MAKING THE EMPIRE BRITISH: SCOTLAND IN THE ATLANTIC WORLD 1542–1707*

By the second quarter of the eighteenth century, the anglophone inhabitants of the Atlantic world began for the first time habitually to describe their community as collectively British and structurally an empire. This 'British empire' included the United Kingdom of Great Britain (created by the Union of England and Scotland in 1707) and its dependencies within Europe, Britain's insular possessions in the West Indies, and the continental colonies of British North America. Sometimes, though not always, it also encompassed the slave stations, factories and forts of Africa and the East Indies.[1] This conception of a British empire demanded the union of a substantive idea of Britishness with a redefinition of inherited ideas of empire. The acquisition of such a conceptual vocabulary is a reliable indicator of a change in the self-consciousness of a community.[2] 'The concepts we have settle for us the form of the experience we have of the world . . . That is not to say that our concepts may not change; but when they do, that means that our concept of the world has changed too'.[3] This is especially true when those concepts define the nature and limits of the community itself. In this case, British imperial ideology had to be sufficiently broad to encompass the pluralism of a multinational and multidenominational polity, while necessarily narrow enough to exclude those deemed unworthy of its political

[1] C. H. Firth, ' "The British Empire" ', *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, xv (1918), 185–9; James Truslow Adams, 'On the Term "British Empire" ', *Amer. Hist Rev* , xxvii (1922), 485–9; Richard Koebner, *Empire* (Cambridge, 1961) 77–85.

[2] Cf. the essays in Terence Ball, James Farr and Russell L. Hanson (eds.), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change* (Cambridge, 1989).

[3] Peter Winch, *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*, 2nd edn (London, 1990), 15.

benefits. It therefore entailed the rejection of earlier concepts of Britain and of empire that implied particular claims by one of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland over any of the others, as well as the abandonment of previous constructions of an empire of Great Britain that was conceived of as inclusive by force rather than by mutual co-operation. The creation of such a demandingly flexible yet precise imperial ideology for Britain and its possessions was the work of two centuries, and was not solely the product of British activities in the western Atlantic, Africa and Asia. The origins of the British empire lay within the Three Kingdoms, though they were necessarily inflected by the experience of American plantation, commercial enterprise, international migration (both voluntary and coerced), and colonial government.[4]

It was self-evident to earlier generations of imperial historians that 'Greater Britain' was 'an enlargement of the English State and not simply of the English nationality'.[5] However, the end of empire has inspired calls for a historiography in which 'England' no longer stands so unreflectively as a synecdoche for 'Britain'.[6] The resulting 'new' British history has begun to rewrite the histories of the peoples, cultures, nations and states that have developed and interacted within the British Isles and Ireland.[7] One important outcome of this research has been to draw the history of Britain closer to that of continental Europe, especially in the early modern period, though genuinely comparative studies are still rare.[8] However, it has largely failed to make common cause with the history of the British-Atlantic world, despite the revival of interest among historians of colonial America in the

[4] David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge, forthcoming)

[5] J. R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England* (1883), ed. John Gross (Chicago, 1971), 38.

[6] For the changing denotation of the term 'British History' in the recent past, compare David Cannadine's 'British History: Past, Present — and Future?', *Past and Present*, no. 116 (Aug. 1987), with his 'British History as a "New Subject": Politics, Perspectives and Prospects', in Alexander Grant and Keith Stringer (eds.), *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History* (London, 1995).

[7] See, for example, Ronald G. Asch (ed.), *Three Nations — A Common History? England, Scotland, Ireland and British History, c.1600–1920* (Bochum, 1993); Hugh Kearney, *The British Isles A History of Four Nations*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1995); Grant and Stringer (eds.), *Uniting the Kingdom?*; Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (eds.), *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485–1725* (London, 1995); Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem, c.1534–1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* (Basingstoke, 1996).

[8] J. H. Elliott, *National and Comparative History* (Oxford, 1991), 13–14, 22–9.

British origins of early American society, culture and politics.[9] The exception to this has been the history of early modern Ireland, though even its historians have been criticized for failing to place Ireland within a larger comparative context.[10] The Anglocentrism of the 'old' British history deflected attention from the history of Scotland, Ireland and Wales; however, the exclusively archipelagic focus of the new British history may enshrine a more expansive, but no less insular, form of provincialism unless it 'extends itself into oceanic, American, and global dimensions', like the British historical experience itself.[11]

The new British history is also symptomatic of the larger movement to construct non-nationalist histories of nations. Contemporary political, economic and demographic processes have challenged the traditional narrative of European history as the story of nation-states. International federation, transnational migration and economic globalization have together blurred the boundaries between nations, while sub-state nationalisms have simultaneously challenged the exclusive claims to legitimacy of modern states.[12] It has become easier to see that nations are ethnically hybrid, that states have been constructed in the relatively recent past, and that states which encompass a single nation are as rare as nations that have established their own homogeneous states. The overarching problem of late twentieth-century

[9] See, for example, Jack P. Greene and J. R. Pole (eds.), *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore, 1984); Ned C. Landsman, *Scotland and its First American Colony, 1683–1765* (Princeton, 1985); Bernard Bailyn and Philip D. Morgan (eds.), *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire* (Chapel Hill, 1991), editors' introduction; Stephen Foster, *The Long Argument: English Puritanism and the Shaping of New England Culture, 1570–1700* (Chapel Hill, 1991); James Horn, *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake* (Chapel Hill, 1994); and most controversially, David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (Oxford, 1989).

[10] Cf. D. B. Quinn, 'Ireland and Sixteenth Century European Expansion', in T. Desmond Williams (ed.), *Hist. Studies*, i (London, 1958), D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca, 1966), Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560–1800* (Baltimore, 1988), and Nicholas Canny, *Ireland in the English Colonial System* (Oxford, forthcoming 1999); with Hiram Morgan's review of *Kingdom and Colony*, in *Internat. Hist. Rev.*, xiii (1991), and Alden T Vaughan, 'Early English Paradigms for New World Natives', *Proc. Amer. Antiq. Soc.*, new ser., cii (1992), 46–50.

[11] J. G. A. Pocock, 'The Limits and Divisions of British History: In Search of the Unknown Subject', *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, lxxvii (1982), 318.

[12] J. H. Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past and Present*, no. 137 (Nov. 1992), 49; Stuart Hall, 'Culture, Community, Nation', *Cultural Studies*, vii (1993), 353–8.

historiography is therefore how to analyse the importance of nation-states in historical development without assuming either that nations are immemorial or that states are immutable.[13]

The nineteenth-century model of nation-states as the necessary unit of historical analysis obscured the fact that those states were as much the products of 'conquest, colonization and cultural change' as the empires they created outside Europe.[14] None of the major European states was either ethnically homogeneous or territorially static: all were composed of diverse peoples occupying various lands. The problems of binding these distinct elements into politically stable communities were ideological as well as practical. Similar theoretical questions had arisen in almost every stage of history known to early modern Europe, from the Biblical union of Judah and Israel, through the Greek confederations and the Roman empire, to the dilemmas of late medieval Christendom. The early modern manifestations of these problems were distinctive only in that they arose simultaneously within both European state-formation and extra-European expansion. Theorists from Francisco de Vitoria in the early sixteenth century to Immanuel Kant in the late eighteenth century wrote with one eye upon domestic political and cultural developments and the other upon European activity overseas.[15] Attention to their theoretical concerns, and the practical policies that inspired them, therefore provides one means to 'embed the history of expansion firmly back into the history of the colonizing nations'.[16]

In the monarchies especially, the language of empire provided the means to define the state both as one sovereign body among many within Europe and as the impersonal source of authority within its increasingly rigid boundaries. An empire, in the early modern period, could be defined as an independent polity, as a community of different territories ruled by a common superior,

[13] Cf. Benedict Anderson, 'Exodus', *Critical Inquiry*, xx (1994), with James Clifford, 'Diasporas', *Cultural Anthropology*, ix (1994).

[14] Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950–1350* (London, 1993).

[15] Anthony Pagden, *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France, c.1500–c.1800* (New Haven, 1995); James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity* (Cambridge, 1995), 58–98; Richard Tuck, *Sorry Comforters: Political Theory and the International Order from Grotius to Kant* (Oxford, forthcoming); David Armitage (ed.), *Theories of Empire, 1450–1800* (Aldershot, forthcoming 1998).

[16] Karen Ordahl Kupperman, 'Needs and Opportunities: British Expansion', *Itinerario*, xviii (1994), 133.

or simply as an absolute monarchy under a single head.[17] The European monarchies made their initial claims to statehood in the language of *imperium*, with each ruler equivalent in his own territories to the Emperor himself: their *rex* an *imperator in regno suo*.[18] All of the major European states — notably France, Spain and Britain — began life either as composite monarchies or multiple kingdoms.[19] A monarchy in which diverse communities were subordinated to a single ruler was an empire in fact if not always in name, such as the Spanish monarchy after the succession of Charles V to the office of Holy Roman Emperor in 1519.[20] Empire was therefore originally an intra-European conception of the legitimacy and form of a political community; only in the nineteenth century would it become shorthand for extra-European 'imperialism'.[21]

Empire was a language of power.[22] Throughout Europe, the assertion of *imperium* and the adoption of symbolic appurtenances such as closed imperial crowns were moves in the aggressive ideological redefinition of monarchy. Scotland and England followed suit in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.[23] The Scottish parliament claimed in 1469 that James III had 'ful Jurisdictioune and fre Impire within his Realme', thereby ante-dating the Henrician parliament's assertion that the 'realm of England is an empire' by more than sixty years, while the Scottish king adopted a closed imperial crown on his coinage in 1486,

[17] John Robertson, 'Empire and Union· Two Concepts of the Early Modern Political Order', in John Robertson (ed.), *A Union for Empire. Political Thought and the British Union of 1707* (Cambridge, 1995); Pagden, *Lords of all the World*, 12–17.

[18] Robert Folz, *The Concept of Empire in Western Europe from the Fifth to the Fourteenth Century*, trans. Sheila Ann Ogilvie (London, 1969); Walter Ullmann, 'The Development of the Medieval Idea of Sovereignty', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, lxiv (1949).

[19] 'All multiple kingdoms are composite monarchies, but not all composite monarchies are multiple kingdoms': Conrad Russell, 'Composite Monarchies in Early Modern Europe: The British and Irish Example', in Grant and Stringer (eds), *Uniting the Kingdom?*, 133.

[20] J. H. Elliott, 'Spain and its Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in his *Spain and its World, 1500–1700* (New Haven, 1989), 7–8

[21] Richard Koebner and Helmut Dan Schmidt, *Imperialism   The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840–1960* (Cambridge, 1964).

[22] J. S. Richardson, '*Imperium Romanum*: Empire and the Language of Power', *Jl Roman Studies*, lxxxi (1991), 1–9.

[23] Dale Hoak, 'The Iconography of the Crown Imperial', in Dale Hoak (ed.), *Tudor Political Culture* (Cambridge, 1995); Roger A. Mason, '*Regnum et Imperium·* Humanism and the Political Culture of Early Renaissance Scotland', in his *Kingship and the Commonweal. Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (East Linton, forthcoming 1998)

three years before Henry VII issued a similar numismatic image.[24] These claims may be related to the acquisition of the Orkney and Shetland Islands after the marriage of James III to Margaret of Denmark in 1468, as well as to James IV's attempts to bring the Western Isles under the control of the crown.[25] The Scottish assertion of *imperium* was both jurisdictional and territorial; it at once proclaimed the independence of the Scottish monarchy and projected its authority throughout the increasingly diverse dominions that made up the kingdom of the Scots. Similarly, Henry VIII's parliamentary claim to empire in the 1530s was territorial as well as caesaropapal, and was intended not only to assert the independent ecclesiastical authority of the crown but also English overlordship of Wales, Ireland and ultimately Scotland. Accordingly, it can be linked to the two Acts of Union that incorporated Wales into the English crown between 1536 and 1543, to the Irish parliament's declaration in 1541 that Henry VIII was 'King of Ireland', rather than merely its 'lord', and, finally, to English aggression against the Scots in the 1540s.[26]

The very language of British imperial ideology — of 'Great Britain', 'empire' and 'colony' — was not forged originally in Ireland, the Caribbean or the Americas, but sprang instead from Anglo-Scottish relations in the late 1540s. The succession of the infant Queen Mary to the Scottish throne in 1542 and the renewal of the 'Auld Alliance' between France and Scotland raised the possibility for both Henry VIII and the regents of Edward VI that England could be encircled by its historic enemies. In the interests of security and honour, both attempted to defuse the threat from Scotland by means of a dynastic marriage between Mary and Edward, enforced if necessary by military invasion. In order to justify this 'Rough Wooing', the English argued that dynastic union would restore the ancient submission of the Scots to the suzerainty of the English crown, and recalled that Scotland

[24] *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, ed. T. Thomson and C. Innes, 12 vols. (Edinburgh, 1814–75), II, 95; Jenny Wormald, *Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland, 1470–1625* (Edinburgh, 1981), 5, 19; Brian P. Levack, 'Law, Sovereignty and the Union', in Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons. Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge, 1994), 224–5; Act in Restraint of Appeals (1533), 24 Hen. VIII, c. 12.

[25] Norman Macdougall, *James III   A Political Study* (Edinburgh, 1982), 78, 90–1. My thanks to Roger Mason for this suggestion.

[26] Graham Nicholson, 'The Act of Appeals and the English Reformation', in Claire Cross, David Loades and J. J. Scarisbrick (eds.), *Law and Government under the Tudors* (Cambridge, 1988), 23–5.

had been a dependency of England as far back as the period following the death of Brutus, the mythical Trojan conqueror of Britain.[27] When the Protector, the duke of Somerset, renewed military action against the Scots in 1547 and 1548, his pamphleteers turned to the early British history 'to prove that al Britayn, was under one Emperor, and beeyng under one Emperor, then was Scotlande and Englande but one Empire'. In light of these ancient historic claims, they argued that the Scots should submit to their feudal superiors, and 'laie doune their weapons, thus rashely received, to fight against the mother of their awne nacion: I mean this realme now called Englande the onely supreme seat of thempire of greate Briteigne'.[28] The Scots took this to mean that the English sought 'to preve that Scotland vas ane *colone* of ingland quhen it vas fyrst inhabit'.[29] This was the first vernacular use in Britain of the term 'colony' to mean a settlement from a parent state in a foreign country,[30] and implied that the Scots were both ethnically and politically a dependency of England within a feudal 'empire of Great Britain'. Though the English claimed that Great Britain was 'no new name but the old to them both', the Scots took the title to imply their inferiority within a composite monarchy. In so far as the Scots would be but a province, or even a colony within 'one sole Monarchie, . . . called Britayn', they had to resist such an unequal conception of both Britain and of empire in the interests of their own autonomy.[31]

The idea of an empire within Britain, used in the reign of Edward VI, antedated by two decades the earliest usage of the precise term 'British empire' by Thomas Twyne in his 1573 translation of Humphrey Llwyd's *Commentarioli Britannicæ*

---

[27] Roger A. Mason, 'Scotching the Brut: History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain', in Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England, 1286–1815* (Edinburgh, 1987).

[28] James Henrisoun, *An Exhortacion to the Scottes to Conforme Themselves to the Honourable, Expedient, and Godly Union betweene the Two Realmes of Englande and Scotland* (1547), in *The Complaynt of Scotlande*, ed. James A. H. Murray (London, 1872), 218–19; Nicholas Bodrugan (*sc.* Adams), *An Epitome of the Title that the Kynges Majestie of Englande, Hath to the Sovereigntie of Scotlande* (1548), *ibid.*, 250

[29] [Robert Wedderburn], *The Complaynt of Scotland* (*c.*1550), ed. A. M. Stewart (Edinburgh, 1979), 64 (my emphasis).

[30] *OED*, s.v. 'colony', ii. 4; Howard Mumford Jones, 'Origins of the Colonial Idea in England', *Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc.*, lxxxv (1942), 449.

[31] Public Record Office, London, State Papers, 50/III/60, cit. M. L. Bush, *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London, 1975), 10, n. 21, Henrisoun, *An Exhortacion to the Scottes*, 230; Roger A. Mason, 'The Scottish Reformation and the Origins of Anglo-British Imperialism', in Mason (ed.), *Scots and Britons*

Descriptionis Fragmentum, although even there it meant solely the possessions of the early British kings.[32] English veterans of the Rough Wooing, like William Cecil, kept alive the English vision of a composite monarchy within the Three Kingdoms well into the late sixteenth century. Cecil had fought at the battle of Pinkie, was close to many of the purveyors of Anglo-British unionist propaganda in 1547–8, and may have helped to compose Somerset's *Proclamation* (1547) and *Epistle* (1548) in his capacity as the Protector's secretary. He also developed a comprehensively archipelagic vision of the British Isles as a single political unit that presented common problems of defence and demanded Protestantism and union to render it secure under a monarchy centred on England.[33] John Dee's appeals in the 1570s to 'this Incomparable Brytish Empire'[34] also owed something to the ideological heritage of the Rough Wooing, as his vision of the British empire included an English claim to 'the Lawfull Possession as well as the Proprietie of the Supremacy over *Scotland*', derived in part from Henry VIII's 'little Pamphlet', *A Declaration, Conteynyng the Just Causes and Considerations of this Present Warre with the Scottis* (1542).[35] This was still a British empire founded on England's terms, an Anglo-British composite monarchy, extending the borders of the recently expanded Anglo-Welsh state to incorporate the surrounding isles and kingdoms as 'British'.

Scotland itself was a compound monarchy whose boundaries remained fluid until the second decade of the seventeenth century. The Western Isles had come into the possession of the Scottish crown from the Norwegian monarchy in 1266,[36] and the MacDonalds only forfeited the Lordship of the Isles in 1493. The crown consolidated its power over a political unit which was 'very close to being a unitary "state" of the Isles' in the fifteenth

---

[32] Humphrey Llwyd, *Commentarioli Britannicæ Descriptionis Fragmentum* (Cologne, 1572), fo. 75a; Humphrey Llwyd, *The Breviary of Britayne*, trans. Thomas Twyne (London, 1573, STC 16636), fo. 92a; Bruce Ward Henry, 'John Dee, Humphrey Llwyd, and the Name "British Empire" ', *Huntington Lib. Quart.*, xxxv (1972).

[33] Jane E. A. Dawson, 'William Cecil and the British Dimension of Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy', *History*, lxxiv (1989), 198–9, and *passim*.

[34] John Dee, *General and Rare Memorials Pertayning to the Perfect Arte of Navigation* (London, 1577, STC 6459), 8.

[35] John Dee, 'Brytanici Imperii Limites' (1576): British Library, London (hereafter Brit. Lib.), Add. MS. 59,681, fo 28ᵛ.

[36] Robin Frame, *The Political Development of the British Isles, 1100–1400* (Oxford, 1990), 44.

century, though the forfeiture only became absolute under pres-
sure of military force in 1545.[37] James IV led two expeditions to
the Western Isles in 1493 and 1495, and after rebellion in the
Isles in 1503–4 he empowered the Earl of Argyll and the Earl of
Huntly to make further military incursions in 1504 and 1506.[38]
James V also headed an expedition to the Isles in 1540, 'to
circumnavigate Scotland and reduce the fierce spirit of the island-
ers to the obedience of the laws'.[39] This beating of the bounds of
the kingdom by the monarch became a traditional expression of
the crown's continuing assertion of *imperium*; it only lapsed when
James VI became the first Scottish king for a century not to
circumnavigate the Isles in person, despite his declared intentions
to do so in 1596, 1598 and 1600.[40] Nevertheless, James did
continue the attempts of his predecessors to bring the clan élite
on the fringes of his realm within the pale of civility by means
of pledges of security, military containment and cultural aggres-
sion against his Gaelic subjects.[41]

The Scottish crown couched its claims to authority over its
dependencies in the language of civility and barbarism. The pre-
valence of this language in early modern Scotland weakens the
claim that it was characteristic of a distinctively English 'imperial-
ist' mentality which had first been developed in the twelfth cen-
tury at the expense of England's Celtic neighbours;[42] in this
context it is also worth recalling that John Mair, the first European
theorist to apply Aristotle's theory of natural slavery to the

[37] Alexander Grant, 'Scotland's "Celtic Fringe" in the Late Middle Ages: The
MacDonald Lords of the Isles and the Kingdom of Scotland', in R. R. Davies (ed.),
The British Isles, 1100–1500: Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections (Edinburgh,
1988), 134; cf. John Bannerman, 'The Lordship of the Isles', in Jennifer M. Brown
(ed.), *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1977)
[38] W. C. Mackenzie, *History of the Outer Hebrides* (Paisley, 1903), 107, 117–18;
Norman Macdougall, *James IV* (Edinburgh, 1989), 102-3, 115–16, 180–9.
[39] George Buchanan, cit. Mackenzie, *History of the Outer Hebrides*, 131, on James
V's expedition, *ibid.*, 131–4.
[40] Maurice Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in his Three Kingdoms*
(Urbana, 1990), 199, 200.
[41] Allan I. Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603–1788* (East
Linton, 1996), 56–87; Jane Ohlmeyer, ' "Civilizinge of Those Rude Partes"· The
Internal Colonization of Britain and Ireland, 1580s–1640s', in Nicholas Canny (ed.),
The Oxford History of the British Empire, i, *The Origins of Empire to 1689* (Oxford,
forthcoming 1998).
[42] John Gillingham, 'The Beginnings of English Imperialism', *Jl Hist. Sociol.*,
v (1992).

American Indians, was a Scot.[43] A similar division between civility and savagery had been generated in Scotland, and was likewise mapped onto the divide between Celtic and non-Celtic, not least by Mair himself.[44] Scotland's premier colonial theorist, James VI, used just such language from the 1590s in relation both to the Western Isles and, later, to Ulster. Advising his infant son, Henry, in 1599, he recommended 'planting Colonies among [the Islanders] of answerable In-lands subjects, that within short time may reforme and civilize the best inclined among them; rooting out or transporting the barbarous and stubborne sort, and planting civilitie in their rooms'.[45] Two attempts in 1598–1600 and 1605–6 to colonize the island of Lewis with lowland adventurers failed; thereafter, more aggressive means were urged to pacify the Isles by main force, and to suppress the 'wilde savaiges voide of Godis feare and our obedience'.[46] Expeditions in 1596, 1599, 1605 and 1607 culminated in two successive civilizing missions in 1608–9 — one military, the other religious — under the leadership of Andrew Stewart, Lord Ochiltree (who had earlier operated a judicial commission in the Anglo-Scottish Borders), and Andrew Knox, the bishop of the Isles. Ochiltree imprisoned island chiefs and appointed outside commissioners, from whom he demanded strategies to civilize the Isles.[47] The Statutes of Icolmkill (1609) legislated to restore decayed religion, encourage hospitality, discourage idleness, begging, drunkenness and the keeping of firearms, and thereby remedy the 'grite crueltie and inhumane barbaritie', 'ignorance and incivilitie' in the Isles, albeit at the expense of the clans' traditions of sociability and militarism.[48]

The regal union between England and Scotland after 1603

[43] Anthony Pagden, The Fall of Natural Man. The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1986), 38–40.

[44] Arthur Williamson, 'Scots, Indians and Empire· The Scottish Politics of Civilization, 1519–1609', Past and Present, no. 150 (Feb. 1996), 57–62.

[45] James VI, Basilikon Doron (1599), in King James VI and I: Political Writings, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge, 1994), 24.

[46] Donald Gregory, The History of the Western Highlands and Isles of Scotland, From A. D. 1493 to A. D. 1625, 2nd edn (London, 1881), 278–93; Lee, Great Britain's Solomon, 200, 213–15; James's instructions to the Commission to Improve the Isles, 8 Dec. 1608, cit. Jane Dawson, 'Calvinism and the Gaidhealtachd in Scotland', in Andrew Pettegree, Alastair Duke and Gillian Lewis (eds.), Calvinism in Europe, 1540–1620 (Cambridge, 1994), 233; see also Williamson, 'Scots, Indians and Empire', 64–6.

[47] Macinnes, Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 60.

[48] 'Statutes of Icolmkill', 23 Aug. 1609, in The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1877–), 1st ser., ix, 26–30.

sharpened these efforts to suppress Scottish Gaeldom. The pre-
sumption that James VI of Scotland would be the heir to the
throne of England had evidently impelled him to greater efforts
of 'civilizing' than might otherwise have been the case and, after
1603, the common enterprise of internal colonization provided
both an argument for greater integration between the two king-
doms and the ground upon which a new race of 'Britons' might
be formed in Ulster. During the debate over James's proposals
for the creation of a unitary monarchy of Great Britain, the
Scottish mathematician Robert Pont hailed the reduction of 'this
our Great Brittaine, Ireland and the adjoyning Brittish isles . . .
to the monarchical obedience of one emperor' and argued that
one result of that common obedience would be the taming of 'the
wild and savadg Irish of the English dominion, and of the Scottish
ilands the Hebrediani'. The shadow cast by the Rough Wooing
fell on Pont, as he recalled that the advantages of union had been
spelled out almost sixty years earlier in Protector Somerset's
Epistle.[49] The Gaels of Ireland and of Scotland had originally been
separate problems for their respective monarchs; after the regal
union of 1603 they became a single target for the new British
monarchy's policies of security and 'civility'.

The fruit of this anxiety was evident in the colonization of
Ulster, which James promoted as a specifically British venture,
an extension of his policies on the western seaboard of Scotland
to be sure, but one in which both his Scottish and his English
subjects could participate as equal partners. Francis Bacon echoed
James's aspirations when he reckoned that the Ulster plantation
was 'a second brother to Union', the first co-operative British
enterprise of the newly proclaimed kingdom of Great Britain.[50]
James intended the Ulster plantation to provide a buffer zone of
civility and stability between the Gaels in Ireland and those in
Scotland: 'the people [there] being so easily stirred, partly through
their barbaritie, and want of civilitie, and partly through their

[49] Robert Pont, 'Of the Union of Britayne' (1604), in *The Jacobean Union: Six
Tracts of 1604*, ed. Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh, 1985), 4,
22, 29; [Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset], *An Epistle or Exhortacion to Unitie and
Peace* (London, 1548, STC 22268); on the *Epistle*'s afterlife, see Arthur Williamson,
Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI (Edinburgh, 1979), 152, n. 44.
[50] Francis Bacon, *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, 7 vols
(London, 1862–74), iv, 114.

corruption in Religion to breake foorth in rebellions'.[51] It was, therefore, an extension of the late Stuart monarchs' campaigns to tame Gaeldom within their own dominions. Community of personnel in the plantation revealed this continuity of aim as, for example, Lord Ochiltree became one of the major Scottish undertakers in the plantation, and Andrew Knox continued his civilizing mission in Ulster as bishop of Raphoe in Donegal from 1610 to 1633.[52] The majority of the Scottish undertakers were lowland gentry and aristocracy who brought followers with them to settle the lands escheated after the Flight of the Earls in 1607. As an emblem of the co-operative Britishness of the enterprise, the parcels of land offered to Scots and English were roughly equal in size: 81,000 acres in total for the Scots; 81,500 for the English.

The Ulster plantation provided a middle ground for Scots and English alike to pursue common schemes of plantation and 'civilization' in a pan-British enterprise. Its planters were to be the first of a new race of Britons. Their legal identities as Scots or English would be supplemented and, for their children, replaced by their attachment to a new ethnic Britishness, which would not be superimposed upon more basic regional loyalties, but rather serve as a counter-identity to be asserted in opposition to non-Britons, especially the native Irish.[53] The revised articles of the plantation in 1610 called them the 'Brittish undertakers' and the survey of 1618–19 referred throughout to Ulster's 'British families', 'British undertakers' of '*Brittish* birth and descent', and their 'British tenants'.[54] From the roots of James's civilizing mission in Scotland, therefore, grew the first 'British' plantations in his kingdoms.[55] The Ulster plantation before 1641 was the most

[51] James I, speech to English parliament, 21 Mar. 1610, in *Political Writings*, ed. Sommerville, 196.

[52] George Hill, *An Historical Account of the Plantation in Ulster at the Commencement of the Seventeenth Century, 1608–1620* (Belfast, 1877), 286; Michael Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (London, 1973), 99, 107, 257–60.

[53] Cf. the trenchant discussions of 'concentric' and 'oppositional' identities in Peter Sahlins, *Boundaries· The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees* (Berkeley, 1989), 110–13, 270–4

[54] *Conditions To Be Observed by the Brittish Undertakers, of the Escheated Lands in Ulster* (London, 1610, STC 24516); Nicholas Pynnar's survey (1618–19), Lambeth Palace Library, London, Carew MS. 630, in Hill, *An Historical Account of the Plantation in Ulster*, 499–590.

[55] On the process whereby this 'British' plantation was created on the ground, see Nicholas Canny, 'Fashioning "British" Worlds in the Seventeenth Century', in Nicholas Canny, et al. (eds.), *Empire, Society and Labor: Essays in Honor of Richard S. Dunn* (*Pennsylvania Hist.*, lxiv, suppl. vol., College Park, Pa, 1997).

successful fruit of James's efforts to create a united British mon-
archy, with common British enterprises, in the interests of gener-
ating mutual recognition among his subjects as Britons.
Nevertheless, there were evident limits to James's vision. The
most successful early Scottish planters in Ulster were those from
the Gaelic-speaking Borders and the south-west, who were the
closest culturally to the native Irish, even though the plantation
had been planned as a wedge between Scots and Irish Gaels.[56]
Perhaps partly because of this infusion of Gaels, the identification
of the Ulster settlers as 'Britons' lasted barely thirty years and
was otherwise confined to a handful of James's courtiers in the
early years of his reign.

The sheer volume of the Scottish movement to Ulster slowed
Scottish emigration across the Atlantic and thereby delayed the
emergence of potential 'Britons' in the Americas. Because Ulster
provided a more profitable and convenient outlet for Scotland's
surplus population, it effectively kept Scottish involvement in
North America forty years behind that of the English, and thereby
prevented the creation of integrated British settlements across
the Atlantic in their formative period. The first half of the seven-
teenth century saw little disruption in the traditional, continental,
patterns of Scottish migration. Before 1641, twenty to thirty
thousand Scots may have emigrated to Ireland, a figure compar-
able to the numbers who went to Scandinavia in the first half of
the seventeenth century (estimated at twenty-five thousand),
though still smaller than the extraordinary number — perhaps
thirty to forty thousand people — who followed the established
route of Scottish migration into Poland as pedlars, merchants and
soldiers during the same period. Probably less than two hundred
Scots went to the Americas before 1640, and perhaps another
two thousand joined them in the following twenty years, many
under compulsion after Cromwell's victories at Dunbar and
Worcester in 1650–1.[57]

[56] J. Michael Hill, 'The Origins of the Scottish Plantations in Ulster to 1625: A
Reinterpretation', *Jl Brit Studies*, xxxii (1993); Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and
the House of Stuart*, 37.

[57] T. C. Smout, Ned C. Landsman and T. M Devine, 'Scottish Emigration in the
Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in Nicholas Canny (ed.), *Europeans on the
Move: Studies on European Migration, 1500–1800* (Oxford, 1994), 73–83, 86; Anna
Biegańska, 'A Note on the Scots in Poland, 1550–1800', in T. C. Smout (ed.), *Scotland
and Europe, 1200–1850* (Edinburgh, 1986); David Dobson, *Scottish Emigration to
Colonial America, 1607–1785* (Athens, Ga, 1994), 33.

Though the Ulster plantation may have diverted settlers from contemporary colonies in North America, both it and the earlier Scottish efforts at civilizing Gaeldom did have a legacy in the Americas. For example the Englishman, John Mason, governor of the Cupid's Cove colony in Newfoundland, associate of Sir William Alexander and later partner of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, had captained the fleet which carried Bishop Andrew Knox on his pacification of the Hebrides in 1609–10.[58] Similarly, Lord Ochiltree, who had led the expedition to the Isles in 1608 and then became one of the major undertakers in the Ulster plantation, sold his title and his Scottish estates in 1615 to his cousin, Sir James Stewart of Killeith, who as the fourth Lord Ochiltree later commanded the short-lived Scottish colony on Cape Breton Island in 1630.[59]

References to Ireland abound in Scottish colonial writings throughout the seventeenth century: as examples of acculturation through colonization, 'without power to oppress, but onely to civilize', in Sir William Alexander's words; as encouraging examples of 'the fortunate success of the plantation' for Sir Robert Gordon in his promotion of the Cape Breton colony; or, at the very end of the century, as part of Sir Robert Sibbald's call for the recolonization of the Highlands and islands, and as support for the Darien venture in the 1690s.[60] Their enterprises did not contribute to the formation of 'British' colonies in the Americas before the Restoration; that would be left to settlements like East New Jersey, where British Quakers joined their co-religionists, or Pennsylvania, where English and Scots alike mingled under conditions of religious toleration.

Scots shared the 'strange habit', characteristic of Western Europeans, of naming their settlements as ' "new" versions of

---

[58] G. P. Insh, *Scottish Colonial Schemes, 1620–1686* (Glasgow, 1922), 19, 34; Bruce Lenman, 'The Highland Aristocracy and North America, 1603–1784', in Loraine Maclean (ed.), *The Seventeenth Century in the Highlands* (Inverness, 1986), 176.

[59] John G. Reid, *Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland Marginal Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* (Toronto, 1981), 14.

[60] Sir William Alexander, *An Encouragement to Colonies* (London, 1624, STC 341), 4; Sir Robert Gordon of Lochinvar, *Encouragements, For Such as Shall Have Intention to bee Under-Takers in the New Plantation of Cape Briton, now New Galloway in America* (Edinburgh, 1625, STC 12069), sigs. C3ʳ, E3ʳ; [Sir Robert Sibbald], 'Discourses Anent the Improvements may be made in Scotland for Advancing the Wealth of the Kingdome in these Parts' (12 Sept. 1698), National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, Advocates' MS. 33 5.16, fo. 27ᵛ.

(thereby) "old" toponyms in their lands of origin',[61] such as New Scotland and New Galloway in the 1620s, or New Edinburgh in 'Caledonia' on the Isthmus of Panama in the 1690s. Sir William Alexander warned that his 'Countrimen would never adventure in such an Enterprize, unlesse it were as there was a *New France*, a *New Spaine*, and a *New England*, that they might likewise have a *New Scotland*, and that for that effect they might have bounds with a correspondencie in proportion (as others had) with the Countrey whereof it should beare the name'.[62] However, it was only intermittently that settlers from both England and Scotland imagined new Britains in North America. William Strachey conceived 'Virginia Britania' as a composite monarchy, its two parts (divided by the falls of the Chesapeake) no 'more impertinent unto this kingdome, then *England*, *Scotland*, and *Wales*, is to great *Britany*', though this was similar to Alexander's opinion that the river called by the French the St Croix should be renamed the Tweed 'because it doth divide *New England* and *New Scotland*'.[63] There is some evidence that the Britons who settled Ulster had companions in the planters of North America, as when the antiquary and cartographer John Speed referred in 1611 to the '*Colonie* of BRITAINES' lately begun in Virginia. Similarly, Robert Johnson called Virginia 'Nova Britannia' in 1609, and the governor of Newfoundland, Robert Hayman, termed his 'Old Newfoundland', 'New Britaniola' in 1628.[64] In the closing years of James's reign, Samuel Purchas celebrated 'a new other *Brittaine*, in that new other World', but by it he meant Virginia, 'a pure *English* Virgin', despite his enthusiasm for British unionism. When Purchas flatteringly dedicated his *Pilgrimes* to Charles I in 1625, that unionism was tempered by a more federal vision of the expanding British kingdoms, as he promised '*Englands* out

[61] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd edn (London, 1991), 187.

[62] Alexander, *An Encouragement to Colonies*, 32; on Alexander, see Michael Perceval-Maxwell, 'Sir William Alexander of Menstrie (1567–1640), Earl of Stirling, Viscount Canada and Lord Alexander of Tullibody', *Scot Tradition*, xi (1981); John G. Reid, *Sir William Alexander and North American Colonization: A Reappraisal* (Edinburgh, 1990).

[63] William Strachey, *The Historie of Travel into Virginia Britania* (1612), ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund (London, 1953), 33, Alexander, *Encouragement to Colonies*, 17.

[64] John Speed, *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine* (London, 1611, STC 23041), 157; Robert Johnson, *Nova Britannia, Offering Most Excellent Fruits by Planting in Virginia* (London, 1609, STC 14699); Robert Hayman, *Quodlibets, Lately Come Over from New Britaniola, Old Newfoundland* (London, 1628, STC 12974).

of *England* . . . yea Royall *Scotland, Ireland,* and Princely *Wales,* multiplying of new Scepters to his Majestie and His Heires in a New World'.[65] This was no longer the promise of a collectively British empire; rather, it gave assurance that all parts of Charles's composite monarchy were engaged in their own separate ventures across the Atlantic: the English in New England, Virginia and the Caribbean; the Scots in Newfoundland and Cape Breton; and the Irish on the Amazon.[66]

The convergence of interests that ultimately allowed the English and the Scots to find a common identity as Britons has often been attributed to the absorption by the Scots of English norms to create an 'Anglo-British' identity, based on a common language, political culture, economy and institutions.[67] The beginnings of such Anglicization have been found as far back as the thirteenth century, though it is generally agreed that it only began to take hold culturally and economically from the 1680s.[68] The model of Anglicization is, however, too restrictive. It implies that England was Scotland's only cultural model, when it is demonstrable that the migratory cosmopolitanism of the Scots laid them open to a wider variety of European exemplars, in their colonial activities as in other areas of intellectual endeavour. As Gordon Donaldson stressed, 'the history of Scotland . . . is a story of integration in western Europe; and the fate of Scotland was often determined by what was happening in other lands'.[69] The exclusive model of Anglicization also fails to acknowledge the possibility that Scots and English alike could have converged upon similar models, theories and practices, though for different ends, and by different routes. The creation of an Anglo-British identity in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not solely the product of the aggressively active Anglicization of

[65] Samuel Purchas, *The Kings Towre, and Triumphant Arch of London* (London, 1623, STC 20502), 100; cf. *ibid.,* 57, 86–9, Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimes,* 4 vols. (London, 1625, STC 20509), 1, sig.¶ 3ᵛ.

[66] See *English and Irish Settlements on the River Amazon 1550–1646,* ed. Joyce Lorimer (London, 1989).

[67] On which, see Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity, 1689–c.1830* (Cambridge, 1993).

[68] See, for example, Keith M. Brown, 'The Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization and the Court, 1603–38', *Hist. Jl,* xxxvi (1993); Landsman, *Scotland and its First American Colony,* ch. 3; Nicholas Phillipson, 'Politics, Politeness and the Anglicisation of Early Eighteenth-Century Scottish Culture', in Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England, 1286–1815.*

[69] Gordon Donaldson, *Scotland's History: Approaches and Reflections,* ed. James Kirk (Edinburgh, 1995), 7.

passively receptive Scots; rather, it demanded the concession of Scottish ideas about what it meant to be British and what claims could be made in the name of Britain.

The creation of a 'British' empire demanded that Scots and English alike arrive at mutually acceptable methods of integration. The practice of colonization provided the opportunity for such convergence, since Scottish activity in the Americas before the Glorious Revolution had necessarily drawn upon information and personnel from preceding English colonial ventures. The first tract to encourage Scottish emigration to America, published in Edinburgh in 1620, was written by an Englishman, John Mason; the second such tract, by Sir William Alexander, was not published in Scotland at all, but in London in 1624, which may account for the presence of '60 or 80 English' in Ochiltree's Cape Breton colony.[70] Alexander based his claim to lands in Canada partly on the right of first discovery made by John Cabot when in the employ of the English crown, and on Elizabeth's later grant to Sir Humphrey Gilbert. On these grounds potential English colonists in the 1630s asserted their right to trade and plant in Nova Scotia without a patent from the Scottish crown.[71] A proposal in the early 1680s for a settlement on the Caribbean island of St Vincent noted that among the 'Spanish, French, Portugueses, Dutch and Courlanders, as to the English, Irish and others Inhabitants of those parts', only the Scots 'have not some setlement of their owne'. Although the Scottish Privy Council debated the proposal, it was apparently not taken up.[72] The promoter of the East New Jersey settlement, George Scot, attributed his realization that it was Scotland's *'Nationall interest* to advance . . . the design of a Plantation, hence to *America'*, to conversations he had had in London concerning the English colonies in 1679. His scheme was planted on the basis of a royal grant made originally to English proprietors, taken up by a pan-

[70] [John Mason], *A Briefe Discourse of the New-found-land, with the Situation, Temperature, and Commodities thereof, inciting our Nation to goe forward in that hopefull Plantation begunne* (Edinburgh, 1620, STC 17616); Alexander, *Encouragement to Colonies*; Reid, *Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland*, 31.

[71] 'Sir William Alexanders Information touching his Plantation at Cape Breton & Port Reall' (*c.*1630), and 'Remembraunces Concerning the Patent graunted to Sr William Alexander', Brit. Lib., Egerton MS. 2395, fos. 23ʳ, 25ʳ–25*ᵛ.

[72] 'For setling a Scotts Colony in the Cariby Islands' (1681?), Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh, Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland MSS., GD 103/2/4/42; *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, 3rd ser., vii (1681–), 664–5, 671–2; Dobson, *Scottish Emigration to Colonial America*, 76

British group of Quakers, and was deemed to be particularly attractive because it lay 'in the Center of the *English plantations in America*', which would ensure both its safety and its place under the umbrella of the English Navigation Acts.[73] The East New Jersey colony became the most 'British' of all the plantations to which Scots contributed, largely because of its non-denominational cast; otherwise, Scottish colonial ventures were indebted to English models, but in pursuit of their Scottish investors' and settlers' interests.[74]

Seventeenth-century Scottish involvement in the Americas was only contingently related to the notion of an inclusive Britishness. The Scottish courtiers of James VI who followed him to England after 1603 only contributed fitfully to colonizing activities in the Americas. For example, James Hay, first earl of Carlisle, invested in the Virginia, Guiana and New England Companies, and in West Indian privateering, while the second duke of Lennox sank money into the Amazon Company.[75] In the 1620s, New Scotland was the imitative dream of one of the most enterprisingly Anglicizing of all early seventeenth century Scots, Sir William Alexander. He provided a personal link between Scottish plantation in the New World and the early promotion of Great Britain — as parallel political, and even apocalyptic, projects.[76] The Scottish colony of East New Jersey has been persuasively linked to the Anglicizing 'improvers' in Scotland in the 1680s.[77] However, appeals to a larger, British national interest of the kind made to the 'benefite of Great Britane' by Richard Guthry (writing from New Scotland in 1629) were rare: even Sir William Alexander meant Scotland when he spoke repeatedly of 'my Nation' in his colonial tract; and when George Scot referred in 1685 to an earlier

[73] [George Scot], *The Model of the Government of the Province of East-New-Jersey in America* (Edinburgh, 1685), 1–2; *A Brief Account of the Province of East-New-Jarsey in America* (Edinburgh, 1683), 10, 5.

[74] Landsman, *Scotland and its First American Colony*; Linda G. Fryer, 'Robert Barclay of Ury and East New Jersey', *Northern Scotland*, xv (1995).

[75] Brown, 'Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization, and the Court', 558, 562; Theodore K. Rabb, *Enterprise & Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575–1630* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 311, 385.

[76] Arthur Williamson, 'Scotland, Antichrist and the Invention of Great Britain', in John Dwyer, Roger A. Mason and Alexander Murdoch (eds.), *New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1982), 49–52.

[77] Landsman, *Scotland and its First American Colony*, 72–7, 102–3.

'*British* plantation' in America, he meant the Welsh Prince Madoc's supposed settlement in the twelfth century.[78]

Before the Restoration, the 'British empire' most often referred to the territorial waters around the British Isles as a possession of the Stuart imperial crown. Such an argument was a novelty in seventeenth-century England, at least until it found its first major expression in Selden's *Mare Clausum* (*c.*1618; revised 1635). In the sixteenth century, the English and Scottish crowns had taken opposing positions on the extent of their sovereignty over the seas adjacent to their kingdoms. The Scots, comparatively more reliant on fisheries for food and commerce than the English, had demanded *mare clausum* in their territorial waters since the thirteenth century; the English in the reign of Elizabeth, especially when opposing the Spanish and Portuguese beneficiaries of the Treaty of Tordesillas (1494), supported the opposing doctrine of *mare liberum.* Soon after his accession to the English throne in 1603, James began to enforce Scottish policies of *mare clausum* in all of the 'British' seas around the coasts of England and Scotland, reversing the more liberal Elizabethan policies that had allowed foreign access to English waters for both fishing and navigation.[79] The publication of Hugo Grotius's *Mare Liberum* in 1609 coincided with James's policy of restricting Dutch fishing in British waters, thus putting a specifically Scoto-British argument for *mare clausum* at the centre of a global argument over rights of *dominium.* The work, a fragment of the larger treatise *De Jure Prædæ*, was published at the insistence of the Dutch East India Company in the context of the negotiations towards what would become the Twelve Years Truce between Spain and the United Provinces. Grotius justified Dutch rights of trade and navigation in the East Indies against the claims of the Portuguese by arguing from natural law principles that anything *publicum* — such as the air, the sea, and the shore of that sea — was the common property of all, and hence could be the private property of none. The polemical purpose of this was clear: to deny that any state could make the sea an accessory to its realm, and to enforce freedom

[78] Richard Guthry, 'A Relation of the Voyage and Plantation of the Scotts Colony in New Scotland . . . 1629', in N. E. S. Griffiths and John G. Reid, 'New Evidence on New Scotland, 1629', *William and Mary Quart.*, 3rd ser., xxxix (1992), 500; Alexander, *Encouragement to Colonies*, 46, 47; [Scot], *The Model of the Government of . . . East-New-Jersey*, 9.

[79] Thomas Wemyss Fulton, *The Sovereignty of the Sea* (Edinburgh, 1911), 76–85, 105–7, 124–5.

of navigation throughout the ocean, as a Dutch counterblast to Portuguese claims of *dominium* over the seas on grounds of first discovery, papal donation, rights of conquest or title of occupation.[80]

Though the East Indian context was uppermost in Grotius's argument and provided the spur for its publication, this did not prevent James's subjects from imagining that his claims to freedom of the seas were made at the expense of their own demands for new restrictions on Dutch fishing rights: 'K[ing] James coming in the Dutch put out *Mare Liberum*, made as if aimed at mortifying the Spaniards' usurpation in the W. and E. Indyes, but aimed indeed at England', noted one commentator in 1673.[81] Indeed, the Treaty of Antwerp (1609) secured Dutch rights of navigation in the East Indies only a month after Grotius's pamphlet was published anonymously in Leiden. The first response to the work came not from a Spaniard or a Portuguese, but from the Professor of Civil Law at St Andrews University, William Welwod, a Scot who had earlier produced the first independent treatise on sea law in Britain.[82] His chapter, 'Of the Communitie and Proprietie of the Seas', in *An Abridgement of All Sea-Lawes* (1613), supported British fishing rights and *mare clausum* by answering Grotius's arguments, and was the only response to *Mare Liberum* to which Grotius himself replied. If God had meant the sea to be free, Welwod argued, he would not have charged humanity to subdue the earth and rule over the fish (Gen. 1:28), 'which could not be, but by subduing of the waters also'. As God had divided the earth after the Flood, so he had divided the sea, which therefore could be distinguished by boundaries, despite its fluidity. On these grounds, princes might claim *dominium* over the sea around their coasts in order to reserve their fishing stocks to their own kingdoms, even as the wider ocean remained '*mare*

[80] Hugo Grotius, *Mare Liberum: Sive De Iure quod Batavis Competit ad Indicana Commercia* (Leiden, 1609). On the work and its context, see C. G. Roelofsen, 'Grotius and the International Politics of the Seventeenth Century', in Hedley Bull, Benedict Kingsbury and Adam Roberts (eds.), *Hugo Grotius and International Relations* (Oxford, 1990), 104–12; Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge, 1993), 169–79.

[81] Material prepared for the English ambassadors to the Congress of Cologne, 1673, cit. Fulton, *Sovereignty of the Sea*, 347, n. 1.

[82] On Welwod, see Fulton, *Sovereignty of the Sea*, 352–5; *The Sea Law of Scotland* (1590), in *Miscellany Volume*, ed. T. Callander Wade (Scot. Texts Soc., Edinburgh, 1933), 23–36; David M. Walker, *The Scottish Jurists* (Edinburgh, 1985), 84–6.

vastum liberrimum.[83] At the instigation of Anne of Denmark, Welwod pressed his argument further in *De Dominio Maris* (1615), in ignorance of Grotius's unpublished reply to his earlier work.[84] Welwod's arguments foreshadowed the Portuguese response to Grotius by Seraphim de Freitas,[85] as well as Selden's *Mare Clausum* (1635). Selden owned both of Welwod's works and drew on *De Dominio Maris* when writing *Mare Clausum* to affirm 'the *Dominion* or *Ownership* of the *Sea*, incorporating the Isle of *Great Britain*, as belonging to the Empire of the same'.[86] The claim to the empire of the sea was originally a 'Scoto-British' maritime ideology, in which Scottish theories were expanded to justify Anglo-British practices.

The limits of that 'Scoto-British' empire of the seas were soon revealed to the Scots when Charles I reasserted British fishing rights against the Dutch in the early 1630s. The Scottish royal burghs had originally petitioned Charles to prevent Dutch incursions into their coastal waters, to which he responded with a plan for a British fishery allowing English, Scots, Irish and naturalized subjects equal access to all of the waters adjacent to the British Isles.[87] It soon became clear to the Scots that the English would benefit most from such a fishery by gaining access to the Scottish herring-grounds. The Scottish Privy Council tried to enforce a

[83] William Welwod, *An Abridgement of All Sea-Lawes* (London, 1613, STC 25237), 61–72; Hugo Grotius, 'Defensio Capitis Quinti Maris Liberi Oppugnati a Guilielmo Welwodo . . Capite XXVII ejus Libri . . . cui Titulum Fecit Compendium Legum Maritimarum' (1615), first pubd in Samuel Muller, *Mare Clausum Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der Rivaliteit van Engeland en Nederland in de Zeventiende Eeuw* (Amsterdam, 1872), trans. as 'Defence of Chapter V of the *Mare Liberum*', in Herbert F. Wright, 'Some Less Known Works of Hugo Grotius', *Bibliotheca Visseriana*, vii (1928).

[84] [William Welwod], *De Dominio Maris, Iuribusque ad Dominium Praecipue Spectantibus Assertio Brevis et Methodica* (London, 1615, STC 25240); J. D. Alsop, 'William Welwood, Anne of Denmark and the Sovereignty of the Sea', *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, lix (1980), 171–4.

[85] Justo Seraphim de Freitas, *De Iusto Imperio Lusitanorum Asiatico Adversus Grotii Mare Liberum* (Valladolid, 1625); C H. Alexandrowicz, 'Freitas *Versus* Grotius', *Brit. Yearbook of Internat. Law*, xxxv (1959).

[86] [John Selden], *Of the Dominion, Or, Ownership of the Sea*, trans. Marchamont Nedham (London, 1652), 1. For Selden's working copies of Welwod's *Abridgement* and *De Dominio Maris*, see Bodleian Library, Oxford, 4°G.26. Jur. Seld., 6, 8; the latter is quoted in John Selden, *Mare Clausum seu De Dominio Maris* (London, 1635, STC 22175), 293–4.

[87] Fulton, *Sovereignty of the Sea*, 209–45; John R. Elder, *The Royal Fishery Companies of the Seventeenth Century* (Glasgow, 1912), 35–53; Allan I. Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, 1625–1641* (Edinburgh, 1991), 108–13

twenty-eight-mile exclusion zone against the Dutch, and restricted Charles's English subjects to half that distance from the Scottish coast. Their attempt failed. The confederation of associations set up to monopolize all fishing, processing and marketing around the coasts of Britain and Ireland collapsed under the impact of local Scottish resistance, especially in the Western Isles, as the Scots objected to being 'confound[ed]' with the English 'under the name of great Britane altho ther be no unioun as yitt with England nor the style of Great Britane receaved there'.[88] They therefore appealed to *mare clausum* against the invasive claims of the English, just as the English would against the Dutch with the revision and publication of Selden's *Mare Clausum* in 1635 and (in Marchamont Nedham's English translation) 1652.[89] Selden's work provided the foundation for later claims to dominion over the seas in the name of a 'British empire', though the Scots were right to think that such assertions had been appropriated by the English in the process of becoming British.

In 1654, rumour in Paris had it that Oliver Cromwell wanted to become 'emperor of the seas *occidentalis* . . . an old pretension of the kings that were heretofore of England' on the basis of Selden's arguments in *Mare Clausum*.[90] This echoed claims that would circulate in 1654–5 that Cromwell would become Emperor of Great Britain, or even in one especially extravagant account, Emperor of the West Indies.[91] This flurry of rumour came in the aftermath of the military pacification of Ireland, the conquest of Scotland in 1650-51, and the elevation of Cromwell to the position of Protector in December 1653. The Cromwellian union achieved what the Stuart kings had failed to provide: the consolidation of England, Ireland, Scotland, and all the territories belonging thereto, into a political unit under a single head. Within the history of the British Isles, such an agglomeration of dominions

[88] *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, 2nd ser., iv (1630–2), 57, cit. Elder, *Royal Fishery Companies*, 41. The Free British Fishery revived some of the aims of the early seventeenth-century fishing associations in a more successful, and successfully pan-British, form in the 1750s. Bob Harris, ' "American Idols": Empire, War and the Middling Ranks in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Past and Present*, no. 150 (Feb. 1996), 131–7.

[89] Fulton, *Sovereignty of the Sea*, 366–9, 410–11.

[90] *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. Thomas Birch, 7 vols. (London, 1742), ii, 287.

[91] David Armitage, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate and the Languages of Empire', *Hist. Jl*, xxxv (1992), 531–4.

had been unparalleled since the days of King Arthur, and would not be seen again until parliamentary union joined Ireland to the United Kingdom after 1801. An earlier Protector, the duke of Somerset, had attempted to create an empire of Great Britain by conquering Scotland, but it took Cromwell, another hammer of the Scots turned Protector, to fulfil his aim. Though the title of 'emperor', implying ruler over multiple dominions, was never formally awarded to Cromwell, the rumour that it might be hinted at the new-found status of the republican government within Britain, and within Europe. Only the Holy Roman Empire could have an emperor, since the universalist claims of the imperial title made it necessarily unique. However, this had not prevented a similar rumour from circulating almost a century before, in 1562–4, that Philip II of Spain would claim another imperial crown, as emperor of the Indies. This was a hint that Philip wished to elevate himself to parity with the emperor, since the title had not passed to his branch of the Habsburgs after the abdication of Charles V.[92] In Cromwell's case, it perhaps signified both a desire for equality with the other rulers of Europe and a recognition of the Commonwealth's unique achievement in creating an archipelagic state within the British Isles.[93]

The Cromwellian conquest of Scotland in 1651 drastically altered the temper of Anglo-Scottish relations for the rest of the century, as the enforced union between 1651 and 1660 had shown that England could conquer and administer Scotland as a dependent province. Meanwhile, the exclusion of Scotland from the English plantation trade under the terms of the Navigation Acts after 1660 motivated economic competition as a means of national autonomy. The Scottish Privy Council began investigating mercantilist means to promote national prosperity after the appointment of James, duke of York, as Lord High Admiral of Scotland, and to this end it proposed a carrying trade supported by the protection of domestic shipbuilding and the expansion of the Scottish fleet. This inevitably implied a challenge to the Navigation Acts though, as Eric J. Graham has argued, that

---

[92] Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, trans. Siân Reynolds (London, 1973), 675–6; Marie Tanner, *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor* (New Haven, 1993), 143

[93] Derek Hirst, 'The English Republic and the Meaning of Britain', in Bradshaw and Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem c.1534–1707*, 194–206.

challenge only threatened Anglo-Scottish relations with the resurgence of English parliamentary mercantilism after 1688.[94] The revival in 1693 of plans for an independent Scottish trade initially made common cause with English merchants who wished to evade the East India Company's monopoly, so that an Anglo-Scottish trading group proposed setting up a joint-stock company. The East India Company compelled its allies in the English parliament to oppose the move, so that the newly founded Company of Scotland Trading to Africa and the Indies was ultimately financed solely by Scottish investment.[95]

The Company of Scotland offered the profits of a trading factory on the isthmus of Panama, both as the alternative to dependency within the Williamite composite monarchy and as an economic defence against the aspiring universal monarchs of contemporary Europe.[96] 'It is the interest and policy of all Governments to improve the naturall product of a Country and to encourage forraign trade', argued one widely circulated defence of the colony: '[t]he experience of all Nations makes appear that nothing contributes so effectually to these ends as forraign plantations'. Scotland's excess population had hitherto been forced to serve abroad as mercenaries and to become settlers in other European colonies or in Ireland, where they flourished, 'but no benefite does accrue to the native Country'.[97] The company's depiction of the potential benefits that an isthmian entrepôt would yield for Scotland and the Scots encouraged support from all but the poorest areas of Scotland.[98] The very willingness of so many Scots to invest in such a speculative venture indicated a major shift in Scottish intellectual life by the 1690s. The economic hardships of that decade had led the Scots into their first encounter

[94] Eric J. Graham, 'In Defence of the Scottish Maritime Interest, 1681–1713', *Scot. Hist. Rev*, lxxi (1992), 89–90.

[95] G. P. Insh, 'The Founding of the Company of Scotland Trading to Africa and the Indies', *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, xxi (1924); G. P. Insh, 'The Founders of the Company of Scotland', *Scot Hist. Rev.*, xxv (1928).

[96] David Armitage, 'The Scottish Vision of Empire: Intellectual Origins of the Darien Venture', in Robertson (ed.), *Union for Empire*.

[97] 'Memoriall in Behalf of the Scots Company Trading to Africa and the Indies', Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh, Dalhousie Muniments, GD 45/1/161, fos. 2ʳ⁻ᵛ (my thanks to the earl of Dalhousie for permission to cite this document); for another copy, see Scottish Record Office, Leven and Melville Muniments, GD 26/13/105.

[98] *A Perfect List of all the Several Persons Residenters in Scotland, Who Have Subscribed as Adventurers in the Joint-Stock of the Company of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1696); T. C. Smout, *Scottish Trade on the Eve of Union, 1660–1707* (Edinburgh, 1963), 150–1.

with the dictates of reason of state and the literature of economic improvement.[99]

In the context of Scotland's historic self-image as an independent martial nation, it took a momentous reappraisal of national needs to acknowledge that the Revolution Settlement had failed to promote Scottish commercial interests, and that those interests were now interdependent with those of every trading nation in Europe. That reappraisal was also marked by a notable shift in Scottish colonial theory. William Paterson warned the Provost of Edinburgh, Sir Robert Chiesly: 'We ought not to think that ever we can bring an Indian business to bear from Scotland only by aping the English and the Dutch'. Yet by using English financial methods to ape the Dutch (and the Portuguese) that is exactly what the Scots were doing.[100] Paterson drew his inspiration for the settlement largely from Dutch models, and he justified it with arguments drawn from English economists, without any reference to earlier Scottish colonial schemes.[101] However, the legal justifications for the colony were not enough to convince either the English parliament or the Spanish crown.[102] Their hostile response destroyed the venture and made it clear with hindsight that the hopes inspired by an independent Scottish colony trade had been misplaced.

The failure to provide a Panamanian pathway to Scottish financial independence drastically narrowed the range of Scotland's political options within the British multiple kingdom. An incorporating union was far from inevitable, but after the battle over the succession in 1703 it became the most likely solution to the problems of sovereignty, national interest and economic rivalry

[99] On the wider context, see Istvan Hont, 'Free Trade and the Economic Limits to Modern Politics Neo-Machiavellian Political Economy Reconsidered', in John Dunn (ed.), *The Economic Limits to Modern Politics* (Cambridge, 1990)

[100] William Paterson to Sir Robert Chiesly, 9 July 1695: National Library of Scotland, Advocates' MS. 83 7.4, fo. 4ʳ.

[101] For Paterson's intellectual resources, see 'A Catalogue of Books and Pamphlets Relating to Trade, Revenue, Navigation &cᵃ Collected by William Paterson Esqʳ Anno MDCIII' (23 Aug. 1703), Brit. Lib., Harleian MS. 4654, in *The Writings of William Paterson, Founder of the Bank of England*, ed. Saxe Bannister, 3 vols (London, 1859), iii.

[102] On these justifications, see 'The Spanish Reasons against the Scotch Invasion of Darien. Offer'd to his Majᵗʸ' (1700?), Brit. Lib., Harleian MS. 2071, fos. 275ʳ-7ᵛ; C. P. Finlayson, 'Edinburgh University and the Darien Scheme', *Scot. Hist. Rev.*, xxxiv (1955); Bridget McPhail, 'Through a Glass, Darkly: Scots and Indians Converge at Darien', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, new ser., xviii, 3 (1994), 133–40.

crystallized by the Darien venture.[103] Yet only with hindsight, long after the Union, did the Darien venture come to look like the Scottish 'equivalent of the English South Sea Bubble'.[104] At the time when it was promoted, the arguments in its favour were unimpeachable, albeit over-optimistic. After its collapse, the recrimination and soul-searching it occasioned showed the strength of the national hopes with which it had been invested. Perhaps its most thoughtful epitaph would be Adam Smith's reflection on the effects of 'misconduct' and 'prodigality' in the *Wealth of Nations*: 'Every injudicious and unsuccessful project in agriculture, mines, fisheries, trade, or manufactures, tends in the same manner to diminish the funds destined for the mainten-ance of productive labour . . . they do not reproduce the full value of their consumption, [so] there must always be some diminution in what would otherwise have been the productive funds of society'.[105] The loss of perhaps one-fifth of Scotland's floating capital in the attempt to colonize a Panamanian swamp ensured that the first Scottish attempt to promote a colonial enterprise based solely on a competitive national interest would also be the last.

The shifting national and international contexts created by the disputed successions to the Spanish, English and Scottish thrones in the opening years of the eighteenth century raised the strategic necessity of incorporating union between England and Scotland, just as it lent the isthmus of Panama a new geopolitical signific-ance. Scottish pamphleteers executed an expedient volte-face in order to persuade the English that it was in their interests to support the Scots and participate in their isthmian venture. Under the shadow of a potential Bourbon universal monarchy encom-passing both the French and Spanish dominions, argued one memorialist, the Scots settlement provided strategic and financial defences and the way to 'be ready at hand to seize on Antichrists pouch' (the Spanish bullion mines in the Americas). All of the

[103] John Robertson, 'An Elusive Sovereignty: The Course of the Union Debate in Scotland, 1698-1707', in Robertson (ed.), *Union for Empire*.

[104] J. G. A Pocock, 'The Varieties of Whiggism from Exclusion to Reform: A History of Ideology and Discourse', in J. G. A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1985), 238.

[105] Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), II, iii, 26, ed. R. H. Campbell and A. S Skinner, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1976), i, 340–1.

historic differences between England and Scotland — from the Wars of Independence to the divergence in church government — could be smoothed over by the profits of trade, for 'an union of Interest is the likeliest way to procure ane union of affections'. Thus, bound together by economic interest and with traditional dissensions tamed, the advantages of union would be clear: 'we are united under the same crown, and together make the greatest Bulwark of the Protestant Religion'.[106]

On similar grounds, the most energetic promoter of the scheme on behalf of the Scots, William Paterson, proposed that a free port at Darien could help to unite the British kingdoms profitably and indissolubly. Under Paterson's new plan for a pan-British enterprise, the Scottish emporium would benefit the Anglo-British *imperium*: united 'into one empire, whereof England [is] to be the centre country, and London to be the centre city' and, 'by means of these storehouses of the Indies, this island, as it seems by nature designed, will of course become the emporium of Europe'.[107] Paterson's vision of an empire centred on England heralded a conception of a British empire that could accommodate the Scots and the English on equal terms. A monarchy with a single crown, a state with a single representative assembly, and a market with a single metropolitan emporium might safeguard the interests of both England and of Scotland.[108] Yet since the crown was to pass in a line of succession originally chosen by the English, the parliament of Great Britain was to be held in Westminster, and the emporium was based in London, it became clear that this was to be a British empire founded on English terms, though not exclusively to England's advantage.

The standard account of the creation of a pan-British empire in the eighteenth century recapitulates the economic arguments for Anglo-Scottish union. According to this account, the empire provided equal opportunities outside of the British Isles for those — English and Welsh, Scots and Irish — who manifestly

---

[106] National Library of Scotland, Dunlop Papers, MS 9255 (*c.*1699), fos. 217ᵛ, 218ʳ, 220ʳ (endorsed 'That its the Interest of England to joyn with the Scots in their Colony of Caledonia').

[107] William Paterson, 'Proposal for Settling on the Isthmus of Darien, Releasing the Nations from the Tyranny of Spain by throwing open the Trade of S[ou]th America to all Nations' (1 Jan. 1702), Brit. Lib., Add. MS. 12,437, in *Writings of William Paterson*, ed. Bannister, i, 156, 158.

[108] John Robertson, 'Union, State and Empire: The Britain of 1707 in its European Setting', in Lawrence Stone (ed.), *An Imperial State at War: Britain from 1688 to 1815* (London, 1994), 247–8.

enjoyed different positions within the United Kingdom and its dependencies. Britain's internal dissensions could thereby be overcome and the attendant energies rechannelled into a profitable common enterprise. As the later eighteenth-century experience would show, the empire paid. It provided adventurous and talented Scots with a profitable arena for their talents which would otherwise have languished in impoverished provinciality within Britain: 'Investing in empire supplied Scots with a means of redressing some of the imbalance in wealth, power and enterprise between them and the English' and 'enabled [them] to feel themselves peers of the English in a way still denied them in an island kingdom'.[109] The empire therefore provided the consolation prize for the loss of independent nationhood, and relief from the frustrations of provincial marginality.

This perspective on the creation of a 'British' empire is reassuringly pragmatic, but it is also historically foreshortened: because the Scots profited from the empire after 1707, they must have yearned for its spoils before the Union; because being British paid in the eighteenth century, to be Scots in the seventeenth century must have been impoverishing; because the Scots contributed equally to the enterprises of the core after the Union, they must have been creatures of the periphery before it. Yet, these assumptions have to be tested counterfactually. It was, after all, quite possible for the less powerful partners within early modern European monarchies to escape provinciality by enriching themselves through overseas trade. As J. H. Elliott has suggested, 'in the seventeenth century, as "empire" came to include the possession of overseas dominions, Scottish colonization projects in the New World might serve to reinforce the counter-claim to "empire" in its new, more modern sense'.[110] The United Provinces and Portugal both managed to attain or retain their independence from the Spanish monarchy by virtue of the profits of commerce and their possession of overseas colonies.[111] Dutch maritime enterprise expanded into new markets in both the East and the West Indies as a result of Spanish and Portuguese

---

[109] Linda Colley, *Britons· Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, 1992), 129, 130; cf. Eric Richards, 'Scotland and the Uses of the Atlantic Empire', in Bailyn and Morgan (eds.), *Strangers within the Realm*, 70, 97, 105, 112; John M. Mackenzie, 'Essay and Reflection: On Scotland and the Empire', *Internat. Hist. Rev.*, xv (1993), 714–21, 737–9.

[110] Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', 59.

[111] Robertson, 'Union, State and Empire', 234.

embargoes in Europe, though the founding of the Dutch West India Company only became possible after the conclusion of the Twelve Years Truce in 1621.[112] Meanwhile, the Portuguese revolt in 1640, which ended sixty years of provincial incorporation into the Spanish monarchy, succeeded largely because Portugal's independence was supported by its colonial empire, as a 'kingdom which had lost its independence on the sands of North Africa won it back on the waters of a Portuguese Atlantic'.[113]

By the 1690s Scots believed that it was not too late to win their economic independence on the waters of a Scottish Atlantic. Only in retrospect did the failure of their attempt reveal that incorporation would be the alternative to independent empire. The creation of a British empire after 1707 was not simply achieved by the export of metropolitan English norms to willing provincials; rather, it was a process of convergence and comparison, derived from previously parallel experiences of state-formation, colonization, migration and acculturation. Yet convergence was not complete, and its limitations at once diminished the Scottish contribution to the formal norms of the empire and channelled their participation in the Atlantic world. The Treaty of Union created a single imperial market in which Scots and English could trade on equal terms. Yet it also enshrined the separation of the English and Scottish legal systems, and thereby preserved Scots law only for those Scots who remained within Scotland: English law was otherwise the law of the British empire. 'The story might perhaps have been different had one or more of the pre-Union Scots colonies survived; but that was not to be'.[114] Similarly, the resistance to uniting the English and Scottish establishments into a single church for the United Kingdom was symptomatic of the impossibility of creating a unitary church for the empire.[115] Scots would exploit the possibilities of clerical mobility offered by this capitulation to diversity by forming Scoto-British networks for

[112] C. R. Boxer, *The Dutch Seaborne Empire, 1600–1800* (London, 1965), 23, 27.

[113] J. H. Elliott, 'The Spanish Monarchy and the Kingdom of Portugal, 1580–1640', in Mark Greengrass (ed.), *Conquest and Coalescence: The Shaping of the State in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1991), 66.

[114] B. H. McPherson, 'Scots Law in the Colonies', *Juridical Rev.* (1995) pt 1, 208.

[115] Cf. J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660–1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World* (Cambridge, 1993), whose vision of the American Revolution as a 'war of religion' reveals the weakness of eighteenth-century Britain as a 'confessional state', as portrayed earlier in J. C D. Clark, *English Society, 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge, 1985).

ministers, like those for merchants, educators, doctors and soldiers, within what was otherwise formally an Anglo-British empire.[116]

Since the mid-sixteenth century, Scots had rightly suspected that appeals to a 'British empire' masked English claims over Scotland rather than the prospect of a union of equals. In order to overcome such suspicions, the British empire had to be ideologically redefined as a community whose benefits could be shared equally by all Britons. That redefinition would be the work of English and Scots alike in the first four decades of the eighteenth century, and would find its most enduring anthem in 1740 in the words of the Anglo-Scot James Thomson's 'Rule, Britannia'. It was only appropriate that it should have been another Scot, Adam Smith, who argued that the British empire before 1776 had 'hitherto existed in imagination only', and that the 'golden dream' promised by the rulers of Great Britain should either be realized or abandoned.[117] The classic conception of the British empire, as Protestant, commercial, maritime and free, lasted barely forty years, until it collapsed under the pressure of denominational diversity, fiscal necessity, territorial expansion and constitutional inequality in the period between the end of the Seven Years War and the British recognition of American independence. Scots helped to make the Atlantic empire British — religiously, economically, militarily and ideologically — and in due course they also helped to unmake it. The resources for both their construction and their deconstruction of the British empire were the fruits of two centuries of Scottish involvement in the Atlantic world.

Columbia University   *David Armitage*

[116] Ned C. Landsman, 'The Legacy of British Union for the North American Colonies: Provincial Elites and the Problem of Imperial Union', in Robertson (ed.), *Union for Empire.*

[117] Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, V, iii, 92, ed. Campbell and Skinner, ii, 947.