he was only ten years old the first time he crossed out the word 'England' in order to put in Britain as a correction.<sup>2</sup> Thomson would eventually serve as president of the Scottish Patriotic Association and was an advocate of Scottish Home Rule in the form of a devolved parliament to handle purely Scottish affairs. While he was a frequent contributor to *The Scottish Patriot*, he was best known for his book titled *Scotland's Work and Worth*.<sup>3</sup>

From its outset the book attempted to justify the statement of a contemporary English historian, 'if we except the Athenians and the Jew, no people so few in number have scored so deep a mark in the world's history as the Scots have done. No people have a juster right to be proud of their blood.'<sup>4</sup> As H.J. Hanham has noted, the book falls below the intellectual heights of Erskine of Mar, however, it still provides an interesting example into the study of national pride at the time.<sup>5</sup> In its pages the history of Scotland is drawn down from early Caledonia through Wallace right up to the twentieth century. It might be added that *Scotland's Work and Worth*, received mixed reviews from the *Scottish Historical Review*. The book was subtitled, 'An epitome of Scotland's Story from Early Times to the Twentieth Century, with a Survey of the Contributions of Scotsmen in Peace and War, to the Growth of the British Empire and the Progress of the World'. A review of one of the earlier sections of the book commented that the work's subtitle reflected a 'flamboyant spirit which

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Brief Biographies of Scottish Patriots', *The Scottish Patriot*, 2 (1904), p. 55.

<sup>3</sup> Charles William Thomson, *Scotland's Work and Worth*, Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1910.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 128.

some people consider patriotic and others regard as the constant cause of historical bias and distortion'.<sup>6</sup> A review of later instalments noted that it had 'steadily redeemed its initial shortcomings'.<sup>7</sup> The same review added that, 'The work bids fair to be a unique register of the more recent contributions of Scotsmen to the progress of science, invention, art and literature, and to take useful place as a work of reference, very diligently compiled, and laden with information.'<sup>8</sup> The usual stories of military triumphs and heroic defeats as well as its great eighteenth century contributions to literature are all well represented. Significant attention is also paid to Scottish scientists, doctors, painters, inventors, engineers and explorers. In concluding the book Thomson asked:

What boots[sic] it to become engrossed in novels or dramas—good, mayhap, in themselves—but unworthy to take precedence over the records of the sufferings and struggles, the glorious victories and the no less honourable defeats, of our forefathers in the field of battle, on the moors and in caves, in the council-chamber or on the scaffold, in the paths of industry or in the flights of scientific and philosophic ecstasy.<sup>9</sup>

With his writings and his participation in the Scottish Patriotic Association Thompson demonstrated the tendency of cultural nationalists, as observed by Hutchinson, to 'establish informal and decentralized [sic] clusters of cultural societies and journals, designed to inspire a spontaneous love of community in its different members by educating them to their common heritage of splendour and suffering'.<sup>10</sup> Scotland has had a long history of admiring ancient patriots who fought for Scottish independence with sword or musket, however if the eighteenth century contributions of Walter Scott and Robert Burns proved that writers could also be classed as patriotic heroes, the late nineteenth and early twentieth century proved that contributions to science, art, and history could also be sources of immense patriotism, and under the right circumstances they could be used to promote nationalist tendencies.

---

<sup>6</sup> *The Scottish Historical Review*, 7 (1910), p. 205

<sup>7</sup> *The Scottish Historical Review*, 7 (1910), p. 318.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Thomson, *Scotland's Work and Worth*, p. 845.

<sup>10</sup> John Hutchinson, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: the Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State*, London: Allen Unwin, 1987, p. 16.

## **Science**

The study of science was growing rapidly during the decades leading up to the first world. Famous expeditions to the ever dwindling unexplored areas of the world led to exciting breakthroughs in geography and zoology. New developments in fields like meteorology meant that society's understanding of the natural environment was ever growing. This section will focus primarily on two disciplines, meteorology and geography, and two of their most prominent scientific endeavours of the period, the Ben Nevis Observatory and the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition. In both cases there was a distinct desire to see that Scotland would be well represented in the global contributions to science. Furthermore it will be shown that when these projects ran into difficulties, often regarding funding, they were readily adopted by Scottish MPs, especially ones in favour of Scottish Home Rule, as evidence that Scotland was being neglected, mismanaged, or underfunded by a London- or, indeed, in some cases a Dublin-focussed Westminster. This relationship between those interested in the promotion of Scottish Scientific reputation and Scottish Home Rulers is particularly interesting in the case of the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition. There we see a leading figure in the field vigorously support Scottish Home Rule. Still more we also see journals such as *Scotia*, which was normally far more interested in promoting cultural expressions of Scottishness such as song and literature, pay more attention to Scottish Home Rule as a means to securing more resources for Scottish endeavours.

The first foundations of a Ben Nevis Observatory were planted in 1881 when Clement L. Wragge, working on behalf of the newly—founded Scottish Meteorological Society, established a small shelter for recording climate data. The Scottish Meteorological Society spent the next two years successfully raising £5,000 in voluntary subscriptions for the purpose of erecting a more substantial observatory with modern meteorological equipment. Construction of the site was extremely arduous and required the use of ponies to bring supplies up from the town below. Two years later an additional and more substantial observatory was completed.

When a member of the Board of Directors, John Murray, appealed for funds at the half-yearly meeting of the Scottish Meteorological Society in 1899 he appealed

to the patriotism of his audience, calling it a disgrace that Scotland should lose so useful a scientific asset, pointing out that Austria, Germany, Switzerland and France all had high—level observatories.<sup>11</sup> Although on this occasion the society was successful in securing the requisite funds, largely due to the generosity of J. Mackay Bernard, a threatened closure and desperate plea for funds became a near annual occurrence. On several occasions Scottish MPs attempted to move the House into providing a grant. The Scottish press lent its support and *The Scotsman*, in a rare compliment given to the Liberal MP D.V. Pirie, commended him for his efforts in the House of Commons the previous day. Before Pirie was cut off by the Speaker he had begun to claim that had observatories been located in England or Ireland there would have been no problem in securing the needed funds.<sup>12</sup> Pirie went on to suggest Scottish Home Rule to the House in 1902 and 1908 on the basis of both parliamentary efficiency and due to the inability of Scotland to attain the legislation as a result of a hostile English majority.<sup>13</sup>

Ultimately the appeals to Parliament were unsuccessful. During the July of 1902 the board of directors of the two observatories announced that the observatories would be closed during the October of that year. However, after further generous private donations and the promise of a Government inquiry it was decided to keep the observatories open. In 1904 the Government released the results of its inquiry and announced that it would be unable to donate further funds for maintaining the Ben Nevis Observatories. Although the Board was eventually able to secure the promise of £350 from the Government, with little prospect of raising the remainder in time to stock the observatories for the long winter, the decision was made to close down the observatories on the first of October 1904.

The closure of the meteorological observatory was felt across Scotland, not least in the patriotic periodicals that had sprung up in the early decades of the twentieth century. In 1905 the Scottish Patriotic Association's monthly publication

---

<sup>11</sup> 'The Scottish Meteorological Society: The Proposed Closing of the Ben Nevis Observatories', *The Scotsman*, 22 July 1898, p. 8.

<sup>12</sup> 'Ben Nevis Observatory', *The Scotsman*, 1 Aug. 1899, p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 22 Jan. 1902, vol. 101, cc. 628–44 and 26 May 1908, vol. 189, cc. 968–75. His 1908 motion to prepare a Bill for the future government of Scotland received passed 257 to 102.

*The Scottish Patriot*, edited by John Wilson, published a letter addressed to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, which called for the funding of the observatory directly beneath a request for a local parliament in Edinburgh. Wilson attributed the observatories' closure to 'the absolute meanness of the English people', and requested that Campbell-Bannerman bring up the matter in Parliament from a 'distinctly national point of view'.<sup>14</sup> As noted in chapter one, the objectives of *The Scottish Patriot* and its parent organisation the Scottish Patriotic Association were closely aligned with the culturally nationalistic ambitions outlined by Hutchinson, namely the promotion of history, art, music, literature, national recreations, and national holidays.<sup>15</sup> Further condemnation of the observatories' closure can be seen in a later issue of the same volume in which the Scottish Patriotic Association appealed to form a 'Scottish National Association for the Promotion of National Ideas and the Defence of Scottish Rights...'. Here the closure of the Ben Nevis Observatories was included in a long list of what it described as the selfishness and arrogance of the official Englishman.<sup>16</sup> Viewing the closure from a national standpoint was not confined to the pages of patriotic periodicals. Letters were written to Scottish newspapers including several to the *Scotsman* from an author signed G.S. repeating the accusation that had Ben Nevis been located in England or Ireland the Government would have found no difficulty in granting it funding.<sup>17</sup> G.S. went on to claim that it was absurd that Scotland should be expected to contribute so much to the funding of the British Museum and Dublin National Library while funding for Scottish institutions were lacking.

It is worth noting that the closing of the observatories remained a thorn to Scottish nationalists and a brief push for its reopening occurred in 1935. R.E. Muirhead, who for decades supplied much needed and generous funding to the various Scottish Home Rule groups, lamented the observatories' closure and blamed it on the refusal of Government to provide a 'small grant' and offered that there was no hope of restoring the observatories until Scotland was once again in control of

---

<sup>14</sup> John Wilson, 'Correspondence', *The Scottish Patriot*, 3 (1905) p. 5.

<sup>15</sup> Hutchinson, 'Cultural Nationalism', pp. 83-84.

<sup>16</sup> 'Wanted! Opinions regarding the formation of a thoroughly Representative National Association', *The Scottish Patriot*, 3 (1905), p. 80.

<sup>17</sup> "'Puir Old Scotland" Once More', *The Scotsman*, 22 Feb. 1908, p. 11.

'her national purse'.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, a prospective S.N.P. candidate for Greenock complained that Government was able to afford £6,000 to remove litter from Hyde Park while such an important meteorological site remained closed due to lack of funds.<sup>19</sup> While it would be difficult to place the establishment of the observatory firmly as an expression of a cultural nationalism, what the debates surrounding its closure suggest is that its difficulties could be co-opted by those interested in promoting the nationalist agenda to promote the status of Scotland culturally.

At the turn of the twentieth-century explorers were still figures of international fame and the race to the South Pole was beginning to reach its peak. Several nations were vying with each other both for the patriotic honour of being first and also to make scientific discoveries in the unknown environment offered by the Antarctic region. Britain already possessed a long history in the region. James Weddell, Sir James Clark Ross and more recently the *Challenger* expedition of 1872–6 made huge advances in both exploration and scientific research in the region. In 1899 two more Antarctic expeditions were being planned in the United Kingdom. The first, the British National Antarctic expedition, led by Robert Falcon Scott, was largely coordinated by a joint committee of the Royal Society of London and the Royal Geographical Society. The other was to be a distinctly Scottish endeavour organised and led by William Speirs Bruce. Bruce was the son of a doctor and born near London in the August of 1867. Although born in England, Bruce was thoroughly Scottish by way of his parents and his education at the University of Edinburgh. He exhibited his patriotism overtly like so many who come to Scotland after birth.<sup>20</sup> Bruce had been involved in five previous polar expeditions and had further experience collecting scientific data in freezing conditions from his time served working at the Ben Nevis Meteorological Observatory. At the University of Edinburgh Bruce had studied under the eminent scientist John Murray. Murray was a member of the *Challenger* expedition. He also served on the board of directors of the Ben Nevis Meteorological Observatories and later was president of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society.

---

<sup>18</sup> R.E. Muirhead, 'Ben Nevis Observatory', *The Scotsman*, 4 Sept. 1935, p. 13.

<sup>19</sup> 'Fort William's Future: Aid from a Scots Parliament, A Nationalist's Address', *The Scotsman*, 17 Apr. 1935, p. 11.

<sup>20</sup> Other examples of this phenomenon might be seen in T.D. Wanliss; Theodore Napier.

The Royal Scottish Geographical Society was founded in the autumn of 1884, largely as a result of the efforts of the J.G. Bartholomew. Being aware that France, Germany, Holland, and Belgium all had societies, he thought Scotland certainly should; and given Scotland's history of contribution to the field in the way of explorers, geographers and cartographers he felt sure that he could find sufficient support to carry on such a society. Among its goals and aims was to further exploration as well as geography, paying special attention to Scottish geography, and to help the teaching of geography to be incorporated into university curriculum.<sup>21</sup>

*The Scotsman* was very favourable in its response to the foundation of the society:

No extreme exercise of ingenuity is needed in order to correlate geographical science and the national genius of Scotland. Geography is the pioneer of the natural sciences; Scotsmen have been among the foremost and most distinguished pioneers of geography. Scotsmen, above all other men, have run to and fro; and knowledge of the earth's surface has been thereby increased...Of this abstract actual relationship between the race and the science there has hitherto been no outward or formal recognition; one may look down the long list of our national institutions in vain for the name of a "Scottish Geographical Society." It is satisfactory to know that a movement has been set on foot, and is on the point of taking tangible shape, the object of which is to supply this omission—to remove, it might almost be said, this national reproach.<sup>22</sup>

This quote from the *Scotsman* is interesting. As has been demonstrated throughout this thesis the *Scotsman* was very antagonistic to the political expression of nationalism, Home Rule, whether Irish or Scottish. The quote above demonstrates that the *Scotsman* was still interested in promoting Scotland's status scientifically. This desire to promote Scotland's position through the study of science can further be seen in the foundation of the Dundee branch of the Scottish Geographical Society. It was formed a month after the parent body. While speaking at the branch's inauguration R. Richardson argued, 'if Scotland is to stay in the van of intellectual progress they must make a greater effort in the establishment of geographical societies'.<sup>23</sup> Both the Dundee branch and the main body of the society were committed to exploration. Bruce's plan for a Scottish Antarctic Expedition was put

---

<sup>21</sup> 'Editorial', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 50 (1934), pp. 257–269; Roy C. Bridges, 'The Foundation and Early Years of the Aberdeen Centre of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 101 (1985), pp. 77–84.

<sup>22</sup> 'Editorial', *The Scotsman*, 11 Oct. 1884, p. 6.

<sup>23</sup> 'Scottish Geographical Society', *Dundee Courier & Argus*, 27 Nov. 1884, p. 2.



before the Royal Scottish Geographical Society in March 1902.

Financing the expedition proved to be extremely challenging. Bruce had hoped to receive support from the joint Antarctic Committee but instead was met with jealousy that a rival Antarctic expedition might divert funds away from its own British National Antarctic expedition. As a result, most of the funds had to be secured in Scotland. This was carried out largely through the help of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society and more specifically two generous donations from brothers James and Andrew Coats. The two belonged to a very successful family of textile manufactures in Paisley. Together they were reported to have contributed £30,400 out of the £36,405 raised for the expedition.<sup>24</sup> Without this contribution it seems very improbable that the expedition would have been able to proceed. According to Robert Neil Rudmose Brown, a close friend, colleague, and biographer of Bruce, James Coats was so desirous that the expedition remain distinctly Scottish ‘that he stipulated that £1000 of his subscription should replace an equivalent sum offered by a foreign geologist who wished to accompany the expedition’.<sup>25</sup> It would be hard to find a greater example of the way in which national pride can influence the pursuit, or at least the funding, of scientific discoveries. It is perhaps not surprising that national pride rung loudly during the last great age of discovery. As well as being judged by their scientific contributions, newly found land could still be claimed for the country of its discoverer. The generosity of the Coats brothers was not forgotten and following the discovery of the land forming the eastern shoreline of the Weddell Sea and the area became known as Coats Land.

In researching reactions to the expedition Innes M. Keighren has noted an interesting trend which existed among press reports. ‘For the English press and public, the significance of the Expedition lay in its scientific accomplishments, whilst in Scotland, the Expedition acquired an additional significance—by doing credit to

---

<sup>24</sup> *Scottish National Antarctic Expedition: Application to The Prime Minister From the Committee of the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition*, 1909, William Speirs Bruce Collection, University of Edinburgh Library, Gen. 165.

<sup>25</sup> Robert Neal Rudmose Brown, *A Naturalist at the Poles: The Life, Work & Voyages of Dr. W.S. Bruce the Polar Explorer*, London: Seeley, Service & Co. Ltd, 1923, p. 100.

science, it had done credit to Scotland.’<sup>26</sup> Bruce took great pride in the Scottishness of his expedition. When hosting a farewell dinner for the crew John Murray, who served on the board of directors for both the Ben Nevis Observatory and the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition, spoke in highly patriotic terms. In a toast he proclaimed that the reason Scotland had a National Expedition of her own was because ‘there is still a Bruce in Scotland’.<sup>27</sup> The crew was composed almost entirely of Scots and the ship that had been rebuilt in Dundee was named Scotia.<sup>28</sup> In the introduction he provided for an account of the expedition written by three of his crew members Bruce said, ‘While “Science” was the talisman of the Expedition, “Scotland” was emblazoned on its flag.’<sup>29</sup> This was not merely a figure of speech; Rudmose Brown, tells a humorous anecdote of Bruce being sent into a rage when a port medical officer evidently mistook the yellow background of the Lion Rampant flying at the foremast as a quarantine flag.<sup>30</sup> For Bruce, scientific achievement was one of the key ways in which a nation could display its virility. After the expedition he wrote, ‘Not the least important of these was Scotland taking her stand alongside the other nations of the world in the exploration of the Antarctic Regions by sending out the Scotia, 1902-1904, well equipped with all the resources of modern science, and sailing under the name and title of “Scottish National Antarctic Expedition.”<sup>31</sup> The trip was a success despite insufficient funds being available to conduct an expedition into the interior of the continent. The deep sea observations along with the biological and meteorological observations of *Scotia* proved to be of incredible value to the scientific community and human understanding of the region.

Following the completion of the journey Bruce found difficulty in raising the necessary funds to publish the scientific results of the expedition. This exasperated him and he wrote bitterly that it would be a tragedy for such important information to

---

<sup>26</sup> Innes M. Keighren, ‘Of Poles, Pressmen, and the Newspaper Public: Reporting the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition, 1902–1904’, *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 121 (2005), p. 215.

<sup>27</sup> Speak, *William Speirs Bruce: Polar Explorer and Scottish Nationalist*, Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, 2003, p. 80.

<sup>28</sup> Although it was hoped that after the expedition the Scotia would be donated to sit in a museum it was put to owing to lack of funds it was put to a variety of different services, including looking for icebergs in the North Atlantic, before it was lost to fire in 1914. *The Dundee Courier*, 19 Jan. 1914, p. 4.

<sup>29</sup> Quoted in Speak, *William Speirs Bruce*, p. 97.

<sup>30</sup> Rudmose Brown, *A Naturalist at the Poles*, p. 119.

<sup>31</sup> William S. Bruce, ‘Scotland and Antarctica’, *Scotia*, 2 (1908), p. 193.

go unpublished for the want of a few hundred pounds when expeditions organised in London had received such generous grants. This view was echoed by several public figures. Bruce's 1914 application to the government for funds to publish his results was supported by James Geikie, the president of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and Cargill G. Knott, the general secretary of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and the Earl of Stair, president of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society. The Principals and Vice Chancellors of the University of Edinburgh, University of St Andrews, University of Aberdeen, University of Glasgow and the University College, Dundee all also offered their support to the renewed application for funds.<sup>32</sup> These men all urged for the further funding to be given on the basis of the importance the expeditions scientific results.

Personally Bruce could not refrain from viewing the matter from a nationalistic standpoint. Writing in the St Andrews Society's patriotic periodical *Scotia* he said:

These records of the work of the Scottish expedition are being placed in every important scientific library in the world, and scientists abroad, as well as those at home, will see and feel thereby that Scotland is no mere name, no mere province of England, but a nation willing and able to take a leading part in the progress of civilisation...This appeal to individual Scotsmen for funds should not be necessary. For purely Scottish affairs we should have something in the nature of a Scottish Treasury.<sup>33</sup>

Although a patriotic periodical like *Scotia* seems a fine place for him to present his argument on the national basis it should be mentioned the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition committee secretary also was not afraid to bring up national politics when writing to Scottish MPs. On 14 March 1914 in a letter addressed to the Scottish Members of Parliament the secretary argued:

It is generally acknowledged, not only in Scotland but also in other parts of the United Kingdom, that Scotland has been unfairly treated in the matter of Treasury grants compared with those expeditions that have been organised in England. As an example of this it may be mentioned that, on 5<sup>th</sup> November 1909, H.M. Treasury refused to make a grant towards Dr Bruce's expedition officially supported by

---

<sup>32</sup> *Application to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury for the sum of £3,800 for completing the Publication of the Scientific Reports of the "Scotia"*, 1914, Edinburgh University Library, Gen. 1656.

<sup>33</sup> Bruce, 'Scotland and Antarctica', *Scotia* 2 (1908), p. 195.

the Royal Scottish Geographical Society, the plans of which were practically identical with those for which it is now suggested that Sir Ernest Shackleton should be voted a sum of £10,000. It is a point of interest that shortly after that refusal was made, viz., on the 7<sup>th</sup> March 1910, that H.M. Treasury granted the late Captain Scott a sum of £20,000. A similar refusal was made while the ‘Scotia’ expedition was being organised, a grant being refused because it was a “purely Scottish expedition”, while the sum of £45,000 was granted to the English expedition. ..It would appear therefore that H.M. Treasury take the view that expeditions organised in England are more worthy of support than those organised in Scotland.<sup>34</sup>

While it is difficult to gauge the reaction of the whole body of Scottish MPs to the argument for funding presented in the letter it is worth noting that the following week several Scottish MPs petitioned Prime Minister Asquith for the Government to approve the funds. The Young Scot James Hogge seems to have been particularly motivated to press Scotland’s case when he asked Asquith:

[W]hether, in view of the fact that Scotland contributes a surplus revenue to the United Kingdom of approximately three millions a year, he can see his way to make this Grant of £3,800 to complete the work of an expedition which has enriched the Admiralty, the Meteorological Office, and the museums of the United Kingdom?<sup>35</sup>

On this occasion Asquith remained firm and reminded Hogge that the previous grant of £3,000 had been issued to Bruce on the conditions that it should allow him to complete publication of the expeditions results. The answer did not satisfy Hogge but the question was left for the day. Nearly a month later *The Glasgow Herald* reported that a meeting of Scottish MPs had resolved to take measures as to ‘compel the Government to reconsider its position’.<sup>36</sup> Although the size and composition of the meeting was not reported it is likely to have been led by Charles Price. Price entered politics after retiring from the biscuit-making partnership M’Vitie and Price. He served as the MP for Bruce’s constituency of Edinburgh Central between 1906 and 1918. Although Price was also born in England he shared in Bruce’s love of Scotland. Upon his death in 1934 *The Scotsman* remembered that ‘No native of Scotland had a keener interest in or a wider knowledge of Scottish history or literature.’<sup>37</sup> Price was himself a keen Scottish Home Ruler and he had hitherto been

<sup>34</sup> William Speirs Bruce Collection, University of Edinburgh Library, Gen. 165.

<sup>35</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 23 Mar. 1914, vol. 60, cc. 28–9.

<sup>36</sup> ‘The Bruce Antarctic Expedition’, *The Glasgow Herald*, 17 Apr. 1914.

<sup>37</sup> ‘Death of Mr Charles Price’, *The Scotsman*, 9 July 1934, p. 8.

influential in pressuring the Government for more funding for Bruce. In 1914 Bruce wrote to Price in order to congratulate him on the event of being given the freedom of Edinburgh and to thank him for having done more than any other for the progress of Scotia.<sup>38</sup> Despite this support Bruce was unable to achieve any further funding from the Government.<sup>39</sup>

Rudmose Brown suggested that it was at least partly Bruce's modesty and unwillingness to sensationalise his endeavours by coupling them with exciting challenges such as reaching the South Pole that inhibited his chances of securing larger donations. This theory has recently benefited from useful discussion by Keighren who has noted that Bruce had been deliberate in his attempts to downplay the adventurous aspects of his expedition. 'Personally, I am not a pole hunter and I do not believe in urging men on till they drop in order to get a mile further north or south than somebody else, but I do believe in an effort to get to know the unknown wherever or whatever it is and thus add to the wealth of human knowledge.'<sup>40</sup> Although this commitment to the scientific focus of his trip is commendable it is perhaps unsurprising that that his expedition failed to capture the imagination of the British general public outside of Scotland.

This explanation did not prevent Scottish Home Rule groups from using the Government's modest funding of the *Scottish National Antarctic Expedition* as evidence of England's neglect of Scotland. In its pamphlet, 'Scottish Home Rule: The case in 60 points', the YSS cited inadequate funding of the expedition as a reason for establishing a devolved Scottish Parliament for matters that pertained only to Scotland. The pamphlet complained the Government only gave a 'beggary grant

---

<sup>38</sup> William S. Bruce to Charles Price, 14 Mar. 1914, Bruce Collection, Edinburgh University Library, Gen. 1656.

<sup>39</sup> Letters of support of Bruce's applications for funding were also supported by the other half of the former biscuit making partnership Robert M'Vitie. Writing to *the Scotsman* M'Vitie pointed out that while the British Government had contributed £85,000 to Antarctic expeditions originating in England '...they have absolutely refused to contribute one penny either to the recent Scottish National Antarctic Expedition or to the new Scottish expedition at present being organised in Scotland by Dr. W.S. Bruce', *The Scotsman*, 25 Jan. 1910, p. 10.

<sup>40</sup> Bruce 1904, *Introductory lectures to Saint Mungo's College*, Bruce Collection, Edinburgh University Library, Gen. 1646, 19/20, quoted in: Keighren, 'Of Poles, Pressmen, and the Newspaper Public', p. 211.

after tremendous pressure'.<sup>41</sup> A circular issued on behalf of St Andrew Society, Scottish Patriotic Society and Scottish Rights Association to the parliamentary candidates at the January 1910 election contained the question: 'Will you support in every way possible the claims of the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition upon the Government for a Treasury grant as already given to the two expeditions that sailed from England?'<sup>42</sup> A report of the circular was published in *Scotia* and revealed that of approximately forty replies only a handful of the candidates replied unfavourably to the question. Of these candidates, thirteen were elected, ten of whom had given support to the clause while three replied in terms too general to determine favour.<sup>43</sup> One candidate was reported to have replied 'Would be prepared to consider this favourably, but would require to know something about proposed expedition.'<sup>44</sup> The report noted sardonically 'that the gentleman who gave this answer does not bear a Scottish name'.

At the 1911 annual joint meeting of the Scottish Patriotic Association and the St. Andrew Society it was called shameful that the expedition had received so little while the expeditions of Scott and Shackleton had received such generous grants. It called it the duty of its members to dispute the inequitable funding of this expedition which was 'not less ably conducted, [and] whose only defect appear[ed] to be that it [was] not organised in England'.<sup>45</sup> Here we see that the perception that a Scottish scientific endeavour was being neglected was taken very seriously by these two groups who sought to promote Scotland culturally. The Scottish expedition's inability to attain further funding was also cited by the Alexander Wilkie in the February 1912 motion for Scottish Home Rule in the House of Commons.<sup>46</sup>

Though Bruce begrudged the Government for what he perceived as being unfair treatment to his expedition when compared to other Antarctic expeditions he still held their work in very high regard. When Shackleton's ship, *The Endurance*, became stranded during its fateful 1914 trans-Antarctic expedition Bruce readily

<sup>41</sup> YSS, *60 Points for Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Alex McClaren & Son, February, 1912, p. 43.

<sup>42</sup> 'Questions to Parliamentary Candidates', *Scotia*, 4 (1910), p. 41.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41–47.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48. The candidate in question was Joseph Sullivan who ran for Labour in Lanarkshire North East and received 11.8 percent of the poll.

<sup>45</sup> 'Report by the Council of the St Andrew Society,' *Scotia*, 5 (1911), p. 44.

<sup>46</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 Feb. 1912, vol. 34, c. 1643.

volunteered his service to the relief mission.<sup>47</sup> Shackleton was also supportive of his fellow polar explorer. In 1914 he wrote to Charles Price commending Bruce's contribution of the study of the region, and expressed an earnest hope that the government would provide the additional funding required.<sup>48</sup>

Although both the Royal Scottish Geographical Society and the Scottish Meteorological Society were founded from a position of pride in the scientific capabilities of Scotland rather than as a desire for deliberate separatism, when their respective projects ran into difficulties securing adequate funding a sense of jealousy was clearly exhibited between the societies both north and south of the border. While the official societies preferred to remain removed from the nationalistic claims, often they drew support and funds from their more outwardly patriotic countrymen. In some cases they were even used as evidence by the more nationalistic groups that Scotland should have more control of her affairs, specifically through devolution.

## **Art**

Having discussed the position of some of the scientific endeavours and institutions in Scotland during the period it may be beneficial to next turn to the place of national art of within Scotland. The various schools of art make for interesting consideration but so to do the debates surrounding how best to exhibit Scottish artistic contributions. It is in this regard that we see the similar clash of those who would co-opt the essentially cultural topic of the management of the National Gallery of Scotland into a political debate questioning the nature of London's influence on a Scottish artistic institution. Jordanna Bailkin has provided an excellent study in the case the National Gallery of Scotland interacting between cultural and political nationalist movements.<sup>49</sup> The Scottish National Gallery was first opened to the public in 1869. By the late nineteenth century the position of the Gallery was almost entirely unsatisfactory. The Scottish National Gallery was funded by the way of annual grants of £2,000 which was still being paid out of an initial £398,095 which

---

<sup>47</sup> Speak, *William Speirs Bruce*, p. 124.

<sup>48</sup> Printed in: 'Dr Bruce's Expedition: Sir Shackleton Support the Claim for Funds', *The Scotsman*, 25 Mar. 1914, p. 9.

<sup>49</sup> Jordanna Bailkin, *The Culture of Property*, Chicago: University of Chicago, 2004, p. 78.

had been owed to Scotland following the Union whereby Scotland agreed to take on a proportional share of the national debt. If this arrangement seemed irregular for the time it also served to highlight the fact that the National Galleries in London and Dublin received a supplement from the Parliament whereas the Scottish National Gallery was paid for out of a debt that was already owed to Scotland.<sup>50</sup> Bailkin has noted that many in Scotland were infuriated when a substantial Scottish collection went to auction. The galleries in Dublin and London both received purchase grants from the Imperial Parliament and made substantial purchases while the National Gallery of Scotland missed out.<sup>51</sup> The situation was further exasperated when it was proposed that control of the gallery should change hands from the Board of Manufactures to the Department of Science and Art at South Kensington. Many had questioned why an art gallery should fall under the control of a board which had existed since Union to oversee Scottish manufacturing and fisheries, however it was still found preferential to control being moved to London. In a comment which expressed the importance of the national character attached to these institutions *The Scotsman* said:

It is not the proper function of the Treasury to pronounce upon the fashion in which the Scottish National Gallery, National Portrait Gallery, and School of Art are managed... The leanings of that Department are distinctly hostile to Scottish claims and aspirations. The Board of Manufacturers may mismanage these institutions; English control would destroy them altogether. They would lose their national character, and become mere branch agencies of a central institution in London.<sup>52</sup>

The position of the Scottish National Gallery at the turn of the twentieth century was deplored by members of the SHRA and later by editors of the nationalist periodicals including *The Fiery Cross*, *The Scottish Patriot*, and *The Thistle*. The editor of *The Scottish Patriot*, John Wilson, in particular was able to link the cause of promoting Scottish Home Rule arguing that Scotland was being robbed of an annual sum and that the situation would never be rectified unless she had a parliament of her own or equal representation in the House of Commons.<sup>53</sup> In Parliament the cause was enthusiastically taken up by the Unionist member John Stirling-Maxwell. Stirling-

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p. 88.

<sup>52</sup> *The Scotsman*, 2 July 1902, p. 6.

<sup>53</sup> Bailkin, *The Culture of Property*, p. 89.



Maxwell did not see the Scottish Gallery as a reason for devolution, but rather, the gallery's restructuring provided a way for strengthening Scottish ties to the state and empire. Bailkin has noted that the initial debates surrounding the Galleries Bills caused many, including *The Scotsman*, to call for united work by Scottish MPs aside from party politics.<sup>54</sup>

Bailkin has argued that these debates provided several opportunities for discussing notions of Scottish identity.<sup>55</sup> The question of Scottish identity manifested itself with regard to whether or not the board would be composed of regional representatives. John Gulland, Dumfries Burghs, and Donald Smeaton, Stirlingshire, argued that that as the Bill stood Edinburgh would be overly represented on the Board of Trustees and would have undue influence in the representation of Scotland through art. Although Edinburgh had served as Scotland's historic capital from the 1880s the Glasgow School painters, including the likes of James Guthrie, E.A. Walton and George Henry, had begun to challenge Edinburgh's cultural hegemony in Scotland.<sup>56</sup> From the 1860s onward many Scottish artists struggled with their own notions of Scottish identity.

In the past a vision of Scottishness had been closely tied to Scott's romanticism of the Highlands featuring images of stags and Highland chiefs. In the 1860s younger artists such as George Reid increasingly came to challenge this notion and lowland scenes began to receive far more attention than had hitherto been expressed. Reid whose style was strongly influenced by the realism of continental artists challenged what it meant to be a Scottish painter both in terms of his technique and subjects he portrayed. While the century ended with a swing back towards the highlands by way of the Celtic Revival, the work of mid to late century artists shows that Scottish artists were aware and thinking about the national connotations of their art. John Morrison has convincingly demonstrated that these ideas of nationhood expressed by artists fit within the existing framework of Unionist-Nationalism. Although artists were eager to depict a Scottish national life it was always within the

---

<sup>54</sup> Bailkin, *The Culture of Property*, p. 91.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>56</sup> John Morrison, *Painting the Nation*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003, p. 192.

framework of the United Kingdom.<sup>57</sup>

The theme of nationalism came up on several occasions during the debates surrounding the Scottish National Galleries, most notably during the discussion of selecting members for the Board of Trustees. The original bill called for board members to be nominated by the Secretary for Scotland. Gulland described the nomination of boards as an English practice and insisted, ‘surely what was needed was not that Scotland should follow English practice, but that they should level up England to Scottish practice. They had in Scotland some ideas of nationality, and they were quite capable of managing their own affairs.’<sup>58</sup> In the same speech Gulland went on to move that as the Bill was pre-eminently a Scottish matter it should be sent to a Scottish Grand Committee.<sup>59</sup> Munro Ferguson a thorough Scottish Home Ruler, strongly agreed with Gulland’s proposal to pass the Bill on to a Scottish Grand Committee and suggested that a great deal of other Scottish legislation could be framed in such a setting.<sup>60</sup> Munro Ferguson, would go on to give a speech and vote in favour when a Scottish Standing Committee was established the following year.

Ultimately compromise was found and the Bill was passed in December 1914, though as Bailkin has suggested it pleased very few.<sup>61</sup> *The Scotsman* reported that vigilance would be needed to ensure funds were properly disposed of. In its discussion of the Bill, *The Scotsman* reminded readers of the Imperial Parliament’s neglect of other Scottish institutions. It was reported that since 1855 societies based in London had received nearly £430,000 while Scottish bodies such as the Royal Society of Edinburgh, The Scottish Metrological Society and the Royal Institute had only received a total of £19,333. Particular jealousy was directed towards Ireland when it claimed ‘they have drawn their thousands, while we have been grudging our hundreds’.<sup>62</sup> This was representative of both a national jealousy towards Ireland, which had received so much attention from the House of Commons but also it reflects a strong desire that Scotland’s academic and scientific institutions should not

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>58</sup> Quoted in: Bailkin, *The Culture of Property*, p. 105. *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 July 1906, vol. 162, c. 226.

<sup>59</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 28 July 1906, vol. 162, c. 226.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, cc. 228–229.

<sup>61</sup> Bailkin, *The Culture of Property*, p. 111.

<sup>62</sup> ‘Editorial’, *The Scotsman*, 14 Dec. 1906, p. 6.

fall behind other nations.

John Stirling-Maxwell was also the first president of the newly formed Scottish Modern Arts Association. The group was founded in 1906 and lasted until 1964. The aims of the society were expressed in its Constitution:

The objects of the Association shall be to ensure the preservation of representative examples of Scottish art, more particularly by acquiring works of contemporary Scottish artists, and also to assist in the enriching of Scottish Public Art Collections. These objects shall be attained by:

- (1) the acquisition of works of art by Scottish painters, sculptors, gravers, and other craftsmen;
- (2) the acquisition of works of art by artists other than Scottish;
- (3) the exhibition of works so acquired;
- (4) the endeavour to secure adequate representation of Scottish art in British National Collections;
- (5) the furtherance of any scheme which shall have for its object the promotion of modern Scottish art.<sup>63</sup>

In an article published in *Scotia* the Association's Chairman of the Executive, A. Stodart Walker, expanded on these aims most notably the 'endeavour to secure adequate representation of Scottish art in British National collections'.<sup>64</sup>

It has been only too clear that there is an impression in the south that the word 'British' is synonymous with 'English'. Without attempting to dispute the evident absurdity, it is only right for us to maintain that in all cases where a gallery or an exhibition professes to represent the several parts of the British Isles the claim of Scotland for adequate and distinctive recognition be not lost sight of. On more than one occasion it has been necessary to point out that the National and Tate Galleries in London are not English, but British, and that works by Scottish artists should find places there, not as a matter of favour, but of right. As matters stand at present it is only too evident that, in the case of the more modern of these two national collections, little note is taken of the majority of those artists who are considered by Scotsmen to be an essential part of their national artistic asset, and that the position which Scottish art has vindicated for itself in the art life of London and the English provinces, and even more especially in Paris and the chief Continental art centres, has yet to receive its due in British national collections. As was forcibly pointed out by Sir James Guthrie in his evidence before the Chantry Commission, no collection of British modern art could possibly be called

---

<sup>63</sup> A. John Stodart Walker, 'A Scottish National Movement', *Scotia*, 2 (1908), p. 199.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

representative that did not contain a single specimen of Sir William Fettes Douglas, Thomson of Duddingston, J.C. Wintour, Alexander Fraser, David Scott, and George Paul Chalmers. That contention applies forcibly to the Tate Gallery in London, which calls itself “The National Gallery of British Art”.<sup>65</sup>

It is hoped that the production of the quote at length may be forgiven as it so strikingly expressed Unionist Nationalism within the realm of Scottish art. Were the phrases ‘National Gallery of British Art’ and ‘Scottish artwork’ substituted with ‘British Parliament’ and ‘Scottish Legislation’, the nationalist argument of the likes of Hogge or Waddie would be replicated. Stodart’s complaint demonstrated the frustration that a component of Scottish national life should be relegated from its rightful position within the British institution, and demanded its full and equal representation. In seeking to remedy the complaint the association sought both to address the issue in the British sphere of the National Gallery and then later within Scotland through the desire to establish a national museum for Scottish modern art. Another example of Scottish artist’s protesting their position within the arena of British art happened at the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair. The Royal Scottish Academy declined the invitation from the Royal Academy to nominate an artist to serve on the British Art Committee unless it received guarantee that suitable space would be designated within the British section for Scottish art.<sup>66</sup> The reason given for doing so was that ‘Scottish art could not be adequately represented at St Louis if it had to be mixed up with a general collection of pictures which the Royal Academy might get together.’<sup>67</sup> Both of these examples serve to illustrate a dissatisfaction that was felt by some Scottish artists that Scottish art was not receiving the representation it deserved at the British level while seeking to establish a separate realm for it expressed. Having discussed the position of art and sciences now it is possible to turn to the study of history in Scotland.

### **Scottish History**

This section will focus on a number of topics under the heading of Scottish history. The most significant is perhaps the teaching of Scottish history and the desire

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> ‘Scottish Art at St Louis Exhibition’, *Edinburgh Evening News*, 4 Nov. 1903, p. 2.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

of Scottish Home Rulers to ensure that Scottish children were receiving an education which emphasised Scotland's history as distinct from English or British. It will also consider the early endeavours to establish Scottish History as a subject of study and the perceived value of that endeavour. The subject of history will almost always be a topic of interest to nationalists. A.D. Smith has argued that nationalism:

seeks to fashion a future in the image of the past. Not any past, of course; only an authentic past, the genuine past of a people in its home land. It is this past that must be rediscovered and resurrected to provide a blueprint of the community's destiny; for only through a real understanding of the ethnic past can national regeneration succeed.<sup>68</sup>

The most ardent Scottish Home Rulers were certainly interested in using Scotland's past as inspiration. One of Charles Waddie's earliest publications was a historical play based on William Wallace. Even before the foundation of the SHRA in 1886, Charles Waddie had published booklets on the history of the Union between Scotland and England.<sup>69</sup> Interest in Scottish history was not, however, confined to Scottish nationalists. The founding of the Scottish Historical Society and the *Scottish Antiquary* in 1886 represented an increased interest in Scotland's past.<sup>70</sup> *The Scottish Antiquary* was continued by the long running *Scottish Historical Review*. The University of Edinburgh and, as will be discussed shortly, the University of Glasgow took increased interest in the topic as demonstrated by the establishing professorships in Scottish History in 1901 and 1913 respectively. As was discussed in chapter one, history could also be used to promote a unionism which allowed for Scottish distinctiveness as was the case in the collaboration between the first professor of Scottish History at the University of Glasgow Robert Rait and the renowned constitutional theorist A.V. Dicey, *Thoughts on the Scottish Union*. With Scottish history being utilised by both those in favour of and against Home Rule the position of school text books becomes very interesting.

By the first decade of the twentieth century there was a noticeable push to promote Scottish history by educationalists. In 1914 an issue of *Education News* ran

---

<sup>68</sup> A.D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism*, London: Routledge 2000, p. 112.

<sup>69</sup> Charles Waddie, *The Treaty of Union Between Scotland and England. With an Historical Introduction*, Edinburgh: Waddie & Co, 1883.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 16–17.

a Bannockburn edition stressing the importance of teaching Scottish History. Scottish history's place within Scottish universities during this period has recently been the subject of a valuable discussion by Robert Anderson. Anderson has noted that although history was first introduced to the Scottish curriculum during the middle of the nineteenth century it was a British constitutional history which was deemed most useful to the education of students.<sup>71</sup>

The promotion of Scottish history can often be seen along claims for Scottish Home Rule in the manifestos of Scottish patriotic groups, including the Scottish Patriotic Association and the YSS. This desire to interpret Scottish history from a more patriotic standpoint was continued by the advocates of Scottish Home Rule into the subsequent decades. Complaints were made that Scottish history was neglected and often misrepresented. Another complaint was the misuse of the national names England and English for Britain and British. It was seen as particularly egregious that famous Scots such as David Livingstone, James Watt and Adam Smith were being labelled as Englishmen in British history books. The misuse of national names had been a complaint for several decades among Scottish Home Rulers but the matter was seen as particularly distasteful in the case of history books being used in Scottish Schools. David Macrae was one of the primary champions of this cause. In a well read pamphlet he noted that an offending book was found to have 658 errors of this type.<sup>72</sup> *The Scottish Historical Review* responded favourably to this pamphlet. While acknowledging that some points were 'over-accentuated', it expressed satisfaction that the movement had started to succeed in 'its purpose by stimulating the production of school books designed to give a true rendering of the place of this country, past and present, as a constituent of the Empire'.<sup>73</sup>

The Edinburgh based, journal of the Education Institute of Scotland, *The Educational News*, gave attention to the issue of the teaching of Scottish history in its edition in August 1905. When evaluating a set of history books which had been specifically designated as Scottish editions they found them lacking in quality.

---

<sup>71</sup> Robert Anderson, 'University History Teaching, National Identity and Unionism in Scotland, 1862–1914', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 91 (2012), p. 6.

<sup>72</sup> David Macrae (ed.), *Scottish History in Our Schools: Urgent Need for Reform*, Glasgow: Scottish Patriotic Association, 1906, p. 8.

<sup>73</sup> 'Notes and Comments', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 4 (1907), p. 239.

‘Judged as text books of English history they are excellent; judged from the point of Scottish or even of *British* history, they fall far short of the ideal.’<sup>74</sup> The campaign for the better teaching of Scottish history received one of its greatest achievements in the same year when the 1905 Annual Committee of the Council of Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs passed a motion that:

That a representation be made by the Convention to the Scottish Education Office, desiring them to direct that in the teaching of Scottish history in Board schools, care should be taken to only use such books as give a more adequate and accurate presentation of important events in Scotland from an authentic Scottish standpoint, and urging that the use of the words 'British' and 'Britain' should be used instead of the words 'English' and 'England' in history books dealing with British history after the Union of the Crowns.<sup>75</sup>

Such a representation was drafted and addressed to the Scottish Education Department in August of 1905. A reply was received less than two weeks later expressing that their Lordships were generally agreeable to the views however were hesitant to interfere with the firmly established right of local school boards to determine to choose what text books were used.<sup>76</sup> Although at first this reply might be seen as a superficial appeasement, in subsequent letters over the next two years the Education Board further developed its position which eventually led to the issuing of a memorandum to teachers. It suggested that careful attention was given to avoid choosing textbooks which contained such inaccuracies and it recommended the study of Scottish history as a valuable part of the curriculum specifically with regards to younger students.<sup>77</sup>

Evaluating the effectiveness of the campaign for better Scottish history books is difficult. This is largely due to the local autonomy of individual school boards. Complaints about offending books remained a consistent feature of *Scotia* for the duration of its publication. In spite of this there were, however, some clear signs of improvement. By 1907 advertisements could be found in *the Scotsman* advertising

---

<sup>74</sup> *The Educational News*, 30 (1905); *The Educational News* was a weekly newspaper from the Educational Institute of Scotland. Started in 1876, Robert D. Anderson has described *Education News* as the main forum for Scottish educational debate. Robert Anderson, *Education and the Scottish People*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 175.

<sup>75</sup> ‘The Convention of the Scottish Burghs’, *The Scotsman*, 23 Feb. 1904, p. 4.

<sup>76</sup> Quoted in: Macrae, *Scottish History*, p. 13.

<sup>77</sup> ‘The Study of Scottish History in Schools: Suggestions for Teachers’, *The Scotsman*, 17 Dec. 1907, p. 7.

British history books specifically with regard to the attention they paid to Scottish history.<sup>78</sup> There were also instances of local school boards writing to publishers of history textbooks asking that more care be given regarding the terms of the Treaty of Union and the use of national names in the future. In 1909 the Scottish Patriotic Association issued a circular to candidates running for various local school board elections. The candidates were asked if they were elected would they abide the suggestions that had been put forth in the Scottish Education Department 1907 memorandum and ensure that the textbooks chosen for the teaching of the subject provide an adequate and accurate representation of Scotland's constitutional position with careful regard to the use of national nomenclature. The results of this circular were very favourable. In Edinburgh nineteen of the twenty-one elected officials had sent favourable replies, while in fifteen school boards of Glasgow and Govan no less than ten successful candidates had responded positively. Glasgow was a particular success as Rev. James Barr who had been a strong supporter of the movement came first in the polls and received over 81,000 votes.<sup>79</sup> Barr was a strong Home Ruler and active member of the YSS.

It is tempting now, as it was then, to refer to these matters as being issues of trivial national sentiment that were only regarded as important to those of a particularly eccentric vein of patriotism. It should however be highlighted, that support to this cause was also given by several leading academics. Professor Peter Hume Brown, the first professor of Ancient Scottish History and Palaeography at the University of Edinburgh insisted that:

A fussy patriotism was certainly a thing to be reprobated, but that could not be called fussy which only demanded an exact use of historical terms, and maintained that rising generations should have full and accurate instruction in the history of their native country. It was from the history of our own people that the richest gain was to be derived, for the simple reason that we could adequately understand it.<sup>80</sup>

For Hume-Brown inadequate instruction of pupils in Scottish history was to be

---

<sup>78</sup> 'Educational Works', *The Scotsman*, 12 Sept. 1907, p. 2.

<sup>79</sup> 'Notes and Comments', *Scotia*, 3 (1909), pp. 148–149.

<sup>80</sup> Peter Hume Brown, 'The Teaching of Scottish history in Schools', *Scottish Historical Review*, 5 (1907), p. 44. Original address was to a meeting of the Glasgow Branch of the Educational Institute of Scotland 18 March.



regretted for the loss of national sentiment but more importantly for depriving them of what he deemed 'a nutriment at once for soul and mind' which no other subject could provide as fully'.<sup>81</sup>

Hume Brown was born in East-Lothian in 1849. He attended school at Prestonpans before matriculating at Edinburgh University in 1872. His career itself reflects the growing position of Scottish history in Scotland. Hume-Brown was an interesting choice for the chair. As Dauvit Broun has noted he differed fundamentally from many contemporary historians in Scotland over his view of English history. For many in Scotland at the time English history was to be admired for its continuity, Hume-Brown's work however focused on 'clean breaks with the past and revolutions—by which he meant not conflagrations but thoroughgoing changes achieved gradually after a decisive event or reign'.<sup>82</sup> Another notable aspect of Hume-Brown's work is that his seminal book from 1911, *History of Scotland*, was included in a national historical series as part of the Cambridge Historical Series.<sup>83</sup> Much to the satisfaction of many patriotic societies in Scotland his *History of Scotland* was accompanied by a single volume version which was intended to be used as a schoolroom textbook. As well as being the first professor of Scottish history at any Scottish University, he published several new volumes of Scottish history and was a frequent contributor to the newly established journal, the *Scottish Historical Review*.

Despite Hume Brown's inspiring defence of Scottish history, Robert Anderson has noted that among the university professors of history of the time only James Mackinnon, lecturer at St Andrews and later Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical history at the University of Edinburgh, was sympathetic to Scottish Home Rule.<sup>84</sup> He was a vice-president and lifetime member of the St. Andrews Society. In the concluding chapter of his book *The Union of England and Scotland*, Mackinnon framed the arguments of Scottish Home Rulers stating:

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>82</sup> Dauvit Broun, 'A forgotten anniversary: P. Hume Brown's *History of Scotland*, 1911', in: Pryce, H. and Evans, R. (eds), *Writing a Small Nation's Past – Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850–1950*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Anderson, 'University History', pp. 21–22.

One fact is certain, unless more radical measures are adopted in the direction of Home Rule, than have hitherto been attempted, for remedying what are admitted to be reasonable grievances, Scotsmen will not continue to acquiesce in the present unsatisfactory regime. Men will not pay large sums for an effete order of things, merely because that order is a part of the constitution, established two hundred years ago. They may reasonably conclude that expediency, apart from a mere doctrinaire patriotism, suggest the establishment of a national legislative Council, as the logical sequence of the County Council.<sup>85</sup>

Although Mackinnon was reserved about the Irish case for Home Rule as he described it as ‘inexpedient and dangerous, owing to the peculiar circumstances of religious division in that country’, he saw Scottish Home Rule as being in no way incompatible with imperial unity.<sup>86</sup>

Another example of the increased focus on the teaching of Scottish history as a distinct subject can be found at the university level. The first professorship of specifically Scottish history was established in 1901 when Peter Hume-Brown was made professor of Ancient Scottish History and Palaeography at the University of Edinburgh. Shortly after Hume-Brown was appointed to the University of Edinburgh the Federation of Burns societies began to advocate the founding of a chair for Glasgow University as well. The principal of the University of Glasgow, Donald MacAlister, favoured the idea especially as that the increasing priority given to Scottish history in schools necessitated teachers received an adequate education in the subject.<sup>87</sup> The founding of the chair also received favourable reports from the press. Most notably, Dr William Wallace, the editor of the *Glasgow Herald*, 1906-1909 was head of the joint committee for this purpose and was frequently credited for his strenuous personal efforts in gathering support and funding.<sup>88</sup> William Smart, Glasgow’s Professor of Political Economy, recognised the difficulties that would be associated with such an endeavour, not least of which was that it would require somewhere in the realm of £15,000, which was later revised to £20,000 to have any

---

<sup>85</sup> James Mackinnon, *The Union of England and Scotland*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896, p. 519.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 517.

<sup>87</sup> ‘Presentation of the Cheque’, *The Scotsman*, 17 Jan. 1913, p. 10.

<sup>88</sup> ‘Glasgow Chair of Scottish History’, *The Scotsman*, 16 Dec. 1913, p. 9.

chance of success.<sup>89</sup> It was acknowledged early on that they should look outside the group for additional sources of help. As a result of this necessity, a joint committee of Burns societies, patriotic associations and various Scottish societies was formed and by 1909 £4000 had already been subscribed.<sup>90</sup>

To raise the remainder of the funds a Scottish National Exhibition was held in Glasgow's Kelvingrove Park in 1911. The exhibition was a stunning success and showcased the best of Scottish history, art, and industry. Taking the trend from Glasgow's previous Great Exhibitions the exhibits were spread over Kelvingrove Park and structures were erected and dedicated as 'palaces' to their respective fields. Even the palaces themselves were designed to represent a romantic interpretation Scottish style with 'baronial style, castle and drawbridge, ancient palace and courtyard, old-world streets of quaint houses with outside stairs and tiny windows with knotted panes of glass.'<sup>91</sup> The exhibition was not without amusements and it featured abundant musical performances, restaurants tea-rooms, bars and notably an aerial railway which carried passengers across the skyline of the park.

The Palace of History is worthy of special comment. Its exterior design was modelled on Falkland Palace and ancient Holyrood. No less impressive were its contents. Under the direction of Professor John Glaister, a renowned expert of forensic medicine and public health, an attempt was made to provide an exhaustive display of Scottish historical relics. Perilla Kinchin and Juliet Kinchin have noted that over 1,400 private owners, including King George contributed items to the collection which was insured at £459,000. The collection included letters of Sir William Wallace, and the Sword of Robert the Bruce and, as Perilla and Juliet Kinchin, point out the *Official Catalogue* hoped the collection 'will keep alive, in the breasts of all who reverently look upon them, the love of their native land-the ancient kingdom of Scotland-and will sustain affection for those who have made their nation's history'.<sup>92</sup> Scotland's achievements in other fields, including fine art, industry, music, science, and engineering were also well represented. The Scottish

<sup>89</sup> 'Burns Club and Chair of Scottish History', *The Scotsman*, 26 Apr. 1907, p. 6.

<sup>90</sup> *Scotia*, 3 (1909), pp. 261–263.

<sup>91</sup> 'The Scottish Exhibition some Preliminary Impressions', *The Glasgow Herald*, 28 Apr. 1911, p. 10.

<sup>92</sup> Perilla Kinchin and Juliet Kinchin, *Glasgow's Great Exhibitions: 1888 1901, 1911, 1938, 1988*, Wendlebury: White Cockade, 1988, p. 100.

National Antarctic Expedition also provided a display for the exhibition which Bruce hoped would generate public interest and support for the allocation of further funds to continue with the publication of the journey's scientific findings.

The public's interest can be gauged by the fact that the final day drew in over 170,000 visitors, despite experiencing what was described as exceptionally bad weather. Over the course of the previous six months over 9,000,000 visitors attended. In reviewing the exhibition *The Glasgow Herald* offered the hope that though the, 'shining pavilions will disappear and their treasures be dispersed; the memory of the Exhibition will find its truest perpetuation in the great city of learning at Gilmorehill'.<sup>93</sup> The paper's hope was not misplaced. Of the profits £15,000 was donated to the university and later that year Dr Rait became the first Chair of Scottish history and literature at the University of Glasgow.<sup>94</sup> Robert Anderson has noted that Rait was a strong unionist who viewed the Union of 1707 as a great success because it created a state without destroying the national identities of Scotland and England. While it might be tenuous to claim the establishment of a chair of Scottish history and the reform of teaching curriculum and textbooks as acts of nationalism they do represent conscious attempt to promote the study of Scottish history as its own distinct entity.

As well as calls for reform of the way in which Scottish history was to be taught in schools, there were also more general claims for reform to the whole system of Scottish education. The handling of this educational question appears in the first three Scottish Home Rule motions by Dr G.B. Clark in 1889, 1890 and 1891 and again in the final debates of Scottish Home Rule before the War in 1912, 1913, and 1914. The image that was consistently presented was that for centuries Scotland had led the world in educating her people and now that progress was being stunted by lack of parliamentary attention and a tendency to model Scottish legislation retrospectively on English bills. This sentiment can be seen in Mr Cowan's 1913 motion where he said:

[A] single Scottish official rules Scottish education with almost despotic sway. And why? Because in the early seventies this Scottish

---

<sup>93</sup> 'The Scottish Exhibition some Preliminary Impressions', *The Glasgow Herald*, 28 Apr. 1911, p. 10.

<sup>94</sup> Anderson, 'University History Teaching in Scotland', p. 37.

Department was transferred to London. That was a gratuitous insult to the nation, which had its own national and democratic system of education before England ever dreamt of educating her people at all, and if Scotland has not fully maintained her lead during the forty years since that transfer we must attribute it to this attempt to Anglicise Scotland, and that that attempt has largely failed, as it has, is one of the strongest evidences of the vitality of Scottish nationality.<sup>95</sup>

Unsurprisingly the Scottish patriotic periodicals often took an even more disparaging view of the situation. In 1904 *The Scottish Patriot* accused the Secretary of Scotland of planning an education bill in the dark in order to impose on Scotland a Bill replicated on the English Education Act of 1902. It warned that, ‘The Scottish people know what they want in educational matters, and more than that we venture to affirm they will get what they want or they will know the reason why. Scotland will not be imposed upon.’<sup>96</sup> Another periodical, *The Scottish Nation* edited by Hector Macpherson, received frequent contributions from the Principal of St. Andrews, James Donaldson. Donaldson is an interesting character; he was a leading educationalist and for a time served as the editor of *The Educational News*. His achievements in the field of education were rewarded with a knighthood in 1907. He had strong ties to the Liberal party and had an agreement not been reached over the Lord's Veto he would have been among the new peers to have been created by Asquith.<sup>97</sup>

Sir James Donaldson was born in 1831 in Aberdeenshire. He attended the Aberdeen grammar school and later Marischal College in Aberdeen. Coming from very humble origins Donaldson distinguished himself through academic prowess and came under the tutelage of John Stuart Blackie while in Aberdeen and then again in 1852 when he became assistant to Blackie who was then serving as a professor of Greek at Edinburgh.<sup>98</sup> Through a shared interest in the collection of rare books he became a close associate of Lord Rosebery. This connection developed into a

---

<sup>95</sup> *Hansard House of Commons Debs*, 30 May 1913, vol. 53, cc. 471–551.

<sup>96</sup> *The Scottish Patriot*, 2 (1904), p. 31.

<sup>97</sup> E.M. Craik, ‘Donaldson, Sir James (1831–1915)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32856>, accessed 13 June 2013].

<sup>98</sup> It has been suggested by one biographer that it may have been through his interaction with the noteworthy Scottish Home Ruler, Charles Stuart Blackie. Craik, ‘Donaldson, Sir James’.

meaningful, if somewhat lopsided friendship, between Donaldson and both Rosebery and his wife. This relationship was not without material benefit to Donaldson and it has been convincingly demonstrated that many of his professional advancements owed much to his personal connection with Rosebery.

A. Scott Lawson, his most comprehensive biographer to date, has noted that in the final years of his life Scottish Home Rule served as his primary political interest.<sup>99</sup> By 1914 he claimed to have been a Scottish Home Ruler for sixty years, though as Lawson has noted, there is no evidence of his involvement with the movement through previous groups such as the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights, or the SHRA. This silence may have been due in part to his close connection to Lord Rosebery. Donaldson and Rosebery had come into acquaintance through a shared love of rare books. In time this association developed into a friendship though as Lawson has pointed out, this was bolstered by an element of mutual benefit to each other. Donaldson served as Rosebery's agent in Scotland relaying information about new books and increasingly political developments and Rosebery served as a source of patronage. It was widely and perhaps not incorrectly suspected that this relationship played a role in Donaldson's securing several important teaching posts throughout his career. While Rosebery had undoubtedly advocated increased political representation for Scotland, particularly through the restoration of the Secretary for Scotland, he always remained icy with regard to Scottish Home Rule.<sup>100</sup> Lawson has suggested that Donaldson may have been wary of putting too much support to the cause as to avoid damaging his beneficial relationship with a man whose influence in Scotland at the time was almost unmatched. By 1910 Lord Rosebery had largely withdrawn from active political life. It might be speculated that this freed Donaldson to pursue his interest in the topic of Scottish Home Rule.

One of his earlier pronouncements on Scottish Home Rule can be seen in the report of his opening the Winter Session at St Andrews on the thirteenth of October 1903. In this address Donaldson took a favourable view of the trend toward free, or

---

<sup>99</sup> A. Scott Lawson, 'Principal Sir James Donaldson: education and political patronage in Victorian Scotland', PhD diss., University of St Andrews, 1988, p. 464.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

at least very affordable, education, which had recently seen progress at Continental Universities.<sup>101</sup> Donaldson contended that this had been a principle of Scottish universities since their earliest foundations, a principle which had only recently come under challenge by English traditions. In linking the cause of Scottish education with Scottish Home Rule he claimed, ‘if Scotland had had a separate Legislature to deal with purely Scottish matters this would have been in operation long ago, and our Scottish Universities would have stood in the foremost rank of national Universities in point of equipment and efficiency’.<sup>102</sup> Regardless of his earlier inactivity James Donaldson became a valuable proponent of Scottish Home Rule in the years preceding the War. He was the senior honorary president of the International Scots Home Rule League. This fact distinguished him from the list of ordinary honorary presidents which at times numbered over one hundred. The founder of the International Scots Home Rule League and indeed one of the most unwavering advocates of Scottish Home Rulers of the early twentieth century, Edinburgh Councillor F.J. Robertson, described him as the Grand Old Man of Scottish Home Rule.<sup>103</sup> The title had previously been bestowed on John Stuart Blackie and Charles Waddie.

As might be expected Donaldson came to Scottish Home Rule through his involvement with Scottish education. Before a meeting of the Scots Home Rule League he recalled one of his early memories that helped convert him to the cause. Early in his career, while in London supporting an education reform, he met with a member of the Government and attempted to persuade him that Scotland was more suited for the reform than England. He was met with the reply, ‘We don’t intend to do anything for you; wait until we make up on you.’<sup>104</sup> It stuck with him for many years and he went on to warn, ‘That idea governed a great many of our legislators in London, with the result that Scotland had often to wait owing to the backwardness of England.’<sup>105</sup> Donaldson was not the only prominent academic who supported Scottish Home Rule. His mentor from his studies in Aberdeen, John Stuart Blackie,

---

<sup>101</sup> ‘Principal Donaldson on Scottish Universities’, *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1903), p. 88.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>104</sup> ‘Principal Donaldson on Scots Home Rule’, *EEN*, 26 Feb. 1914, p. 7.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

as has been mentioned was also a prominent member of the SHRA. In his pamphlet, *The Union of 1707 and its Results: a Plea for Scottish Home Rule*, Blackie asserted that ‘Borrowed culture is always dangerous, and to be safe must always be kept in due subjection to what is national and native.’<sup>106</sup> He therefore called that the national song and history of Scotland be kept in a prominent place in Scottish schools. Blackie is a fascinating character in the study of Scottish cultural nationalism and Scottish Home Rule. Hutchinson notes that ‘What lies behind this cultural politics is a drive to resurrect the personality of the nation in all its dimensions in space and time.’<sup>107</sup> In many ways Blackie fits this mould, whereby Scottish Home Rule featured as only one component of his ambition to revitalise the Scottish nation in defence encroachment from England.

In one particular series of articles for *The Scottish Nation* he addressed Scotland's claims for Home Rule from merely an educational standpoint. He was highly critical of the Scottish Education Act of the 1872 and complained bitterly that Scottish education should be brought into line with its English counterpart. Donaldson had been a supporter of Lord Advocate James Moncrieff's 1869 Parochial Schools Bill. During his 1869 presidential address to the Education Institute, Donaldson claimed that the Bill furnished ‘as good guarantees for a first-rate system of primary instruction as the system of any country in the world’.<sup>108</sup> Donaldson also approved of the Bill because he felt it was based on a proven tradition of Scottish educational ideas. Under Moncrieff's Bill Scottish education was to be provided by the state and under the control of Parliament. Teachers were to have close links to the universities and were to be provided with long tenure, pensions, and widow support. Moncrieff's Bill of 1869 was rejected in the Lords and in 1871 a similar bill was withdrawn having reached a second reading due to insufficient time. The following year the Scottish Education Act was passed which introduced many changes and notably introduced School Boards which would control the employment and dismissal of teachers. Donaldson's main complaint regarding the primary and secondary education in Scotland was the inability to secure quality teachers. He felt

---

<sup>106</sup> Blackie, *The Union of 1707*, p. 15.

<sup>107</sup> Hutchinson, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism*, p. 21.

<sup>108</sup> James Donaldson, ‘Home Rule and Scottish Education’, *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1913), p. 5.



that the Act of 1872 stripped the Scottish people of their interest in the teaching methods which had characterised their ancestors and that the position of teacher had lost its dignity and respect which it had previously possessed.<sup>109</sup> Donaldson thought that the only place educational matters could be adequately solved was in a Scottish Parliament located in Edinburgh influenced by Scottish ways of thinking.

### **Conclusion**

Of all the subjects that can be taught either in secondary or elementary schools, there is none so specifically fitted to foster imagination and apprehensive power as the study of national history. Science opens up a world that excites curiosity and wonder but it cannot touch the most being in the same degree as the record of the action of our fellow creatures.<sup>110</sup>

Hume Brown's bias can perhaps be forgiven considering his profession; however, it is clear that early twentieth-century Scotland was flourishing with academic and scientific societies and projects. At the turn of the twentieth century there were several scientific and historical societies in Scotland; for the most part these societies existed to promote the study of their respective fields within the borders of their country. However, when difficulties arose making it harder for these groups to carry out their projects they were met enthusiastically with support from patriotic individuals and patriotic societies. The patriotic societies were particularly keen to draw attention to these perceived grievances as they were often cited as evidence for their nationalistic endeavours. On the other hand, the academic societies appear to have been willing to, at least to some extent, work with such groups as to court the favour and perhaps more importantly the financial assistance of their patriotic countrymen.

One of the critiques of this chapter might be that has shied away from classifying groups and individuals as either politically or culturally nationalistic. This has largely been due to the great difficulty in distinguishing between the two. Indeed, one of the dangers of a thesis which has focussed on Scottish Home Rule is that devolution is an inherently political process. By looking at occasions when those

---

<sup>109</sup> 'Primary Schools and the Training of Teachers', *The Scottish Nation*, 1 (1914), pp. 34–36.

<sup>110</sup> Hume Brown 'The Teaching of Scottish History in Schools', *Scottish Historical Review*, 5 (1907), p. 41.

interested in promoting Scotland's position in the world culturally and scientifically turned to Scottish Home Rule there is a danger of overstating the political side of the argument. An argument might be made that many of these groups were examples of cultural nationalism regardless of their commitment towards Scottish Home Rule. This would fall in line with the assessment of Hutchinson who has argued that cultural nationalists will often turn to political nationalism periodically when they find it impossible to carry out their own ambitions without it.<sup>111</sup> The tendency of some of those involved with the Ben Nevis Observatory, Scottish National Antarctic Expedition and those interested in reforming the teaching of Scottish History to turn to arguments for Scottish Home Rule for support during financial difficulties seems to support this assessment.

The extent which the perceived inadequacy of funding for Scottish history, art, and science could be espoused by Scottish nationalists was perhaps best be demonstrated by the most active Scottish Home Ruler of the generation, Charles Waddie. In his very short-lived periodical *The Scottish Nationalist* he attacked the Government over its reluctance to fund Scottish endeavours in ethnic terms, which although not unheard of in the Scottish Home Rule movement, do bear an unusual bitterness:

The business of a civilized government is not confined to making laws and administering the same, nor in levying taxes; these are means to an end, namely, the happiness of the people. It is certainly a poor compliment to the intelligence of our rulers that we are the only state in Europe that entirely neglects two refining influences, to wit, music and drama; and save for the paltry salary given to the Poet Laureate, the muse is equally neglected. Painting and sculpture get some small recognition, but no other art. The amount spent upon scientific research is small indeed; and the impudent attempt to close the Ben Nevis Observatory is quite in keeping with the spirit of our Norman rulers, who value nothing but brute force and feudal sycophantic ceremonies of a court.<sup>112</sup>

Although Scottish nationalists like Waddie, have often been, perhaps not unfairly, described as eccentric fanatics, statements like this show that they were willing to tap into wider issues and apply them to their claims for Home

---

<sup>111</sup> Hutchinson, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism*, p. 19.

<sup>112</sup> *The Scottish Nationalist*, 1 (1903), p. 2.

Rule. The extent which the favour was returned by these various groups depended largely on the individuals involved.

While it is here maintained that the efforts of these various groups and individuals to promote Scottish work in the fields of art, science, history, and education were at least partly inspired by national sentiments it cannot be claimed that all of the individuals in such organisations were closely aligned with those who might be deemed Scottish nationalists. Stirling-Maxwell, president of the Scottish Modern Art Association, was against Scottish Home Rule. James Geikie co-founder and president of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society, 1904-1910 as well as honorary editor of the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, received condemnation from Scottish Nationalists such as T.D. Wanliss and Theodore Napier, for his acquiescence towards the use of the word ‘England’ in place of ‘Britain’ within the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*. William Gordon Burn-Murdoch<sup>113</sup>, a naturalist and artist who accompanied William Speirs Bruce on one of his early polar adventures, publicly withdrew his subscription ‘until the Articles of the Treaty of Union were recognised by that society’.<sup>114</sup> Writing to *The Scotsman* the following day Burn-Murdoch decried:

But I claim that this matter of name of country is, over and above patriotism and sentiment a proper matter for discussion in the Geographical Society, and is also solid business. The business aspect comes in when we see that through our want of perfervid nationality we let the Irish scoop far more from the National Treasury for their institutions than we do—far more for their museum in Dublin, and yet we are taxed more per head than either the Irish or English. For their national ardour they get a Zoo. We have only a Zoological Committee! with 20s. in the treasury! They have grants here and there. We can’t get enough for a hut on Ben Nevis. We get pittance for our picture galleries, our art schools. And in exploration! Look at Dr Bruce’s Antarctic Polar work—unrecognised by our Government but appreciated and honoured by foreign Governments. English expeditions, or at least London-British expeditions are paid for in countless thousands. It is to this apathy of the Anglicised Scotsman to

---

<sup>113</sup> Burn-Murdoch was a longstanding member of the Society and had served on its council. He was also a founding member of the St Andrew Society Edinburgh and would decades later go on to publish a pamphlet in support of Scottish independence. For a short biography of W.G. Burn-Murdoch, including his subsequent nationalist activities see: Geoffrey N. Swinney, ‘From the Arctic and Antarctic to “the back parts of Mull”: The life and career of William Gordon Burn Murdoch (1862–1939)’, *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 119 (2003), pp. 121–151.

<sup>114</sup> *The Fiery Cross*, 10 (1910), pp. 5–6.

the national name, honour, and interest that we owe this heavy debt. I know of no country in the world where one section will tolerate the application of the name of another section to the whole, and are we to set the example?<sup>115</sup>

A year earlier, in an issue of *Scotia*, Burn-Murdoch had cited similar examples of inadequate support for Scottish scientific endeavours and claimed ‘what we still need is a pull on the national purse strings—a right to administer in Scotland, in our own way, a portion of those funds which by our diligence and intelligence we pour into the Imperial Treasury’.<sup>116</sup> Burn-Murdoch’s letter to the Scotsman was subsequently followed by letters from several others including Theodore Napier.<sup>117</sup> Geikie ultimately conceded and noted that as president of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society he would give instruction that the offending terms not be used in such context in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*.<sup>118</sup> Geikie’s initial insensitivity to national nomenclature and Burn-Murdoch’s reaction highlight one of the essential themes of this chapter, which is that academic endeavours in the fields of History, Science, Art could, like politics, serve as a field for discussion of Scottish nationhood and nationalism. Ultimately the relationship between ideas of nationhood and Scotland’s academic efforts was dynamic and susceptible to the influence of personality and circumstance. The great duality of Scottishness and Britishness allowed men like William Speirs Bruce to raise funds for his Scottish adventure by playing to the patriotic aspirations of his countrymen at home while at the same time appealing to the British Treasury for funds to publish research for the good of the empire. When these funds or, more notably in the case of art and history, representation were not found to be adequate at the British level there was disappointment and backlash at the Scottish level. It was at these times that nationalists like Waddie and Napier, and to some extent MPs like James Hogge and Charles Price, were prone to exert Scotland’s claims in order to raise awareness for their own cause of Scottish Home Rule.

---

<sup>115</sup> ‘Royal Scottish Geographical Society and “England” for “Britain”’, *The Scotsman*, 19 Nov. 1909, p. 9.

<sup>116</sup> ‘From the Firth of Clyde’, *Scotia*, 2 (1908), p. 39.

<sup>117</sup> *The Scotsman*, 20 Nov. 1909, p. 13.

<sup>118</sup> ‘Royal Scottish Geographical Society and “England” for “Britain”’, *The Scotsman*, 20 Nov. 1909, p. 13.

## Conclusion

Trying to assess the debates surrounding Scottish Home Rule has offered several challenges. One of the first tasks was to define what was meant by the term. Although the phrase could mean as little as increased local administration, it increasingly came to be understood as the desire for a devolved Scottish Parliament to handle the indistinct concept of ‘purely Scottish legislation’. The early chapters of this thesis have demonstrated that the relationship between Home Rulers of the various constituent countries of the United Kingdom was complex and sometimes conflicting. In spite of this, for most Scottish Home Rulers, the desirability of Home Rule All Round was quickly recognised and it remained a consistent feature of plans for Scottish Home Rule throughout the period. From here a major question presents itself: could devolution be nationalistic? Kennedy’s flexible definition of nationalism was drawn on for the purpose of this thesis; ‘Nationalism as a political project seeks an arrangement in which the status of the nation is politically and/or culturally enhanced.’<sup>1</sup> With this concept in mind it was possible to assess whether or not Scottish Home Rule satisfied this criteria. The words ‘status’ and ‘enhanced’ are essential to this definition.

Would the status of Scotland have increased if Scottish legislation was passed in Scotland, without votes from representatives outside of Scotland? The answer to this perhaps depends on how much the individual adheres to the ‘theory of political legitimacy, which requires that ethnic boundaries should not cross political ones’.<sup>2</sup> As noted in the introduction, Scotland does not fit neatly into Gellner’s definition of nationalism. However, if we apply a little flexibility, specifically a flexibility which is necessitated by an awareness of ‘dual’ or even ‘concentric loyalties’, as observed by Morton, Smout and Smith, it becomes possible to imagine an individual who wants their Scottish identity governed politically by Scots, whilst simultaneously wanting Westminster to govern the Empire which so many embraced.<sup>3</sup> It is for this

---

<sup>1</sup> Kennedy, *Liberal Nationalisms*, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Morton, *Unionist Nationalism*, p. 16, Smout, ‘Problems of Nationalism’, p. 4, Smith, *Ethnic Origin of Nations*.

reason that Charles Waddie and many other Scottish Home Rulers like him, could call himself a Unionist (Scottish-English Union), a Home Ruler and a Nationalist.

One of the next important tasks was to untangle Scottish Home Rule support. As noted in the introduction, Kidd was perceptive when he claimed that Scottish Home Rule was on the margins of the margins of Scottish Politics before the Great War.<sup>4</sup> However, Devine was also correct when he said that it had come ‘within an ace of success’ just before the War’s outbreak.<sup>5</sup> In order to reconcile this paradox, this thesis sought to assess the place of Scottish Home Rule among the various groups, parties, and institutions which promoted it. The reason for doing so was twofold. First, to question why a topic which consistently received the majority of votes from MPs serving Scottish constituencies could be accused of unpopularity. Second, was this support approaching nationalism, or was it a purely pragmatic response to two of the serious and interlinked challenges facing Westminster; the Irish Question, and the ever increasing workload of governing empire? In reflecting on these questions it is important to qualify them. In the case of the former it must be admitted that some of the organisations advocating Home Rule were incredibly diverse bodies of individuals and their collective desires and motivations are difficult to pin down over the course of their lifespan. This was particularly true of the Liberal Party and the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland. The thesis has, therefore, focused on some points of contact where the issue was debated. The image that presents itself is dynamic. The Scottish Liberal Association committed itself to Scottish Home Rule in last quarter of the 1880s.

In 1908 Charles Waddie lamented, ‘I feel a sinking of the heart when I consider that I have spent some of the best years of a long life trying to rouse you [the Scottish nation] from your present apathy.’<sup>6</sup> This sadness appears unusual when we consider that the Scottish Liberal Association had accepted the desirability of Scottish Home Rule as early as 1887 and from 1890 onward every time the question came to division in the House of Commons it received a majority vote from MPs sitting for Scottish constituencies. In spite of this, Waddie was right when he used

---

<sup>4</sup> Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>5</sup> Devine, *The Scottish Nation*, p. 308.

<sup>6</sup> Charles Waddie, *Fiery Cross*, 1908, p. 8; quoted in Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 121.

the word apathy. While resolutions in favour of Scottish Home Rule were passed by an Association which could at the time still claim to represent the dominant political party in Scotland, extracting definite commitment from the leadership of the Party was another story. Despite his assurance that he would offer nothing to Ireland he would not in turn offer to Scotland, Gladstone was very shrewd in withholding a timeframe for reciprocation. It should be recognised that even among members of the SHRA, many were satisfied that this was sufficient commitment to their plan of Home Rule All Round. As chapter one demonstrated, when the executive of the SHRA informed Gladstone that for them this assurance was inadequate a cleft was driven across the association which caused the resignation of many of its important members, including the MP John Leng. If the idea of splitting with Gladstone over a failure to define his commitment to Scottish Home Rule was divisive among the SHRA, a pressure group dedicated to the principle, it is perhaps not too much to speculate that it would have been even less popular among the Scottish Liberal Association, which existed to organise and promote the views and candidates of a political party with a much wider scope of interest. This was the fundamental failure of the SHRA. While it had great success getting several large and important organisations to agree to the acceptability of its proposals it lacked the influence to cause action. When they turned to the traditional pressure group electoral tactics, such as withholding votes, as demonstrated in the letter to Gladstone, or threatening to run their own candidate, Keir Hardie in the 1888 Mid Lanark by-election, their weakness was exposed.

Turning to the second question, we find that the difficulty of assessing the strength of nationalism in Scotland is that even if we accept that devolution can be nationalist, it can also be the result of bureaucratic pragmatism. Devolving parliaments along national lines, purely to ease the congestion of a central parliament does not seek to enhance the status of a nation. It is for this reason that chapters one and two sought to appraise the arguments that were put forward for Scottish Home Rule by the various groups, institutions, and political parties in Scotland. Although the benefit of easing the burdens of an overworked parliament was generally acknowledged, there were some variations between the arguments put forward. The argument that Scotland was being deprived of the legislation it desired, not simply

through lack of time but also due to the will of non-Scots, was persistent among those who supported Scottish Home Rule when it was debated in the House of Commons. Land reform, education, disestablishment, and temperance were all highlighted as examples where outside influence made it difficult for the elected representatives of Scotland to implement legislative reform. While this is not to suggest that there was a united Scottish opinion on these matters, it does support the notion that for at least some Scottish MPs devolution was not simply about pragmatism but something closer to nationalism. Interestingly, James Mitchell noted that it was after Scottish Home Rule managed to link itself with progressive politics, largely as a result of the activity of the YSS, that it was able to gain traction. Though, as the discussion in chapter one demonstrated, it had even in the 1880s and 1890s a position on the agenda of many left-wing organisations such as the ILP, and among a host of far-left individuals including Keir Hardie, Gavin Clark, Cunninghame Graham.

Outside Parliament, the arguments put forward for Scottish Home Rule showed greater diversity. This can be explained for a number of reasons. The audience would have been significantly different and presumably so too would be the objective behind addressing them. Both the SHRA and the YSS produced a significant body of pamphlet literature which could have hoped to reach a wide audience. This is in line, particularly in the later stages of both groups, with their attempts to influence the Liberal Party through electoral pressure. Between 1900 and 1914 there were also roughly a half dozen periodicals which consistently advocated Scottish Home Rule. Due to the higher cost of purchase and production we might assume that these periodicals reached a narrower and perhaps more acutely interested audience than the pamphlets. What was seen in the pamphlet and periodical literature was a much broader range of arguments in favour of Scottish Home Rule. *Scotia* and *The Scottish Patriot*, the periodicals of the St. Andrews Society and the Scottish Patriotic Association, in particular were perhaps closer to cultural nationalism than political. *Scotia* outlined these objectives quite clearly in its first issue, ‘to foster the study of Scottish History, Archaeology, Art, Literature, Music, and Customs’ in



order to promote the welfare and ‘dignity’ of the country.<sup>7</sup> This objective fits the definition of nationalism proposed by Kennedy, as well as Hutchison’s description of a cultural nationalistic movement: ‘ethno-historical “revivals” that promote a national language, literature and the arts, educational activities and economic self-help’.<sup>8</sup>

This link between those interested in promoting these sorts of topics including History, Art, Science and Scottish Home Rule was largely the inspiration behind chapter five. As mentioned earlier, one of the challenges of this thesis has been distinguishing between those who sought devolution for nationalistic reasons and those who were purely pragmatic. Chapter five presented an interesting challenge whereby parallels of the themes explored in earlier chapters emerged and the importance of avoiding attributing to (cultural or political) nationalistic sentiment what could be a case of pragmatism became apparent. This is perhaps best demonstrated in the case of the Ben Nevis Observatory. While it is possible to imagine an individual who opposed the closure of a state-of-the-art observatory because to them it signified a reduction in Scotland’s status in the global scientific community; it is equally possible to imagine opposition to the closure on account of the suitability of the site’s geographic features, namely elevation, temperature, and proximity to the sea, even if they were unaware of the concept of Scotland as a nation. It is from this understanding that the label cultural nationalist was used sparingly throughout the chapter. Cultural nationalism irrespective of Home Rule link between political and cultural nationalism is an area that might benefit from future research.

Looking at the interaction between those involved in these Scottish expressions of science, art, and history with Scottish Home Rule, usually as a result of conflict with a British institution, was nevertheless interesting. Not only because it allowed an opportunity for political nationalists like James Hogge to attempt to co-opt the conflict as evidence for Scottish Home Rule but also because it had the effect of highlighting those individuals who might have been overlooked as cultural

---

<sup>7</sup> *Scotia*, 1 (1907), p. xvii.

<sup>8</sup> Hutchinson, ‘Cultural Nationalism’, p. 75.

nationalists as they slip, even if only intermittently, into calling for Scottish Home Rule as a method for securing their own interest. William Speirs Bruce is perhaps the best example of this. Through his perception that his Antarctic expedition had received both inadequate funding and recognition from British institutions he came to argue for, and be used as an argument for, Scottish Home Rule. This evidence demonstrates compatibility with Hutchinson's observation that those associated with cultural nationalism 'often engage in political, even insurrectionary activities'.<sup>9</sup>

One of the features of this thesis, which has focused so heavily on the motivations behind the arguments for Scottish Home Rule, is that it has relied heavily on published materials. Had it been possible to locate greater manuscript material a clearer image of the personal motivation behind these arguments might have emerged. The thesis has, however, demonstrated the case for Scottish Home Rule that was being put before the public in a variety of different formats, including parliamentary speeches, pamphlets, letters to newspapers, periodicals, and political posters. Gauging the receptiveness of the public to these messages, however, is a notoriously difficult task, especially as the period in question predates opinion polls.<sup>10</sup> It is for this reason that it was chosen to focus on by-elections in chapter two. Although there is some debate as to whether or not by-elections can represent national matters or local interests they still served as a useful forum for a distinctly Scottish political topic to be discussed.<sup>11</sup>

Chapter two demonstrated that by 1910 Scottish Home Rule was a feature in most election addresses by Liberal candidates and that it was a topic of debate in nearly all of fourteen by-elections between the second 1910 election and the outbreak of the First World War. Equally usefully, the chapter helped to demonstrate the capacities of both the SHRA and the YSS in promoting candidates. The SHRA had little in the way of success having supported Keir Hardie who polled abysmally in Mid Lanark in 1888 and also failing to induce Ramsay Macdonald to contest East Aberdeenshire in 1892. The YSS, on the other hand, appear to have shown considerable influence, arranging meetings and using modern technology, such as

---

<sup>9</sup> Hutchinson, 'Cultural Nationalism', p. 76.

<sup>10</sup> Packer, 'Contested Ground', p. 157.

<sup>11</sup> Norris, *British By-Elections*, p. 3.

automobiles, to mobilise voters. In the case of Kilmarnock in 1911 they also appear to have demonstrated some influence in the ability to wrench commitment from the Liberal candidate with the threat that they would support a Labour candidate if he did not advocate Scottish Home rule. This is particularly interesting because it suggests that their influence was not yet in decline and it reflects the growing importance that the society was ascribing to Scottish Home Rule as means of supporting progressive legislation.

This thesis has also attempted to place desire for Scottish Home Rule in a context outside of Scotland. As Colin Kidd and Graeme Morton have identified, some of the strongest Scottish Home Rulers of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, such as T.D. Wanliss, Theodore Napier and James Grant, were born several thousand miles from Scotland.<sup>12</sup> Closer to home, English-born Scottish Home Rulers like Charles Price and William Speirs Bruce demonstrated the possibility of supporting Home Rule for Scotland on the principle of nationality, despite being born across the border. The fact that Price was not included on list of English-born MPs, who, some suggested, should be driven from Scotland, is indicative of the fact that Scottishness could be used to represent a perceived system of political values, which were more often than not associated with progressive reform. Chapter four has demonstrated that Scottish Home Rulers were keen to appeal to Scots abroad for both financial and ideological support. While Scottish Home Rule never received the same levels of international support as its Irish counterpart, in the case of the International Scots Home Rule League, there were signs of encouragement and several branches were established across America. The support from these individuals is interesting because they, more than those living in Scotland, were presumably less affected by the everyday political issues of Scotland and therefore more likely to support Scottish Home Rule on the basis of nationalism.

This thesis has also shown the importance of the way in which Scottish Home Rulers interacted with their Welsh, Irish, and English counterparts in attempts to secure their shared goal. This can largely be explained by the fact that from the mid-1880s 'Home Rule All Round' was the preferred method of securing devolution.

---

<sup>12</sup> Morton, 'Returning Nationalists', p. 118. Colin Kidd, *Union and Unionisms*, p. 279.

Despite having some shared objectives, the Scottish and Irish Home Rulers were not natural allies and within both movements there existed a spectrum of opinions and priorities, which encompassed: antagonism, indifference, support and, perhaps the most common, conditional support so long as it furthered the individual's own ambitions.

The position of Welsh and Scottish Home Rulers is in many ways more fitting for comparison. Their interactions—though still dogged by the subtle distinctions between their respective goals, most notably in the case of Welsh disestablishment—highlight the willingness of Liberal Home Rulers on the periphery to attempt to work together to secure mutual goals. This is evidenced by the fact that several of the proposals for Scottish and Welsh Home Rule in the House of Commons were seconded and supported by Welsh Members. Chapter three has shown that the relationship between Scottish and Irish Home Rulers was both more complex and more problematic. The issue of the primacy of Irish Home Rule was particularly divisive among Scottish Home Rulers, and the unwillingness of the executive of the SHRA to support Gladstone's second campaign for Irish Home Rule, during his government of 1892 to 1894, led to censure and the withdrawal of support from important members. This thesis has also highlighted those who were willing to support Scottish Home Rule but who had no interest in Home Rule for Ireland. While these individuals might represent a minority of Home Rulers they show that Scottish Home Rule had a life of its own beyond the desire to simply bolster Irish Home Rule.

This thesis has demonstrated that although Scottish Home Rule was never the dominant feature of Scottish politics during the period, it was nevertheless integrated with a great number of political and cultural groups, who felt that their interests would be better served if Scottish legislation was framed in a Scottish Parliament, situated in Scotland, and populated by Scots. This is not to say that they were anti-union or that they wanted separation. Indeed, their claims for devolution were strongly motivated by a desire to create a more perfect union between Scotland and the rest of the British Empire. However, this image of an improved union was often

tinted with nationalistic desire that Scottish governance should be framed and administered in Scotland and by Scots.

## Primary Sources

### Archival Collections:

H.H. Asquith Papers, Oxford Bodleian Library, Mss 89.

James M. Hogge Collection, National Library of Scotland, Acc. 11765/74–91.

Papers of the Scottish Secretariat and of Roland Eugene Muirhead, National Library of Scotland, Acc. 3721.

MacCallum Scott Papers, Glasgow University Library, MS Gen 1465.

Murray of Elibank Papers, NLS, MSS 8801.

Scottish Liberal Party & Scottish Liberal Democrats, National Library of Scotland, Acc. 11765/17–19.

William Speirs Bruce Collection, University of Edinburgh Library.

### House of Commons Debates:

*Hansard House of Commons Debates* 1889–1924.

### Newspapers:

*Aberdeen Daily Journal*

*The Advertiser* (Adelaide)

*The Argus*

*Brandon Daily Sun*

*Colac Herald* (Victoria)

*The Daily News* (Perth)

*Daily Review*

*Dundee Courier & Argus*

*Edinburgh Evening News*

*The El Paso Herald*

*The Evening Post* (Wellington, NZ)

*Freeman's Journal and Daily Commercial Advertiser*

*The Glasgow Herald*

*Liverpool Mercury*

*The Los Angeles Daily Herald*

*Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*

*Manchester Guardian*

*The Mercury* (Hobart)

*The Morning Post*,

*The New York Times*

*New-York Tribune*

*New Zealand Tablet*

*North Otago Times*

*Ohinemuri Gazette*  
*Otago Daily Times*  
*Pall Mall Gazette*  
*The Public Ledger*  
*The Scotsman*  
*The Sun* (New York)  
*Timaru Herald*  
*The Times*  
*The Washington Post*  
*Western Daily Express*  
*West Coast Times*

**Periodicals:**

*The Caledonian*, 1912–17

*The Educational News*, 1905

*The Fiery Cross*, 1901–10

*Scotia*, 1907–11

*The Scottish Historical Review* 1907–10

*The Scottish Nation*, 1913–17

*The Scottish Nationalist*, 1903

*The Scottish Patriot*, 1903–5

*The Scottish Review* 1914–16

*The Thistle*, 1912–17

**Pamphlets:**

Blackie, John Stuart, *The Union of 1707 and its Results: A Plea for Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Morison Brothers, 1892.

Carnegie, Andrew, *Home Rule in America: A Political Address Delivered in St. Andrew's Halls on Tuesday, 13 September 1887*, Glasgow: Glasgow Junior Liberal Association, 1887.

Convention of Royal Burghs, *Local Self-government for Scotland: Report Approved by the Convention on 7th April 1914*, Edinburgh: The Convention, 1914.

Jacks, William, *The House of Lords and Federal Home Rule. A Political Address to the Glasgow Central Liberal Association*, Glasgow: 1889.

- John, E.T., *Home Rule for Wales, Addresses to 'Young Wales'*, Bangor: Jarvis and Foster, 1912.
- Hamilton, Patrick, *Home Rule a New Departure*, Upper Tooting: J.J. Gandy, 1890.
- Hunter, W.A., *The Financial Relations of England and Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Home Rule Association, 1892.
- Laughland, William, *Manifesto and Appeal to the Scottish People on Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Young Scots' Society, 1911.
- Macrae, David (ed.), *Scottish History in Our Schools: Urgent Need for Reform*, Glasgow: Scottish Patriotic Association, 1906.
- MacFarlane, Donald, *Ireland Versus England*, London: William Clowes, 1889.
- Mackenzie, B.D., *Home Rule for Scotland: Why Should Scotland Wait*, Reprinted from the Westminster review, SHRA: Edinburgh, 1891.
- Mackinnon, James, *The Union of England and Scotland*, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1896.
- Macpherson, Hector, *Hector Macpherson: the Man and His Work*, Edinburgh: W.F. Henderson, 1925.
- Mitchell, William, *Home Rule for Scotland and Imperial Federation*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1892.
- Napier, Theodore, *Scotland's Demand for Home Rule: Or Local National Self-Government: an Appeal to Scotsmen in Australia*, Melbourne: M.L. Hutchinson, 1892.
- Napier, Theodore, *The Arrogance of Englishmen: a Bar to Imperial Federation*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1895.
- Romans, John, *Home Rule for Scotland with Introduction by W. Mitchell*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1894.
- Romans, John, and Charles Waddie, *An Address to the People of Scotland: on the Historical and Constitutional Bearing of the King's Assumed Title Edward VII*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1901.
- SHRA, *Mr. Davitt and Federal Home Rule in The House of Lords and Federal Home Rule*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1889.
- SHRA, *Home Rule and Political Parties in Scotland*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1889.



SHRA, *Report of the Debate: In the House of Commons Friday, 23<sup>rd</sup> of June on Dr. G B Clark's Motion in Favour of Home Rule for Scotland*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1893.

SHRA, *Scottish Versus Irish Grievances*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1892.

Waddie, Charles, *The Treaty of Union Between Scotland and England. With an Historical Introduction*, Edinburgh: Waddie & Co, 1883.

Waddie, Charles, *Scotia's Darling Seat: A Home Rule Sermon, and Other Poems*. Edinburgh: Waddie & Co., 1890.

Waddie, Charles, *The Government of Scotland's Bill. Being the Draft of a Proposed Measure for Restoring Self-government to Scotland*, Edinburgh: 1892.

Waddie, Charles, *The Application of the Home Rule Principle: an Address delivered at the National Liberal Club London, 7 Feb 1893*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1893.

Waddie, Charles, *The Government and Scottish Home Rule*, Edinburgh: SHRA, 1894.

Young Scots' Society, *60 Points for Scottish Home Rule*, Glasgow: Alex McClaren & Son, 1912.

### **Books:**

Carnegie, Andrew, *Autobiography of Andrew Carnegie*, Boston; Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

Dicey, A.V., *England's Case Against Home Rule*, London: J. Murray, 1886.

Dicey, A.V. and Robert Rait, *Thoughts on the Union between Scotland and England*, London: MacMillan, 1920.

Hogge, James M., *Scotland Insured*, Edinburgh: W.F. Henderson, 1913.

Kemp, Daniel William, *The Position of the Convention 1907–1908: A Series of Articles which Appeared in the Glasgow Herald*, Edinburgh, 1908.

Lowe, David, *Souvenirs of Scottish Labour*, Glasgow: W. & R. Holmes, 1919.

Rudmose Brown, Robert Neal, *A Naturalist at the Poles: The Life, Work & Voyages of Dr. W.S. Bruce the Polar Explorer*, London: Seeley, Service & Co. Ltd, 1923.

Thomson, Charles William, *Scotland's Work and Worth*, Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1910.

Wanliss T.D., *Bars to British Unity*, William Paterson: Edinburgh, 1885.

## Secondary Sources

### Books

Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. edn., London: Verso, 1991.

Anderson, Robert, *Education and the Scottish People, 1750–1918*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Aroney, Nicholas T., *The Constitution of a Federal Commonwealth: The making and meaning of the Australian Constitution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Bailkin, Jordanna, *The Culture of Property*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Bashford Alison and Stuart Macintyre (eds), *The Cambridge History of Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Biagini, Eugenio F., *British Democracy and Irish Nationalism 1876–1906*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Biagini, Eugenio F. (ed.), *Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals and Collective Identities in the British Isles, 1865–1931*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Balfour, Francis, *A Memoir of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, K.T.*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925.

Bleiman, David, and Keating, Michael, *Labour and Scottish Nationalism*, London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1979.

Boyce, David George, *Nationalism in Ireland*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., London: Routledge, 1991.

Brand, Jack, *The National Movement in Scotland*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Breuilly John (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

- Brock, Jeanette, *The Mobile Scot: Emigration and Migration, 1861–1911*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1999.
- Broun, Dauvit, Richard Finlay and Michael Lynch (eds), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland through the Ages*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1998.
- Bueltmann, Tanja, *Scottish Ethnicity and the Making of New Zealand Society: 1850–1930*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Burness, Catriona, *'Strange Associations': The Irish Question and the Making of Scottish Unionism, 1886–1918*, East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2003.
- Dickinson, H.T. and Michael Lynch (eds), *The Challenge to Westminster: Sovereignty, Devolution and Independence*, East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- Cage, R.A. (ed.), *The Scots Abroad: Labour, Capital, Enterprise, 1750–1914*, London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Cameron, Ewen A., *The Life and Times of Charles Fraser Mackintosh Crofter MP*, Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen, 2000.
- Cameron, Ewen A., *Land for the People: The British Government and the Scottish Highlands, c.1880–1925*, East Linton: Tuckwell, 2006.
- Cameron, Ewen A., *Impaled Upon a Thistle: Scotland Since 1880*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Colley, Linda, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*, new edn., London: Vintage, 1996.
- Cook, Chris and John Ramseden (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics*, London: UCL Press, 1997.
- Cook, Christopher, *A Short History of the Liberal Party 1900–1997*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.
- Coupland, Reginald, *Welsh and Scottish Nationalism: A Study*, London: Collins, 1954.
- Cragoe, Matthew, *Culture, Politics and National Identity in Wales 1832–1886*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Cromerford, R.V., *The Fenians in Context: Irish Politics and Society, 1848–82*, Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1985.
- Devine, T.M., *The Scottish Nation: 1700–2000*, London: Penguin, 1999.

- Devine, T.M., *To the Ends of the Earth: Scotland's Global Diaspora*, London: Penguin, 2011.
- Devine, T.M., and Jenny Wormald (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Donnachie, Ian L., Harvie Christopher and Ian S. Wood (eds), *Forward!: Labour Politics in Scotland 1888–1988, Determinations*, Edinburgh: Polygon, 1989.
- Elton, Godfrey, *The Life of James Ramsay Macdonald: 1866–1919*, London: Collins, 1939.
- Finlay, Richard J., *Independent and Free: Scottish Politics and the Origins of the Scottish National Party, 1918–1945*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1994.
- Finlay, Richard J., *A Partnership for Good: Scottish Politics and the Union since 1880*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997.
- Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2008.
- Geoghegan, Patrick M., *Liberator: The Life and Death of Daniel O'Connell 1830–1847*, Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2010.
- Graham, Thomas, *Willie Graham*, London: Hutchinson, 1948.
- Grant, Wyn, *Pressure Groups, Politics and Democracy in Britain*, Hemel Hempstead: Philip Allan, 1989.
- Grigg, John, *The Young Lloyd George*, rev. edn., London: Eyre Methuen, 1978.
- Hamer, D.A., *The Politics of Electoral Pressure: A Study in the History of Victorian Reform Agitations*, Hassocks: Harvester Press Limited, 1977.
- Hanham, H.J., *Scottish Nationalism*, London: Faber and Faber, 1969.
- Harper, Marjory and Constantine, Stephen, *Migration and Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Harvie, Christopher, *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707 to the Present*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., London: Routledge, 1994.
- Harvie, Christopher, *No Gods and Precious Few Heroes: Twentieth-Century Scotland*, 3rd edn., Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.
- Hearn, Jonathan, *Claiming Scotland: National Identity and Liberal Culture*, Edinburgh: Polygon at Edinburgh, 2000.

- Hearn, Jonathan, *Rethinking Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *Nations and Nationalism since 1780 : Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. and Terrance Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Cambridge: Canto, 1983.
- Hroch, Miroslav, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, Translated by Ben Fowkes, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Hutchison, I.G.C., *A Political History of Scotland 1832–1924: Parties, Elections and Issues*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986.
- Hutchinson, John, *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism: The Gaelic Revival and the Creation of the Irish Nation State*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.
- Jackson, Alvin, *Home Rule: An Irish History 1800–2000*, London: Phoenix, 2004.
- Jackson, Alvin, *The Two Unions Ireland, Scotland, and the Survival of the United Kingdom, 1707–2007*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Jackson, Daniel, *Popular Opposition to Irish Home Rule in Edwardian Britain*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.
- James, R.R., *Rosebery: A Biography of Archibald Phillip, 5<sup>th</sup> Earl of Rosebery*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963.
- Kendle, John, *Ireland and the Federal Solution: The Debate Over the United Kingdom Constitution, 1870–1921*, Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.
- Kendle, John, *Federal Britain: A History*, London: Routledge, 1997.
- Kendle, John, *The Round Table Movement and Imperial Union*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- Kennedy, James, *Liberal Nationalism: Empire, State, and Civil Society in Scotland and Quebec*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.
- Kennedy, Paul M. and Nicholls, Anthony James, *Nationalist and Racialist Movements in Britain and Germany before 1914*, London: Macmillan in association with Saint Antony's College, Oxford, 1981.

- Kidd, Colin, *Union and Unionisms: Political Thought in Scotland, 1500–2000*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kinchin Perilla and Kinchin, Juliet, *Glasgow's Great Exhibitions: 1888 1901, 1911, 1938, 1988*, Wendlebury: White Cockade, 1988.
- King, Carla, *Michael Davitt*, Dundalk: Dundalغان Press for the Historical Association of Ireland, 1999.
- Lyons F.S.L., *Ireland Since the Famine*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971.
- MacCormick, Neil, *The Scottish Debate: Essays on Scottish Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- McCrone, David, *Understanding Scotland: the Sociology of a Nation*, 2nd edn., London: Routledge 2001.
- Macdonald, Catriona M.M., *Unionist Scotland, 1800–1997*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 1998.
- MacKenzie, John and Tom Devine (eds), *Scotland and the British Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- MacKenzie John M. and Nigel R. Dalziel, *The Scots in South Africa, Ethnicity, Identity, Gender and race 1772–1914*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Manela, Erez, *The Wilsonian Movement: Self-Determination and Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- McFarland, E.W., *John Ferguson 1836–1906*, Tuckwell: East Linton, 2003.
- McLean, Iain, *Keir Hardie, British Political Biography*, London: Allen Lane, 1975.
- McLean, Robert, *Labour and Scottish Home Rule: Part I Mid-Lanark to Majority Government 1888–1945*, Whitburn: Scottish Labour Action, 1991.
- McMinn, W.G., *Nationalism and Federalism in Australia*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Marley, Laurence, *Michael Davitt: Freelance Radical and Frondeur*, Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007.
- Marquand, David, *Ramsay Macdonald*, London: Richard Cohen, 1997.
- Mitchell James, *Strategies for Self-Government: The Campaigns for a Scottish Parliament*, Edinburgh: Polygon, 1996.

- Mitchell, James, *Governing Scotland: The Invention of Administrative Devolution*, London: Macmillan, 2003.
- Mitchell, James, *Devolution in the UK*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009.
- Moody, T.W., *Davitt and Irish Revolution 1846–42*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Morgan, Kenneth O., *Wales in British Politics: 1868–1922*, Cardiff: University of Wales, 1963.
- Morgan, Kenneth O., *Keir Hardie, Radical and Socialist, Radical Men, Movements, and Ideas*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1975.
- Morgan, Kenneth O., *Rebirth of a Nation Wales 1880–1980*, Oxford: Oxford University, 1982.
- Morrison, John, *Painting the Nation*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
- Morton, Graeme, *Unionist Nationalism, Governing Urban Scotland, 1830–1860*, East Linton: Tuckwell, 1999.
- Morton, Graeme, *Ourselves and Others: Scotland 1832–1914*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 2012.
- Nairn, Tom, *The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*, London: NLB, 1977.
- Newby, Andrew G., *Ireland, Radicalism and the Scottish Highlands, 1870–1912*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Norris, Pippa, *British By-Elections: the Volatile Electorate*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Otte, T.G. and Paul Readman (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics 1832–1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
- Parry, J.P., *The Rise and Fall of Liberal Government in Victorian Britain*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Pelling, Henry, *Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain*, London: Routledge, 1978.
- Periwal, Sukumar (ed.), *Notions of Nationalism*, Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995.
- Pittock, Murray, *The Invention of Scotland*, London: Routledge, 1991.

- Potter, Simon J. (ed.), *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire c. 1857–1921*, Dublin: Four Court Press, 2004.
- Prentis, Malcolm D., *The Scots in Australia: A study of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, 1788-1900*, Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1983.
- Pryce, H. and R. Evans (eds), *Writing a Small Nation's Past - Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850–1950*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.
- Richards, Eric, *The Land of Exiles: Scots in Australia*, Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1988.
- Reid, Fred, *Keir Hardie: The Making of a Socialist*, London: Croom Helm, 1978.
- Smith, Anthony (ed.), *Nationalist Movements*, London: Macmillan, 1976.
- Smith, Anthony, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Speak, Peter, *William Speirs Bruce: Polar Explorer and Scottish Nationalist*, Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, 2003.
- Tanner, Duncan (ed.), *Debating Nationhood and Governance in Britain, 1885–1945: Perspectives from the 'Four Nations', Devolution Series*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Wall, Joseph Frazier, *Andrew Carnegie*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Webb, Keith, *The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland*, rev. edn., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Varricchio, Mario (ed.), *Back to Caledonia: Scottish Homecomings from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012.
- Whelehan, Niall, *The Dynamiters Irish Nationalism and Political Violence in the Wider World, 1867–1900*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.



### **Articles and Chapters in Books**

- Anderson, Robert, 'University History Teaching, National Identity and Unionism in Scotland, 1862–1914', *Scottish Historical Review*, 91 (2012).
- Bogdanor, Vernon, 'The West Lothian Question', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 63 (2010).
- Bridges, Roy, C., 'The Foundation and Early Years of the Aberdeen Centre of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 101 (1985).
- Buelmann, Tanja, "'No Colonists are more Imbued with their National Sympathies than Scotchmen": The Nation as an Analytical Tool in the Study of Migrant Communities', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 4 (2009).
- Butler, David, 'By-Elections and their Interpretation', in Chris Cook and John Ramsden (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics*, London: UCL Press, 1997.
- Broun, Dauvit, 'A forgotten anniversary: P. Hume Brown's History of Scotland, 1911', in H. Pryce and R. Evans, (eds), *Writing a Small Nation's Past - Wales in Comparative Perspective, 1850–1950*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.
- Hume Brown, Peter, 'The Teaching of Scottish History in Schools', *Scottish Historical Review*, 5 (1907).
- Brown, Nicolas, 'Government, Law and Citizenship', in Alison Bashford and Stuart Macintyre (eds), *The Cambridge History of Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Cameron, Ewen A., 'Politics, Ideology and the Highland Land Issue, 1886 to the 1920s', *Scottish Historical Review*, 72 (1993).
- Clarke, Peter, 'The Electoral Position of the Liberal and Labour Parties, 1910–1914', *English Historical Review*, 90 (1975).
- Cooke Alistair B., 'Gladstone's Election for the Leith District of Burghs, July 1886', *Scottish Historical Review*, 49 (1970).
- Cohen, Anthony, 'Personal Nationalism: A Scottish View of Some Rites, Rights, and Wrongs', *American Ethnologist*, 23 (1996).
- Crowley D.W., 'The Crofters' Party–1885 to 1892: The first British Independent Common People's Political Party', *Scottish Historical Review*, 35 (1956).
- Dickson, Tony, 'Marxism, Nationalism and Scottish History', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 20 (1985).

- Elder Ian R., 'J.M. Hogge Backbench Maverick', *Journal of Liberal Democrat History*, 30 (2001).
- Finlay, Richard J., 'Pressure Group or Political Party', *Twentieth Century British History*, 3 (1992).
- Finlay, Richard J., 'The Rise and Fall of Popular Imperialism in Scotland, 1850–1950', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 113 (1997).
- Finlay, Richard J., 'The Scottish Press and Empire: 1850–1914', in Simon J. Potter (ed.), *Newspapers and Empire in Ireland and Britain: Reporting the British Empire c. 1857–1921*, Dublin: Four Court Press, 2004.
- Forsyth, David, 'Empire and Union: Imperial and National Identity in Nineteenth Century Scotland', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 113 (1997).
- Gellner, Ernest, 'Do Nations have Navels?', *Nations and Nationalism*, 2 (1996).
- Golden, J.J., 'The Protestant Influence on the Origins of Irish Home Rule, 1861–1871', *English Historical Review*, 128 (2013).
- Harvie, Christopher, 'Ideology and Home Rule: James Bryce, A.V. Dicey and Ireland, 1880–1887', *English Historical Review*, 91 (1976).
- Hirst, John, 'Nation Building: 1901-1914', in Alison Bashford and Stuart Macintyre (eds), *The Cambridge History of Australia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Hitchcock, Tim, 'Confronting the Digital or How Academic History Writing Lost the Plot', *Cultural and Social History*, 10 (2013).
- Hunter, James, 'The Gaelic Connection: the Highlands, Ireland and nationalism, 1873–1922', *Scottish Historical Review*, 54 (1975).
- Hutchinson, John, 'Cultural Nationalism', in John Breuilly (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Jalland, Patricia, 'United Kingdom Devolution 1910–14: Political Panacea or Tactical Diversion?', *English Historical Review*, 94 (1979).
- Jones, J. Graham, 'E.T. John and Welsh Home Rule', *Welsh History Review*, 13 (1987).
- Kellas, James, G., 'The Liberal Party and the Scottish Church Disestablishment Crisis' *English Historical Review*, 79 (1964).
- Kellas, James G., 'The Mid-Lanark By-Election (1888) and The Scottish Labour Party 1888–1894', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 18 (1965).

- Kendle, John, 'The Round Table Movement and 'Home Rule All Round', *Historical Journal*, 11 (1968).
- Kennedy, James, 'Responding to Empire: Liberal Nationalism and Imperial Decline in Scotland and Québec', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 19 (2006).
- Kennedy, James, "'Contrasting Liberal Nationalists": The Young Scots' Society and the Ligue Nationaliste Canadienne', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 13 (2007).
- Keighren, Innes M., 'Of Poles, Pressmen, and the Newspaper Public: Reporting the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition, 1902–1904', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 121 (2005).
- Kidd, Colin, 'Race, Empire, and the Limits of Nineteenth-Century Scottish Nationhood', *Historical Journal*, 46 (2003).
- Machin, Ian, 'Disestablishment and Democracy, c. 1840–1930', in Eugenio F. Biagini (ed.), *Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals and Collective Identities in the British Isles 1865–1931*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- MacKenzie, John M., 'Empire and National Identities: The Case of Scotland', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series 8 (1998).
- Mann, Michael, 'A Political Theory of Nationalism and its Excesses', in Sukumar Periwal, (ed.), *Notions of Nationalism*, Budapest: Central European University Press, 1995.
- McCarthy, Angela, 'Scottish Migrant Ethnic Identities in the British Empire since the Nineteenth Century', in John MacKenzie and Tom Devine (eds), *Scotland and the British Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Meek, Donald E., 'The Catholic Knight of Crofting: Sir Donald Horne Macfarlane, M.P. for Argyll, 1885–86, 1892–95', *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*, 58 (1993).
- Mitchell, James, 'Devolution and the end of Britain?', *Contemporary British History*, 14 (2000).
- Morgan, Kenneth O., 'Welsh Nationalism: The Historical Background', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 6 (1971).
- Morton, Graeme, 'Scottish Rights and "Centralisation" in the Mid-Nineteenth Century', *Nations and Nationalism*, 2 (1996).
- Morton, Graeme, 'What If? The Significance of Scotland's Missing Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', in D. Broun, R. Finlay and M. Lynch (eds), *Image and*

- Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland through the Ages* Edinburgh: John Donald, 1998.
- Morton, Graeme, 'The First Home Rule Movement in Scotland, 1886 to 1918', in H.T. Dickinson and Michael Lynch (eds), *The Challenge to Westminster: Sovereignty, Devolution and Independence* Tuckwell Press: East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- Morton, Graeme, 'Scotland is Britain: The Union and Unionist Nationalism, 1807–1907', *Journal of Irish Scottish Studies*, 1 (2008).
- Morton, Graeme, 'Returning Nationalists, Returning Scotland: James Grant and Theodore Napier', in Mario Varricchio (ed.), *Back to Caledonia: Scottish Homecomings from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, Edinburgh: John Donald, 2012.
- Morton, Graeme, 'Identity within the Union State, 1800–1900', in T.M. Devine and Jenny Wormald (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Newbiggin, Marion Isabel, 'The Royal Scottish Geographical Society: The First Fifty Years', *Scottish Geographical Review*, 50 (1934).
- Peatling, G.K., 'Home Rule for England, English Nationalism, and Edwardian Debates About Constitutional Reform', *Albion*, 35 (2003).
- Packer, Ian, 'Contested Ground: Trends in British By-elections, 1911–1914', *Contemporary British History*, 25 (2011).
- Pentland, Gordon, 'By-Elections and the Peculiarities of Scottish Politics, 1832–1900', in T.G. Otte and Paul Readman (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics 1832–1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
- Readman, Paul and Luke Blaxill, 'Edwardian By-elections', in T.G. Otte and Paul Readman (eds), *By Elections and British Politics: 1832–1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
- Rix, Kathryn, 'By-elections and the Modernisation of Party Organisation, 1867–1914', in T.G. Otte and Paul Readman (eds), *By-Elections in British Politics 1832–1914*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013.
- Robbins, Keith, 'Cultural Independence and Political Devolution in Wales', in H.T. Dickinson and Michael Lynch (eds), *The Challenge to Westminster*, East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- Smith, Anthony D., 'National Identity and Vernacular Mobilisation in Europe', *Nations and Nationalism*, 17 (2011).

- Smout, T.C., 'Perspectives on the Scottish Identity', *Scottish Affairs*, 6 (1994).
- Swinney, Geoffrey, 'Some new perspectives on the life of William Speirs Bruce (1867–1921), with a preliminary catalogue of the Bruce collection of manuscripts in the University of Edinburgh', *Archives of Natural History*, 28 (2001).
- Swinney, Geoffrey, 'From the Arctic and Antarctic to "the back parts of Mull": The Life and Career of William Gordon Burn Murdoch (1862–1939)', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 119 (2003).
- Townshend Charles, 'The Home Rule Campaign in Ireland', in H.T. Dickinson and Michael Lynch (eds), *The Challenge to Westminster*, East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- Young, James D., 'A Sketch History of Scottish Nationalism', in Neil MacCormick (ed.), *The Scottish Debate*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Young, James D., 'Marxism and the Scottish National Question', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 18 (1983).
- Young, James D., 'Nationalism, 'Marxism' and Scottish History', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 20 (1985).

### **Unpublished Theses:**

- Akroyd, Robert John, 'Lord Rosebery and Scottish Nationalism', PhD Thesis University of Edinburgh, 1996.
- Lowson, A.S., 'Principal Sir James Donaldson: education and political patronage in Victorian Scotland', PhD Thesis., University of St Andrews, 1988.
- Naylor, Adam Charles, Illingworth, 'Scottish Attitudes to Ireland, 1840–1914', Edinburgh University PhD Thesis, 1985.

### **Online:**

- Cameron, Ewen A., 'Clark, Gavin Brown (1846–1930)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47107, accessed 10 Nov. 2013]
- Cameron, Ewen A., 'Young Scots' Society (act. 1900–c.1920)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press. [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/theme/100417, accessed 16 Nov. 2012].
- Craik, E.M., 'Donaldson, Sir James (1831–1915)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32856, accessed 13 June 2013].

Hazlehurst, Cameron, 'Scott, Alexander MacCallum (1874–1928)', *ODNB*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/72181>, accessed 19 Apr. 2013)

Millar, Gordon F., 'Hogge, James Myles (1873–1928)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45599>, accessed 13 Nov. 2012].

Watts, Cedric, 'Graham, Robert Bontine Cunninghame (1852–1936)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33504>, accessed 2 Dec. 2013].