
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2010

The Highland Soldier In Georgia And Florida: A Case Study Of Scottish Highlanders In British Military Service, 1739-1748

Scott Hilderbrandt
University of Central Florida



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Hilderbrandt, Scott, "The Highland Soldier In Georgia And Florida: A Case Study Of Scottish Highlanders In British Military Service, 1739-1748" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 4375.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4375>

THE HIGHLAND SOLDIER IN GEORGIA AND FLORIDA: A CASE STUDY OF
SCOTTISH HIGHLANDERS IN BRITISH MILITARY SERVICE, 1739-1748

by

SCOTT ANDREW HILDERBRANDT
B.A. University of Central Florida, 2007

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of History
in the College of Arts and Humanities
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2010

ABSTRACT

This study examined Scottish Highlanders who defended the southern border of British territory in the North American theater of the War of the Austrian Succession (1739-1748). A framework was established to show how Highlanders were deployed by the English between 1745 and 1815 as a way of eradicating radical Jacobite elements from the Scottish Highlands and utilizing their supposed natural superiority in combat. The case study of these Highlanders who fought in Georgia and Florida demonstrated that the English were already employing Highlanders in a similar fashion in North America during the 1730s and 1740s.

British government sources and correspondence of colonial officials and military officers were used to find the common Highlander's reactions to fighting on this particular frontier of the Empire. It was discovered that by reading against what these officials wrote and said was the voice of the Highlander found, in addition to confirming a period of misrepresentation of Highland manpower in the colony of Georgia during the War of Jenkins' Ear that adhered to the analytical framework established.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	2
Methodology.....	11
CHAPTER 1: HISTORIOGRAPHY	16
CHAPTER 2: THE TRANSITION PERIOD, 1745-1815.....	26
Highland Recruitment.....	26
The Black Watch at Fort Carillon, 1758.....	32
The Relief of Fort Pitt: The Battle of Bushy Run, 1763.....	35
The Peninsular Campaign.....	38
The Battle of New Orleans	43
Opinion of Highlanders: Perspectives from English Generals and Politicians.....	47
Conclusion	50
CHAPTER 3: SCOTTISH HIGHLANDERS DURING THE WAR OF JENKINS' EAR	54
Outbreak of War	64
Ambush at Fort Mosa.....	68
Tense Tranquility	72
The Spanish Invasion of Georgia.....	75
Conclusion of the War	79
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION	83
LIST OF REFERENCES	95

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- CGHS* *Collections of the Georgia Historical Society, 20 Vols.*
Savannah: Georgia Historical Society, 1840-.
- CRSC* Easterby, J. H., et. al., ed. *The Colonial Records of the
of South Carolina. Journal of the Commons House of
Assembly, from the 1st Day of December, 1741 to the 8th
Day of March, 1742.* Columbia: The Historical
Commission of South Carolina, 1953.
- CRSG* Candler, Alan D., et. al., ed. *The Colonial Records of
the State of Georgia, 32 Vols.* Atlanta and Athens: various
publishers, 1904-1916, 1976-.

INTRODUCTION

There can be no mistaking the integral role Scotland has played in the British armed services. Scots contributed significantly – whether in manpower for the army or building valuable ports for the Royal Navy – to the military of Great Britain. Historians who have written on this subject generally concur that the impact of Scots in the British armed forces was beneficial and seen in many ways, including the solidification of relations between the nations of Great Britain. By fighting a common enemy together, i.e., France, it was thought that the Scots, in particular the Highlanders, lost their Jacobite tendencies (which France supported) and became fully integrated into the British nation. However, when one looks back at the primary source material available from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a somewhat different picture begins to appear. While the complete inclusion of all of Scotland into the British military did have a positive effect for Great Britain, the actual experiences of Scottish soldiers tell a different story.

Reviewing the military history of Great Britain from this period shows how the English took advantage of the new pool of manpower found in Scotland after the 'Forty-Five in their campaigns against their old enemy, France. Britons may not have completely come together and fought a common enemy, as some historians claimed. Scottish Highlanders were coerced into service of Great Britain through conscious means by the English for the expansion and consolidation of the British Empire. The Highlanders who colonized Georgia in the 1730s were

part of the martial misappropriation that occurred throughout the eighteenth century in the British military in part due to the stereotypical notion of the Highlander as suited for the military colonization demanded in Georgia.

Background

In the years leading up to parliamentary union, the relationship between Scotland and England was tense at best.¹ Since the Union of Crowns in 1603, there was much debate on how each country could better from the other. Scotland wanted more share in foreign matters, particularly trade in newly-acquired territory.² James VI and I, the first ruler of a united Scotland and England under one monarchy, even desired to politically unite the two countries under one government, each country being equally represented in one parliament.³ The English, however, were not as keen to allow more Scottish involvement in imperial matters, and abhorred the idea of complete union between the two nations.⁴

With the triumph of William of Orange (William III) over the House of Stuart and his ascendance to the throne, there was a sharp increase in mutual hatred and distrust between Scotland and England.⁵ However, according to Christopher Whatley and Derek Patrick, the foundation for parliamentary union in 1707 was laid two decades before when Scottish

¹ Murray G. H. Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 28; Christopher A. Whatley and Derek J. Patrick, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 3.

² T. C. Smout, "Introduction," in *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603-1900: Proceedings of The British Academy*, vol. 127, ed. T. C. Smout (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 3; Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 56-58.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 4-5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.

politicians began talks with William of Orange concerning the new king's ascension to the Scottish throne in 1688.⁶ The English resented these negotiations, and continued to dominate the discourse on who had more control in the monarchial union of Scotland and England.⁷ The English saw the Scottish Parliament as a body that could not govern its own people, particularly the threat posed by Jacobites who desired to restore the Stuart dynasty. Scots wanted a union but only if both countries were able to participate fairly in the new government, where Scotland would not be "reduced...to the position of a mere satellite."⁸ Yet Scotland persisted in attempting to form a political union throughout the troublesome decade of the 1690s when Scotland was continually made a lesser partner in matters at home and abroad.⁹

Anti-Scottish and Anti-English rhetoric increased in the eighteenth century. More prevalent throughout this century was English xenophobia of Scotland, where Scots were portrayed as "vermin-like" and barbarous in their manners and lifestyle.¹⁰ Even the Gaelic language, spoken by as much as one quarter of the population of Scotland at the turn of the eighteenth century, and other Scots dialects were ridiculed by the English in their attempts to alienate the Scots.¹¹ Much of the distrust of the Scots in general was focused on those who supported the restoration of the House of Stuart, currently residing in exile in Catholic France, a traditional rival of England and close supporters of the Jacobite cause outside the British Isles.¹² The desire of the Jacobites to see the Stuarts once again on the throne, a divine right in itself

⁶ Ibid., 5.

⁷ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 26-29, 58.

⁸ Smout, "Introduction," 3-4.

⁹ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 26; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 5.

¹⁰ Paul Langford, "South Britons' Reception of North Britons, 1707-1820," in *Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1603-1900: Proceedings of The British Academy*, vol. 127, ed. T.C. Smout (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 153, 158; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 1.

¹¹ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 45; Langford, "South Britons' Reception of North Britons," 164-165, 168; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 12-13.

¹² Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 56.

according to Jacobite rhetoric, added to a growing English stereotypical view of the Jacobites as backward and militaristic, longing for the chance to restore the Stuarts by force if necessary.¹³ The issue of rule by divine right played perfectly into the anti-Catholic and anti-Episcopalian propaganda promulgated by the Protestant English after the Glorious Revolution.

The Jacobite cause was backed largely by an increasingly-isolated Episcopalian population once Presbyterianism returned with the victory of William of Orange after the Battle of the Boyne in 1690.¹⁴ This shift caused many Episcopalians to feel estranged from the rest of the Scottish population, including the process of becoming more involved in political activity.¹⁵ This caused many Episcopalians to distrust any union with an English population that saw them as enemies of the state, demonstrated in the destruction of Episcopalian churches and meeting houses.¹⁶ The influence of more pro-government Presbyterianism and the Church of England ostracized the Episcopalian community by associating them with Catholics, and as consorting with France for a possible invasion of England and restoration of the Stuart dynasty.¹⁷

In the years between William of Orange's accession to the English and Scottish throne and full political union in 1707, Scotland and its image suffered tremendously from English attempts to position itself in a position of dominance over Scotland in the monarchial union.¹⁸ Yet both countries had significant attributes the other desired.¹⁹ Even William III desired a union

¹³ Daniel Szechi, *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 255-256; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 2-3.

¹⁴ Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 3.

¹⁵ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 27.

¹⁶ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 44; John L. Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars: Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745* (Edinburgh: Polygon at Edinburgh, 2002), 3.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 104. Pittock asserts that Scottish Presbyterians, while initially associated with Jacobitism, moved farther away as Episcopalians became more associated with the Jacobite movement.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁹ Smout, "Introduction," in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 5-6.

of parliaments, a cause taken up by his successor, Queen Anne, in 1702.²⁰ A political union was seen as a way to stem the rising threat of French-supported Jacobitism in England and Scotland.²¹ There was a good support base in Scotland for union, but certain acts passed by the English Parliament, such as the Act of Settlement of 1701 where any future monarch must be Protestant and adhere to the Church of England, and the Alien Act of 1705 that would have made Scots foreigners according to the English, hindered progress to such a union.²² Riots broke out in towns and cities in Scotland in protest of parliamentary union and English intimidation of the Scots prior to and after the establishment of a British Parliament in May 1707.²³ In light of these events, the Scottish Parliament was dissolved and both England and Scotland were ruled under one governing body with the Act of Union of 1707.

T.C. Smout argues that “parliamentary union did little in the short run for Anglo-Scottish relations,” and the Scots themselves received little benefit, save for elite in both countries.²⁴ Despite the afore-mentioned reaction to union in Scotland, the Scots appeared to have accepted the new government better than the English.²⁵ There was still a deep mistrust of Scots, particularly those with Jacobite sympathies that all Scots were thought to have. While not all Scots harbored nostalgic feelings of a triumphal return of the Stuarts, it was thought they did, and the English sought to eradicate this wherever possible, whether by pro-Hanoverian propaganda

²⁰ Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 4.

²¹ Smout, “Introduction,” in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 4; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 1.

²² Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 30-31; Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 6; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 6.

²³ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 32; Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 8; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 11.

²⁴ Smout, “Introduction,” in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 4; Langford, “South Britons’ Reception of North Britons,” in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 143.

²⁵ Smout, “Introduction,” in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 5.

or by armed struggle.²⁶ In reaction to this, Jacobites residing within Great Britain, including those in the Scottish Highlands, began to partake in militant resistance to what they saw as foreign domination of their country.

Between 1713 and 1715, Scottish Ministers of Parliament led a failed petition for more inclusion of Scotland into some of the politics of the British Parliament.²⁷ This, coupled with other attempts at altering, if not dismantling, the political ties between Scotland and England, led to the outbreak of the first large-scale Jacobite rebellion in 1715, known as the 'Fifteen.²⁸ The 'Fifteen was intended to bring together those throughout Scotland disaffected by the new British Parliament, and not exclusively those who wanted a return of the Stuarts.²⁹ Despite the attempts of claiming the rebellion would rightfully place a true British monarch to the throne (as opposed to the Germanic House of Hanover), the Jacobites did not find the support they needed to remove the Hanoverians.³⁰ A lack of strong central leadership and poor military planning broke up the parties associated with the Jacobite cause, and the rebellion was suppressed that same year.

After the 'Fifteen, the British government passed several acts aimed at eliminating the factors with which the Jacobites were able to form, such as the enactment of measures to disarm the Highland population.³¹ In the Scottish Highlands, there was much animosity amongst the population who supported the 'Fifteen for the British government, yet this disaffection appeared to wane after the 1720s; two decades later, Scots who had supported the Jacobites were seen

²⁶ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 32, 58, 104.

²⁷ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 32. Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 16-17.

²⁸ Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 18-19; Szechi, *1715*, 2, 5, 251.

²⁹ Geoffrey Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 17. Plank argues that while many Scottish Highlanders took up arms in support of the 'Fifteen, the Jacobite army was not entirely composed of them, a stereotypical image developed after the 'Fifteen and repeated in the 'Forty-Five.

³⁰ Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 48-58; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 17.

³¹ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 18. Plank points out that while these measures were somewhat effective, they were not properly enforced.

celebrating the birthday of King George II.³² However, as Christopher Whatley and Derek Patrick argue, one must be aware that this show of loyalty to the Hanoverians and the British Parliament was not entirely inclusive of all Highlanders; not until after the last Jacobite rebellion, the 'Forty-Five, that the Union would be more secure.³³

When Charles Edward Stuart, grandson of James VII and II, called for an overthrow of the Hanoverians, he believed his family were the only legitimate heirs to the British throne, and was set on restoring a true British monarchical dynasty for all of Britain.³⁴ In late July 1745, Charles Edward landed in Scotland and, with his Jacobite army, began fighting Government forces as the Jacobites moved south into northern England.³⁵ Despite victories against Government troops and Scots loyal to the Hanoverians, the Jacobite army fell back into Scotland, and in April 1746 were massacred at Culloden Moor.³⁶ It was at Culloden that Government forces were awed by the mass charge of the Jacobites, further solidifying the assumed notion of the Scots Gaels as tenacious warriors suited for frontier warfare in the unstable British colonies. After the collapse of the Jacobite movement, the British government put into effect severe reprisals to eradicate the radical Jacobite movement from the Highlands, which included the banning of cultural objects used by the Highlanders (e.g., bagpipe, kilt), disarmament of clan militias, and removal of Gaelic from common usage. These measures were felt at all levels of society in the Scottish Highlands and carried out to ensure that there would be no future threat emanating from northern Britain.³⁷

³² Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 368-369.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 3.

³⁵ Ibid., 1.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 183-188; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 1.

In the decade after the 'Forty-Five, Parliament passed legislation banning the Scottish Highlanders from owning weapons, wearing tartans, playing traditional Highland music, and owning land.³⁸ The enforcing of these laws was taken up early on by Government troops, who, driven by a “widespread antagonism” of the Scots Gaels, were determined that no rebellion of that scale happen again.³⁹ The Scottish Highlands, stereotypically regarded as a tinderbox of seditious rebellious activity after the 'Fifteen and more so after the 'Forty-Five, were seen as a backward part of Great Britain, marked by the afore-mentioned cultural elements of its Gaelic-speaking inhabitants.⁴⁰ The process of “Anglicizing” the Highlands to become integrated into the larger British state involved the suppression of the supposed violent tendencies of the Highland population, accomplished in one way by recruiting Highlanders for policing duties.⁴¹ Unfortunately for the Highlanders, militant Jacobitism became associated with the Scottish Highlands due to a misconception that Highlanders made up a vast majority of the Jacobite forces during the uprisings of the early and mid-eighteenth century.

By the 1750s, and particularly so during the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), military service for Highland men presented an excellent opportunity for the British government to stabilize the rebellious regions in Scotland, while providing an outlet for the Scots Gaels'

³⁸ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 6.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 3-4, 6.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 3-4, 8.

⁴¹ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 109; Langford, “South Britons' Reception of North Britons, 1707-1820,” 162; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 10-21. According to Plank, the utilization of the Highland independent companies to patrol the Highlands “connect[ed] them, politically and economically, to the wider British world.” These independent companies also participated in road-building projects, designed to connect the Scottish Highlands with the rest of Great Britain and facilitating the process of assimilation. It should not be forgotten that armed insurrection was, as Murray Pittock claimed, “an extreme manifestation of Jacobitism rather than a normative one,” and that this stereotypical image of the Jacobite-sympathizing Scottish Highlander was a construct of eighteenth-century propaganda by the English as a means of civilizing Scottish Gaeldom by recruiting Highland men on a large scale for military service abroad. See also, Robert Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero: The Image of the Highlander, 1745-1830* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, Ltd. 1995).

supposed inherent martial capabilities.⁴² Scots, specifically Highlanders, were in high demand for military service in the numerous conflicts and conquests of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The period 1740 to 1815 saw British forces engaged in wars on a global scale. The end of the 'Forty-Five and the implementation of plans to incorporate the Scottish Highlands into Great Britain presented the English with a new source of manpower for martial needs. While there were Highlanders employed by the Hanoverian dynasty before the end of the 'Forty-Five, such as Forty-Second Regiment of Foot (The Black Watch), many Highlanders did not serve in the British army until the Seven Years' War. This war, in addition to the American War of Independence, the Napoleonic wars, the War of 1812, and the defense of British colonies, particularly in the Americas, featured significant numbers of Highland soldiers. During these wars, Scotsmen, Highland and Lowland, made up a significant portion of the British army, despite being a minority within Great Britain.⁴³

The same is applicable to what transpired on the border between Spanish Florida and the colony of Georgia earlier in the eighteenth century. Throughout the North American theater of the War of the Austrian Succession (1739-1748), known as the War of Jenkins' Ear, there were bitter border disputes between the newly-established British colony of Georgia and Spanish Florida. Each side claimed territory in Georgia acquired after previous conflicts. The British continued to spread their influence over more North American territory, and Georgia was selected for, among other things, the establishment of a strong defensive border on the southern frontier of British possessions. In doing so, the settlers, most of them Highlanders, were thrust

⁴² Roberts, *The Jacobite Wars*, 191-192; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 21.

⁴³ Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats: The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 266-268; T. M. Devine, *Scotland's Empire and the Shaping of the Americas 1600-1815* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 2003), 313-316.

into an often-times intense guerilla war with the Spanish and their Native American allies. Colonel William Stephens, secretary for the Board of Trustees of Georgia, described the loathsome experience of frontier warfare seen by many Highlanders on a daily basis, noting that “the labouring man no sooner sets his foot [in Georgia]” than he finds himself “entering in some Branch or other of Military Service.”⁴⁴ The Georgia provincial units, principally the Highland Rangers and the Highland Independent Company, were raised specifically for conducting raids, countering unconventional warfare tactics practiced by the Spanish and their allies, and maintaining a constant vigil on the frontier.⁴⁵ Those selected to patrol the borders found it difficult to accomplish due to instances of poor weaponry, inclement weather, and inefficient supply.⁴⁶ The description of the fighting in this region is similar to the style of warfare abhorred by one of Britain’s most famous commanders, General James Wolfe. Wolfe, a British officer who served with Government forces during the ’Forty-Five and would later become one of the more famous generals during the French and Indian War, detested frontier service as “the most insignificant and unpleasant branch of military operations,” with all who served in a “perpetual danger of assassination.”⁴⁷ Contemporary comments such as these show the true sentiment of British military personnel in regards to military service on hostile frontiers during this period. It was this type of frontier warfare that many of the Highland colonists in Georgia faced while defending the southern border of British North America between 1736 and 1748.

⁴⁴ William Stephens to Harman Verelst, January 20, 1743, in Allan D. Candler, et. al., ed., *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* (hereafter identified as *CRSG*), vol. 24, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe, Others, 1742-1745* (Atlanta: Chas. P. Byrd State Printer, 1915), 207.

⁴⁵ Ivers, *British Drums on the Southern Frontier*, 197.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 196.

⁴⁷ Beckles Willson, *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe* (London: William Heinemann, 1909), 141.

Methodology

The period 1740 to 1815 was an important time in Anglo-Scottish relations, one of the major factors being the suppression of Jacobitism and the total inclusion of the Scottish Highlands into Great Britain. The domination of the Scottish Highlands allowed for the British government to employ men from the Highlands for military service on a scale previously unseen. One of the main foci of this thesis is a case study on the martial experience of Highlanders serving in Georgia and Florida in the mid-eighteenth century. An analysis of the experiences of Highlanders who fought the Spanish in Georgia and Florida, defending British possessions, will build a case for the nascent inquiries into possible martial misuse of Scottish Highlanders by examining their deployment against Spanish and Spanish-allied forces during the early years of the War of Jenkins' Ear and further verify the analyses of historians who demonstrated how future Highland regiments in the British Army were used in the conflicts that involved Great Britain in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as well as provide a new military history to this subject along the lines of what John Shy saw as necessary in placing military history in the realm of historical scholarship.

In a lecture before the American Historical Association in January 2008, John Shy put forth a call for military historians, who are on the periphery of historical scholarship, to enter into debate with non-military historians who have written on military history subjects.⁴⁸ Shy argues that studies of warfare by non-military historians have the potential to be improved if these

⁴⁸ John Shy, "History and the History of War," *The Journal of Military History* 72, 4 (October 2008): 1033-1046.

historians work with scholars who specialize in studying military history. This thesis is an attempt to reconcile the “gulf” that has developed between military and other academic historians to enhance the research on these subjects.⁴⁹ Shy’s concept will be part of the analytical framework developed throughout this thesis.

What is missing from the historiography is a critical analysis of how the British government martially employed Scottish Highlanders. This thesis, then, explores the two types of possible exploitation of Scottish Highlanders by the English. The first type examines the Highlander as employed in the British army in large numbers in order to stabilize the country and remove any threat to the government and monarchy. The second type analyzes the misconceptions amongst English military commanders who, through their own praise of the Highland soldiers on the battlefield, subconsciously accepted the idea of the Scottish Highlanders as inherently natural warriors, when in reality this was not the case. The issue of misappropriation of Scottish Highlanders for the expansion and consolidation of the British Empire has briefly appeared in the secondary literature; there is no comprehensive study arguing a systematic pattern of such. There are, however, studies on other minority groups from imperial territories exploited by the English for martial reasons.⁵⁰ These studies provide crucial methodological frameworks in order to demonstrate how minorities within the British Isles were exploited. The Highlanders fall into this particular category of martial misapplication in part due

⁴⁹ Ibid., 1034. In his address, John Shy argues: “Military historians...are sure that those colleagues [academic historians who do not specialize in military history] regard courses and books on military history as not much better than a form of entertainment, ever popular with students and the general public, but lacking the qualities that foster serious critical thinking and genuine understanding of the past.” A “gulf” developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries between military historians and those that wanted to “broaden and deepen historical inquiry,” leaving the study of warfare in history to certain specialists.

⁵⁰ See, Carina A. Montgomery, “The Gurkhas and Colonial Knowledge: Habitat, Masculinity, and the Making of a ‘Martial Race,’ c. 1760-1830” (Master’s thesis, University of Calgary, 1998).

to a stereotypical “martial race” identity applied to the Highlanders by the English. Historians have debated the impact of Scotland in the British military and the impact military service had on Scotland, with arguments made for both positive and negative results. There is a noticeable shift away from analyzing the positive aspects and a focus on bringing out the true nature of the Highland soldier’s employment in the British armed forces, in some cases negative, and demonstrating the value of Scotland in securing the British Empire.

The thoughts and comments of the average Scottish soldier serving in the army from 1740 to 1815 are difficult to ascertain. There is a significant lack of primary source material from Highland soldiers who served in the British army during this time. Many Highland soldiers were illiterate or could only converse in Gaelic. The exploits of these Highlanders, however, were recorded by government officials and high-ranking military personnel. Sources such as court-martial records, battle reports, and casualty lists will be used in order to understand how the Highland soldier reacted to service in the British armed forces during this period.

What is important to establish in this research is to what extent were Highlanders misrepresented by the English in the British military. The first chapter of this thesis will be a survey of the historiography on the martial history of Scottish Highland service in the British armed forces during the mid-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. As mentioned above, part of the framework of this thesis will conform to John Shy’s call for more academic military history studies that will amend the division between military and non-military studies. This thesis will expand upon the ideas put forth in the works of Larry Ivers and Anthony Parker, prominent scholars on colonial Georgia and involvement in the War of Jenkins’ Ear, and tie the experiences

of the Scottish Highlanders in Georgia to that of the broader issue of how Scottish Highlanders became integrated into the British armed services from 1740 to 1815.

The second chapter will be dedicated to a general overview of Highland martial experiences from 1745 to 1815 to provide answers to some of the questions posed above. This chapter will examine the attitudes of government officials and high-ranking officers on the employment of Highland soldiers in the British army. Their opinions are important because these officials and officers actively recruited the Highlanders for military service. By establishing that there was a pattern of misemployment by the English during this period, one will understand how the ordeals of the Highlanders who fought on the southern frontier of British territory in North America fit into this paradigm of service in the British military. An analysis of British government records, specifically documents from Parliament between the 1730s and 1750s, demonstrates that certain policies were in place to allow for such practices to occur. From the perspectives of these elites in British society it becomes clear that the English used lucrative incentives to persuade high-ranking Scots to actively drain the Highlands (and in some cases, Lowland areas) of men for service.

The third chapter will be devoted to the case study of the martial exploits of the Highlanders who defended the southern border of British territory in North America during the 1730s and 1740s. Having established a framework in Chapter Two that shows Highlanders were exploited by the English between 1745 and 1815, the case study in Chapter Three will demonstrate that the English were already employing Highlanders in a similar fashion on the southern frontier of North America. It is here that the common soldier's views will be most important. However, as mentioned above, these sources are difficult to locate. Government

sources and correspondence of colonial officials and military officers will be used to understand the conflicts that took place between the British and Spanish in the 1730s and 1740s, as well as a way of finding the common Highland soldier and his reactions to fighting on this particular frontier of the Empire.

The fourth chapter of this thesis will evaluate how Highlanders who fought in Georgia and Florida in the 1730s and 1740s fit a general pattern of misrepresentation by the English. The purpose here is to develop a framework for future analysis into the theme of the utilization of Scottish manpower in the British armed services. This conclusion will demonstrate the necessity of further inquiry into this topic. Altogether, this will show how the English exploited the Scots, specifically the Highlanders, for the expansion and defense of the Empire. This in turn opens up new venues of interpretation into this area of research. By establishing the existence of manipulative practices towards the Highlanders in the British army will the possibility exist for a proper examination of how Scots were exploited in the Royal Navy. This thesis it is not a complete study of the Highland experience during the period in question. Only with further research on later periods in Britain's military experience and the inclusion of Gaelic sources will the true experience of Highlanders and Lowlanders, and the extent to which they were exploited by the English, become known.

CHAPTER 1: HISTORIOGRAPHY

The historiography of this subject has undergone several developments since the first published studies in the early decades of the nineteenth century. One of the first major studies on Scots in the British armed forces was completed by David Stewart of Garth in *Sketches of the Character, Manners, and Present State of the Highlanders of Scotland*.⁵¹ While it served a purpose as a valuable collection of histories of Highland regiments, including sections on dress, music, and behavior, twentieth-century scholars rejected the text as inaccurate, arguing the book is tainted with Romantic-era descriptions that distort the reality of Highland service in the British army. The rejection of Stewart's work allowed for more complex arguments to develop, specifically on topics such as why Scots took up arms in service of Great Britain, post-'Forty-Five Rebellion recruitment in the Highlands, and the overall contribution of Scots in defense of the burgeoning Empire.

The 400th anniversary of the Union of Crowns in 1603 and the 300th anniversary of the Act of Union of 1707 allowed for a significant re-examination of the complex relationship between Scotland and England. T.C. Smout published a series of papers from leading scholars on the Anglo-Scot relations between 1603 and the turn of the twentieth century.⁵² There is fresh debate on the vision of James VII and II, the last Stuart monarch before the Glorious Revolution of 1688, for an equal representation of Scotland and England under one united government,

⁵¹ David Stewart, *Sketches of the Character, Manners, and Present State of the Highlanders of Scotland, with Details of the Military Service of the Highland Regiments*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and Co., 1822).

⁵² T.C. Smout, ed., *Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1603-1900: Proceedings of The British Academy*, vol. 127 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

English tolerance (in most cases, a lack thereof) of Scottish participation in Britain after 1707, and how Scotland contributed to the expanding British Empire. Paul Langford presents an important critique of the Union of 1707 in his essay, detailing the antagonizing efforts by the English to assert their dominance, and the Scots their acceptance, in the new British state.⁵³ Christopher Whatley and Derek Patrick made a similar contribution with *The Scots and the Union*.⁵⁴ Whatley and Patrick discussed the undercurrent of mutual distrust and xenophobic attitudes developed by both sides prior to and after the Union of 1707. Despite a desire for political union by Scottish Parliamentarians that would benefit not only Scotland but England as well, and a display of loyalty amongst many Highlanders who had supported the Jacobite cause, developed through a loyal service to the British nation during the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), there was still a sense of misunderstanding between Scotland and England that would not be put to rest until after the end of the Napoleonic Wars.⁵⁵ These works are vital in the understanding of the intricacies of the Anglo-Scottish relationship within the context of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth century British armed forces.

There are two general debates within the historiography on the subject of employment of Scots, specifically Highlanders, in the British army. One centers on how the Scots attained a sense of "Britishness" after the Act of Union of 1707. The development of a British state, and the shared efforts of building such a state, including the expansion and consolidation of the Empire,

⁵³ Paul Langford, "South Britons' Reception of North Britons, 1707-1820," in *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603-1900: Proceedings of The British Academy*, vol. 127, ed. T. C. Smout (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 143-169. For an excellent counter-argument, see Colin Kidd, "Eighteenth-Century Scotland and the Three Unions," in *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603-1900: Proceedings of The British Academy*, vol. 127, ed. T. C. Smout (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 171-187.

⁵⁴ Christopher A. Whatley and Derek J. Patrick, *The Scots and the Union* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 369.

allowed for a bond to form between Scotland and England. This bond, according to Linda Colley and Diana Henderson, was significantly forged on the battlefield. The “British” identity was formed, in large part, by fighting together for a common idea against a common enemy, France. The other major debate focuses on the supposed martial identity of the Highland soldier within the British army, which leads to the investigation of negative aspects of the employment of Highland soldiers.

There are scholars who believe that the shared military experience of Scotland and England in wars before and after the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745 was one of, if not the most, important way the nation of Great Britain formed, similar to the bond that appears between men under the extreme stress of combat.⁵⁶ The unique style of Highland dress and their reputation as tenacious warriors aided in bringing public praise for the Scottish soldier and creating a distinct nationalism amongst the Scots in the British Army. Historians’ arguments have developed throughout the years on how and when the British army was started, and how the incorporation of Scotsmen into the English army contributed to the benefit of the individual nations of Great Britain specifically, and to the British nation in general.

Some historians argue that Scots became apart of an unofficially-recognized “British” army when serving with English and Welsh officers in foreign armies in the Wars of Religion raging on the European continent in the seventeenth century up until the English invitation to William of Orange to overthrow James II.⁵⁷ In his 1971 article, “Scotland and the Glorious

⁵⁶ See, Diana M. Henderson, *Highland Soldier: A Social Study of the Highland Regiments, 1820-1920* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1989); Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

⁵⁷ Robert Paul Barnes, “Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688,” *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, vol. 3, no. 3 (Autumn, 1971): 116-127; John Childs, *The British Army of William III, 1689-*

Revolution of 1688,” Robert Paul Barnes looks at Scottish military involvement during the Williamite wars of the late seventeenth century. Barnes particularly commented on the lack of understanding of the Scottish role in this conflict. According to Barnes, there were four key components in unifying Anglo-Scottish efforts to defeat James II: England’s offer to William of Orange, declaration of intentions, the flight of James II from Scotland, and the military defeat of James II in England. While the Scottish force sent to back up English troops supported the monarchy of James II, these four factors contributed to a severe change in loyalty. Barnes argues that, while fighting together against a common enemy – in this case, James VII and II – Scots began to feel integrated into a “British” army of English and Welsh troops.⁵⁸

In 1987 John Childs published his third and final book on the political and social history of the army of William III entitled *The British Army of William III, 1689-1702*. Childs asserts that English, Irish, and Scottish officers serving abroad in foreign armies formed a close bond with each other; without this bond, there would have been no solid officer corps for William to utilize. The experienced officers that served in various armies throughout the seventeenth century initially came back to serve James II, but could switch loyalties without much regard. Childs later mentions that William III only trusted those British officers who had served with him in the Anglo-Dutch Brigade (which was comprised of Dutch, English, and Scottish troops), and despised those that had served in other European armies. These British officers, however, gained much experience in fighting in the wars just after the Restoration in 1660, and proved invaluable in the formation of a “British” army.⁵⁹

1702 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987); Roger B Manning, *An Apprenticeship in Arms: The Origins of the British Army, 1585-1702* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁵⁸ Barnes, “Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688,” 116-123.

⁵⁹ Childs, *The British Army of William III, 1689-1702*, 14.

Published in 2006, *The Origins of the British Army, 1585-1702* perpetuates the arguments put forth by Robert Paul Barnes and John Childs. Roger B. Manning states that the creation of the modern British Army, officially in 1707, could trace its origins to wars in previous years which involved the English army with elements of Scots and Irish volunteers.⁶⁰ Manning further supports his thesis with the assertion that despite the hostility between the English, Irish, and Scottish serving abroad in foreign armies, sharing the experience of war, in conjunction with the idea that they were fighting a common enemy, was crucial for the integration of the English and Scottish armed forces.⁶¹ Hence, the assimilation of Scottish troops happened before 1707.⁶²

However, others stress England and Scotland only became a united fighting force with the Act of Union in 1707. Diana Henderson in particular supported this idea. Henderson discussed the two debates on the employment of Highlanders in the British military.⁶³ She agrees with the idea that military service benefited the Highlander, because it “provided a realistic outlet for the Highlander’s natural fighting abilities.”⁶⁴ Biographies on Scottish commanders reflect this statement. Paul David Nelson argues that General James Grant had a penchant for fighting that was conditioned by the environment (Scottish Highlands) he grew up in.⁶⁵ The analyses presented by historians here unfortunately conform to some of the same stereotypical views of

⁶⁰ Manning, *An Apprenticeship in Arms*, ix.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 94, 443.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 260.

⁶³ Henderson, *Highland Soldier*, 5. Henderson stated: “...[I]t [use of Highlanders in the Army] was a deliberate Government policy not only to disarm the Highlands but to depopulate them, draining the manpower permanently to an army destined for foreign stations and wars, where it would inevitably be ravaged by disease and battles; that the men so recruited were frequently abused, abandoned and betrayed by a distant and unfeeling Government, who made no attempt to understand their Highland culture and motivation. Secondly, and alternatively, that it was unrealistic for the old clan structure to continue any longer. There was serious Highland overpopulation; recruiting to the Army saved many from starvation and restored the credibility of the Highlanders as a loyal fighting man.”

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Paul David Nelson, *General James Grant: Scottish Soldier and Royal Governor of East Florida*. (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1993).

Highland soldiers as a martial race by offering explanations on individuals or groups of Scots, in particular Highlanders, demonstrating service in the British armed forces was beneficial not only for Scots but for the British nation in general. Similarly, there are historians that argue military service was beneficial for the formation of a “British” nation and national identity.

Linda Colley examined the formation of Great Britain in her work, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. It was the shared experience of war and empire-building, Colley argued, in fighting a common enemy – at the time, France was the major threat – that melded the major bonds between Scotland and England.⁶⁶ Stephen Brumwell, in his social study of the British army that fought in the Americas during the Seven Years’ War, added to this idea of soldiers forming a unified national identity that “transcended traditional national rivalries.”⁶⁷ While Brumwell presents a fascinating look at the average British soldier with particular emphasis on the experiences of the Highland regiments, he weakens his statements by not fully appreciating the sectional differences between the respective nations of Great Britain.⁶⁸ There is no doubt that Scotland was a key component of the British military in its wars and conquests since the Union of 1707. However, these general statements misrepresent the true nature of the martial attributes of Scotland – not to mention the similarities and differences in contribution by Highlanders and Lowlanders – and the trials and tribulations of Scottish soldiers and sailors in the British armed services. Nevertheless, these scholarly works have led to additional nuanced interpretations in the historiography of Scots in the British military.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Colley, *Britons*, 132.

⁶⁷ Brumwell, *Redcoats*, 310.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 264-289.

⁶⁹ See, Robert Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero: The Image of the Highlander 1745-1830* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 1995); T. M. Devine, *Scotland’s Empire and the Shaping of the Americas 1600-1815* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 2003); Geoffrey Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the*

Scholars such as John M. MacKenzie, Andrew Mackillop, and Hew Strachan, comment more specifically on the identity of Scots in their military endeavors within the British army.⁷⁰ They provide valuable contributions to the debates concerning the myth of a martial heritage that was imposed on the Highlanders, in addition to how the Scots were able to maintain their national identity, whether it was traditionally militaristic or not, within the larger identity of “Britishness.” According to their respective works, the preservation of a national identity was important for the Highland soldier. Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop argued that the “emergence of a Highland military image reveals the subtle way in which Scottish consciousness and popular opinion felt its way towards an extremely effective and comprehensive accommodation with ‘Britishness.’”⁷¹ What is even more revealing is that, contrary to the popular myths of the existence of a martial race, Scotland was not seen as very militaristic in nature. Scotland, specifically the Highlands, was not so much known for their militaristic nature until the Jacobite uprisings in the eighteenth century. The ’Fifteen and ’Forty-Five rebellions did more to promote the myth of the Highland warrior, including the famous “Highland charge.”⁷²

British Empire (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Hew Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” *The Scottish Historical Review* 85, 2: No. 220 (October 2006): 315-332.

⁷⁰ John M. MacKenzie, “Empire and National Identities: The Case of Scotland,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th Ser., 8 (1998): 215-231; Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop, ed., *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, 1550-1900* (Leide, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002). See also, Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity.”

⁷¹ Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop, “Introduction,” in *Fighting for Identity*, xxxviii.

⁷² Within *Fighting for Identity* are two important essays that deal specifically with the period covered in this research: Andrew Mackillop, “For King, Country, and Regiment? Motive and Identity Within Highland Soldiering, 1746-1815,” in *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, 1550-1900*, ed. Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop (Leide, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 185-212; Dauvit Horsbroch, “‘Tae See Oursels as Ithers See Us’: Scottish Military Identity from the Covenant to Victoria 1637-1837,” in *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, 1550-1900*, ed. Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop (Leide, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 105-129. See also, Andrew Mackillop, “Military Recruiting in the Scottish Highlands, 1739-1815: The Political, Social, and Economic Context,” (Ph.D. diss., University of Glasgow, 1995).

In conjunction with these studies, recent scholarship tends to include negative aspects of the use of Highland soldiers and their service in the British army. Stana Nenadic argued in a case study on Highland gentry families and the impact of the British army that military service was more detrimental than beneficial for these families.⁷³ T. M. Devine, and to an extent Stephen Brumwell, discussed the effects of raising so many Highland regiments after the 'Forty-Five.⁷⁴ Devine argued that the extent to which Highland soldiers were recruited during the wars of the mid-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries led Highland regiments "to be regarded as the expendable cannon-fodder of the empire."⁷⁵ Such works, published in the last ten years, are important for establishing how Highland soldiers reacted to service in the British military for the period of 1745 to 1815, and lay the foundation for a similar argument for Highlanders who served in militia units on the southern frontier of British-controlled territory in North America during the first decade of the British colonization of Georgia.

In the case of Highlanders who fought in Georgia and Florida during the War of Jenkins' Ear, later becoming King George's War or the War of the Austrian Succession, there are two prominent works that stand out in the historiography. Larry Ivers in *British Drums on the Southern Frontier: The Military Colonization of Georgia, 1733-1749* discusses the establishment of Georgia as a yeoman/soldier colony, where settlers would make a living for themselves without the aid of African slaves, and at the same time be employed as soldiers maintaining a constant vigilance against threats posed to British possessions.⁷⁶ One of the main goals of this

⁷³ Stana Nenadic, "The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families, c. 1730 – 1830," *The Scottish Historical Review* 85, 1: no. 219 (April 2006): 75-99.

⁷⁴ Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 290-319; Brumwell, *Redcoats*, 264-289.

⁷⁵ Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 315.

⁷⁶ Larry Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier: The Military Colonization of Georgia, 1733-1749* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1974).

study is to refute previous notions of General James Oglethorpe and allegations of poor leadership.⁷⁷ Ivers approached his study with an elitist outlook, focusing more attention on the actions of Oglethorpe and other high-ranking military and civilian officials than incorporating what the common soldier or militiaman experienced. In light of the “top-down” approach Ivers presents, this work is essential for laying the foundation for mistreatment of Highlanders by primarily English officials.

Twenty years later, Anthony Parker analyzed the town of Darien in Georgia and how the Highland inhabitants contributed to the early development and defense of Georgia in *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia: The Recruitment, Emigration, and Settlement at Darien, 1735 – 1748*.⁷⁸ Parker’s account takes a more sympathetic approach to understanding what the Highlanders experienced while colonizing Georgia. He refutes Ivers’ descriptions of the Highlanders as being “lazy” and ineffective in during Georgia’s trusteeship.⁷⁹ Instead, Parker argues that the previous English settlers of Georgia failed to establish a colony, and the trustees for the settlement of Georgia were forced to look elsewhere, ending their search in the Scottish Highlands because the people there were thought to make both good farmers and soldiers.⁸⁰ To support his argument, Parker integrated descriptions from common Highland civilians in order to establish the common-person perspective on life in a hostile border colony. Parker’s self-assessment of his work is presented correctly when he asserted that the contribution of the Highlanders, “out of all proportion to their numbers,” was previously “neglected by most

⁷⁷ Ibid., 173. In discussing the British victory over the Spanish force that invaded Georgia in 1742, Ivers concluded: “Based upon their previous and subsequent combat records, there is little reason to believe that either the regulars or the provincials would have taken offensive action without Oglethorpe’s leadership.”

⁷⁸ Anthony W. Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia: The Recruitment, Emigration, and Settlement at Darien, 1735-1748* (Athens, G.A.: The University of Georgia Press, 1997).

⁷⁹ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 197.

⁸⁰ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 1-2.

Georgia histories and relegated to the shadows in others.”⁸¹ Parker is one of the first to focus solely on the Highlanders and their service in Georgia and Florida. This thesis will build upon Parker’s analysis, exploring more of the role the Highlanders played in the military campaigns during the colony’s early years and their response to service in the border conflict with Spanish Florida.

Concerning the historiography on the Scottish Highland contribution to the establishment of Georgia, there must be a new military history examination of the Highland militia units that fought against the Spanish and their allies during the War of Jenkins’ Ear. Recent scholarly discourse demonstrates the Highland soldier’s maintenance of a Scottish national identity despite serving in a “British” army, deconstruction of the myth of the Highland soldier as an ideal warrior, and the significance of the Highland contribution to the British military. It is important to utilize this discourse when applied to the study of Highland militia in Georgia during the early to mid-eighteenth century. This thesis will close the gap in the historiography by creating a contextual analysis of how the Highland militiaman reacted to service in Georgia and Florida, particularly under English officers, while placing this case study within the parameters of a larger argument for how the British government martially employed Scottish Highlanders.

⁸¹ Ibid., 99.

CHAPTER 2: THE TRANSITION PERIOD, 1745-1815

The years between the end of the 'Forty-Five and Napoleonic Wars indicates that the Scottish Highlands and its inhabitants went through a transition period where they became Anglicized as the English attempted to, in their opinion, civilize the troubled region. Part of this scheme necessitated the recruitment of Highland men into the British military. This chapter will explain how the English martially employed the Scottish Highlanders during the period of 1745 to 1815, and will be particularly critical of the Highland experience during the French and Indian War. The sub-topic in British military studies presented here is important as it details the extent to which the British went in securing their Empire. This analysis will lay the foundation for how the Highlanders were deployed by the English for similar purposes during the War of Jenkins' Ear in Georgia and Florida in the following chapter.

Highland Recruitment

Historians agree that after the 'Forty-Five Highlanders were recruited on a large scale for service in the British army, and the French and Indian War was the first time a truly British army would be at war against a common foe.⁸² For Scotland, the military was a department of the

⁸² Colley, *Britons*, 287; Mackillop, "Military Recruiting in the Scottish Highlands," 1-2; Mackillop, "For King, Country, and Regiment?" in *Fighting for Identity*, 199; Nenadic, "The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families," 77-78; Strachan, "Scotland's Military Identity," 325. Colley estimates the size of the British army at around 40,000 in 1789, increasing to nearly 250,000 by 1814. The Royal Navy expanded exponentially from 16,000 to 140,000 in the same period. In his dissertation, Mackillop analyzed the recruitment of Highlanders within the context of "rapid socio-economic change," where "upward pressure released by this process

Empire open to all. It was also an effective way of removing any lingering Jacobite radicalism from the Highlands. The pattern of military recruitment in the Highlands is an example of an attempt by the British government to utilize the Scots for the defense and expansion of the Empire. One questions why Highlanders enlisted *en masse* in some cases to fight for a country that went on a terror campaign to eradicate Jacobite sentiment in their own backyard. They did so for different reasons, yet in the end, the overall picture points to a cleverly crafted English campaign to depopulate the Highlands of manpower.⁸³

Great Britain found herself in the 1750s embroiled in an inter-continental war with their old adversary, France. There was a great need for men to serve in the ranks of the British army, and one place that was looked to was Scotland. The end of the 'Forty-Five after the Battle of Culloden in 1746 allowed for the incorporation of thousands of potential recruits for military service in the British armed forces. These men were seen by the English as excellent candidates for military service due to their apparent natural fighting ability. Recruiting drives were established to engage the Highlanders in the affairs of Great Britain. There appears at this time (1750s) a major effort to mobilize the new pool of manpower in the Highlands for martial purposes. What is particularly striking was the method of recruitment exercised by the English. When one looks carefully at the sources from the time, the English appear to use noble Scots as puppets; even Simon Fraser, Lord Lovat actively participated in recruitment despite his father's

was a vital factor in bringing about change in the tenurial structure of the region," an aspect Nenadic describes as a "painful process." Mackillop also links massive recruitment of Highland men to the "decline of the tacksman and the emergence of crafting," and represented a new form of financial stability.

⁸³ Colley, *Britons*, 103; Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 303, 307, 311; Murdoch and Mackillop, "Introduction," in *Fighting for Identity*, xxxix; Mackillop, "For King, Country, and Regiment?" in *Fighting for Identity*, 186; Ian Macpherson McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains: The Highland Regiments in the French and Indian War, 1756-1767*, 2 vols. (Fleischmanns, New York: Purple Mountain Press, Ltd., 2006), 17.

execution after the 'Forty-Five.⁸⁴ The Scottish aristocrats that participated in the rebellion would be able to gain back their lost titles and lands if they recruited men for the army.⁸⁵ The Highlanders might trust the Scots (most of whom were Lowlanders) over the English recruiters. Apprehension of Highlanders towards English soldiers and officers after the suppression of the 'Forty-Five was noticeable, and the English saw the opportunity to use the Scottish officers who wanted to prove their loyalty by having them recruit from the Highlands.

There were many Scots, both Highland and Lowland, who were adamant about proving their loyalty to the Hanoverian dynasty. The English were desirous to take advantage of the new pool of manpower, and turned to the Scots to recruit men for the British army. Historians have commented on the incentives for recruiting as many men as possible, including free commissions, restoration of land and titles, and commuted prison terms. An example of this is Archibald Macdonell, who was sentenced to death after his participation in the 'Forty-Five. Macdonell asked Lord George Beauclerk to release him when "informed there were new levies to be raised in the Highlands" because he was "willing to spend a Life in His Majesty's service in any part of His British Dominions..."⁸⁶ Whether Lord Beauclerk felt pity for the man or not, he commented on Macdonell and others who were in a similar predicament that he would like to see them sent off "to scalp and have their chance of being scalped...so as not to be a mere burden for life upon the Government."⁸⁷ It is striking how ambitious some Scots were in trying

⁸⁴ David N. Mackay, *Trial of Simon, Lord Lovat of the '45* (Edinburgh and Glasgow: William Hodge & Company, 1911), 287-288. Lovat, on the last day of his trial, attempted to prove his loyalty to the British government and royal family when he said that the forces under his command were a "loss to the Government," the 'Forty-Five might not have been as extensive as it was.

⁸⁵ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, pp. 75-76.

⁸⁶ Letter of Archibald Macdonell to Lord Beauclerk, July 17, 1757; quoted in McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 24-25.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

to prove their loyalty. Many prominent Scots took the bait and went on large recruiting drives. Andrew Mackillop stated that Scots were concerned about their public image, and did their best to be seen as fervently patriotic to the British cause. A poem entitled, “A New Song,” was one of many issued in order to get the word out. The poem includes appeals to “Camel’s, Mackenzy’s Fraser’s and Grant’s/For they are brought up to the Sword,/Such warlike men Lord Loudoun wants.”⁸⁸ Lord Loudoun was the first commander of British forces in North America. A noble Scotsman, he was particularly active in recruiting Highlanders for military service, and is an example of the extent to which those Scottish aristocrats that recruited for the British army went in proving their loyalty to the Hanoverian dynasty.⁸⁹

Unlike the afore-mentioned “A New Song” that was meant to stir British patriotic sentiment, there were many other poems and tunes that lamented on the departure of Highlanders for service in North America. One such piece is entitled, “A Song of Departure, 1757,” and describes the sailing of the 78th Regiment of Foot (Fraser’s Highlanders) for duty in North America: “Terrible the news/As the finest men of our country/Are cheerless and humiliated/Surrendering their children to you...”⁹⁰ This tune allows one to see the culture of the Highlands affected by the changes incurred from the recruitment of Scots (particularly Highlanders) into the British army.

The average Highland recruit enlisted for many reasons into an army that had previously hunted down some of his countrymen, yet the typical Highlander was not warlike as portrayed in

⁸⁸ “A New Song,” [ca. 1756], John Carter Brown Library Collection, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

⁸⁹ MacKenzie, “Empire and National Identities,” 220; Mackillop, “For King, Country, and Regiment?” in *Fighting for Identity*, 187. Mackillop added that “this was really just the replacement of a hostile stereotype with a positive one, but a stereotype nonetheless.”

⁹⁰ Michael Newton, trans., “A Song of Departure, 1757,”; quoted in McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 28; Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 113-114.

the past. Recent scholarship is quick to point out that the Highlands were not overflowing with men of distinct martial tendencies. Historians who have written on the Jacobite rebellions conclude that of the Highlanders that would see combat in the French and Indian War, only a few had ever seen combat before. However, the “notions of a Highland warrior were as real as any identity can be,” according to Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop.⁹¹ Many Highlanders would enlist because of the lack of opportunities for employment in Scotland, or due to the devastating effects of a famine that broke out during the mid-1750s. McCulloch argued that recruiters from the Seventy-Seventh and Seventy-Eighth Regiments of Foot (Montgomery’s and Fraser’s Highlanders, respectively), were able to round up large numbers of men for service in the army during this time because of such hardships.⁹²

Perhaps one of the most alluring enticements offered to Highlanders who would serve in the King’s forces was the restoration of Highland traditions, particularly the wearing of the kilt. This is a perfect example of English attempts to draw in the Scots Gaels for their services in the British armed forces. The Proscription Act of 1746 restricted the everyday use of important Highland cultural icons (the kilt, the bagpipe), and disarmed the Highlanders, neutralizing any possible future threat to the security of England.⁹³ Yet Parliament was quick to make certain exemptions for the Act, specifically if one served in the army, he would be able to don his traditional Highland garb. While the prospect of fighting did not seem so attractive to some, the

⁹¹ Murdoch and Mackillop, “Introduction,” in *Fighting for Identity*, xxxvii.

⁹² See, Andrew Mackillop, *More Fruitful than the Soil: Army, Empire, and the Scottish Highlands, 1715-1815* (East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2000), and Mackillop, “For King, Country, and Regiment?” in *Fighting for Identity*, 204; McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 28-29; Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 321.

⁹³ Laws, Statutes, etc., *The Disarming Act, 1746*, 19 Geo. 2, c. 39.

allure of being able to dress in their traditional clothing was enough for serving in a government that had stripped away many of their rights.⁹⁴

Forced recruitment of Highlanders in the form of press gangs was a common practice during this period as well. Ian McCulloch described this process and the Parliamentary Act that allowed for magistrates to “impress all unemployed men by special degree.”⁹⁵ He added a comment from the time by Lady Ballindalloch that “there is not many spared out of Inveraven.”⁹⁶ Her comment shows the extent of male depopulation in the Highlands during these recruiting drives. Robert Kirkwood, a Lowlander serving in the 77th Regiment of Foot (Montgomery’s Highlanders), offered insight into this particular pattern of recruitment. Kirkwood enlisted in a regiment “composed of impress’d men from the Highlands.”⁹⁷ Given these examples, some kind of effort was made by the English to drain the Highlands of manpower not only for anti-Jacobite reasons, but also to employ these potentially loyal soldiers on the frontiers of the Empire. The first such example of mass deployment of Highland infantry in an integrated British army was in North America against the French and their Native American allies.

⁹⁴ Mackillop, “For King, Country, and Regiment?” in *Fighting for Identity*, 187-188; McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 29-30; Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero*, 176; Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 322; MacKenzie, “Empire and National Identities,” 225-226.

⁹⁵ Ian McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 30-31.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ian Macpherson McCulloch and Timothy Todish, ed., *Through So Many Dangers: The Memoirs and Adventures of Robert Kirk, Late of the Royal Highland Regiment* (Fleishmanns, NY: Purple Mountain Press, 2004), 33.

The Black Watch at Fort Carillon, 1758

The French and Indian War was the American theater of the Seven Years' War, from 1754-1763. The fighting in the Americas was particularly tough; British forces had to make critical adjustments in learning how to fight on the American frontier. It took them a while to organize a strategy that would prove effective for dealing with the French and their Native American allies. It was in this war that the British were able to draw on the new pool of manpower found in the Scottish Highlands. The Scots had played a significant role in the British armed forces, specifically in the Anglo-Dutch Brigade.⁹⁸ However, the French and Indian War saw for the first time a truly "British" army with the employment of Highlanders. The Highland regiments would be at the forefront of many campaigns throughout the war, none more significantly than at the Battle of Fort Carillon (Fort Ticonderoga) in 1758.

The British campaign against Fort Carillon in 1758 was one of the major engagements between the French and British struggling for control of North America. William R. Nester wrote one of the most recent accounts of the campaign. Nester analyzed in great detail the significance of the battle. Nester claimed that if the British took the fort when they had the chance, they would have captured the majority of French forces that stood between the fort and Montreal. If victory had been achieved, the British would have easily defeated the French in Montreal and Quebec, perhaps shortening the fighting by as much as two years. This was, however, not to be.

⁹⁸ See Childs, *The British Army of William III, 1689-1702*; Manning, *An Apprenticeship in Arms*.

The British forces who assaulted Fort Carillon on July 8, 1758 saw one of the biggest and bloodiest defeats for British troops serving in the Americas throughout the entire war.⁹⁹

The British forces, led by Major General James Abercromby, outnumbered the French by as much as four to one. Under normal circumstances, this would have been enough of an advantage for victory. However, the French forces under the Marquis de Montcalm utilized a strategy of rapid fire, an assembly line system where one man fired while a small team of others behind the shooter would prepare the next musket. Just as the soldier at the front discharged his musket, another would appear soon afterwards. The French were able to loose six *aimed* shots per minute onto the advancing British in this manner. This tactic proved devastating for the British forces who expected the normal two to three shots per minute from the defenders of Fort Carillon. In tandem with the effects of the rapid fire from the French, Abercromby had his men attack in line-of-battle, where infantry are deployed in long, rectangular ranks so as to present a wall of fire when fighting an opponent. Historians, and British officers at the time, concluded that this was a major mistake. With hindsight on his side, Nester argued that Abercromby should have attacked the fort using column (maneuver) formation, rather than line-of-battle. The column formation would have allowed the British forces to better negotiate the many obstacles that they met while maneuvering through the woods and difficult terrain in front of Fort Carillon, including the defenses thrown up before the fort.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ William R. Nester, *The Epic Battles for Ticonderoga, 1758* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2008), 2-3.

¹⁰⁰ McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 97-98; Nester, *The Epic Battles for Ticonderoga, 1758*, 148-49; *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle* 28 (1758), 446. There is a good description of the battle found here, as well as details of why the British were defeated. The numbers of men on each side, however, are off – the British are said to have had a force of 14,000, the French barely 3,000.

While engaged in fighting at the fort, the 42nd Regiment of Foot (Black Watch) would attack time and again, battling the French for over three hours before finally heeding the call for retreat, which was issued around 2:30 p.m.¹⁰¹ Montcalm himself praised the Highlanders in their attacks while other British regular regiments fell back, where he commented that the “Scottish Highlanders returned unceasingly to the attack, without becoming discouraged or broken.”¹⁰² The Black Watch suffered tremendously as a result of its vain efforts to dislodge the French at Fort Carillon. Of the 1,000 Highlanders of the Black Watch that participated in the assault, 648 were casualties (315 killed, 333 wounded).¹⁰³ The percentage of casualties suffered by the Highlanders, almost sixty-five per cent, is unheard of in warfare at this time. No other regiment, on either side, suffered such high casualties after one battle as the Black Watch did at Fort Carillon. In addition to the devastatingly high numbers, the disparity between dead and wounded is another shock. In most battles from this period in history, there is a larger gap between the numbers of dead and wounded suffered by a unit in battle, with the number of dead being relatively less than the amount of wounded. It is still not known exactly why the Black Watch ignored orders to fall back with the rest of the regular forces when Abercromby ordered them to. Regardless, the Highlanders paid a tremendous price that day for an empire that thought of them as expendable.

¹⁰¹ Letter of Captain James Murray to John Murray, July 19, 1758; quoted in McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 101.

¹⁰² Edward P. Hamilton, *Adventure in the Wilderness: The American Journals of Louis Antoine de Bougainville, 1756-1760* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964), 233.

¹⁰³ Nester, *The Epic Battles for Ticonderoga, 1758*, 153.

The Relief of Fort Pitt: The Battle of Bushy Run, 1763

Many of the Highlanders served on the exposed frontier in North America, far in advance of the main body. James Wolfe, a prominent general in the British army, described the drudgery of serving on frontier duty as “the most insignificant and unpleasant branch of military operations,” with all who served in a “perpetual danger of assassination.”¹⁰⁴ Shortly after the end of the French and Indian War, an uprising of Native Americans occurred, known as Pontiac’s Rebellion, which threatened the frontiers of the British-controlled colonies in North America. Once again, the Highlanders played a crucial role in defending the Empire. The fighting done by the Highlanders during this rebellion fit into the reasons why Highland regiments were deployed by the English in this region. Examples of the Highland charge, of Highlanders stereotypically seen behaving like savages – or being used because they were thought to behave like savages – and the belief that the Highland soldier was accustomed to fighting on difficult terrain under undesirable conditions, are seen in this rebellion.

One of, if not the major turning point of Pontiac’s Rebellion was the Battle of Bushy Run. David Dixon commented on the significance of this battle in *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac’s Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America*. Dixon credited this battle as not completely ending the Indians’ ability to fight, yet it did put an end to the siege of Fort Pitt. Dixon stated that the fall of this important outpost “would have allowed [the Indians] to continue the war for a longer period,” with the added bonus of “an important psychological and

¹⁰⁴ Willson, *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe*, 141.

spiritual impetus.”¹⁰⁵ The prevention of the fall of Fort Pitt allowed for the reopening of communication links between the frontier and Philadelphia, a vital aspect for the possibility of additional military campaigns or expansion of British control in the western regions of British-controlled North America.

The Highlanders made up a significant portion of the column advancing to the relief of Fort Pitt in July and August of 1763. Of the 465 men who accompanied Colonel Henry Bouquet on the campaign, 390 were Highlanders, the rest being trained riflemen and wagon drivers.¹⁰⁶ Once again, Highlanders were being sent out on frontier duty, exposing themselves, as James Wolfe lamented doing years before while in service in the Highlands during the ‘Forty-Five, and privy to ambush and assassination. The terrain of where the battle took place was “commanded by high and craggy Hills,” and the path to be taken by the Highlanders was suspected by Bouquet to be the perfect place for an ambush to occur.¹⁰⁷ This area, according to popular opinion at the time, especially that of the English, should have been perfect for the Highlander, who was supposed to be adept to fighting in this terrain. In addition, the apparent use of the Highlanders as the advance guard of the expedition should perhaps come as no surprise. Their deployment as the lead group in this column is evidence of their supposed capability for fighting in this kind of terrain, and is another example of the Highlanders manipulated by the English for the greater good of the British expedition.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ David Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac’s Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005), 197.

¹⁰⁶ McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 302.

¹⁰⁷ Letter of Colonel Bouquet to Amherst, August 5, 1763; quoted from full-text letter in Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*, 277.

¹⁰⁸ Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*, 186.

The fighting was particularly fierce. Dixon argued that the Highlanders could only keep the Indian attackers at bay by making bayonet charges to force the Indians back into the woods. Robert Kirkwood described the trap set for the Indians: "...having made a kind of breastwork with the flour bags, [we] waited their approach; when they came close up, we gave them our whole fire, and rushed out upon them with fixt bayonets; the Indians...took to their heels, and left the field of battle."¹⁰⁹ The images of Highlanders attacking with broadsword and musket and laying waste to whomever was in their way as described in the primary and secondary material available on this battle show how this is similar to what Government forces encountered during the 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five uprisings.¹¹⁰ Colonel Bouquet commented on the severity of the fighting, where the Indians "resolutely returned Fire, but could not Stand the irresistible Shock of our Men, who rushing in among them, killed many of them."¹¹¹ This and the other charges made by the Highlanders confirm the afore-mentioned tactics the Jacobites used during the 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five rebellions, particularly the devastating charge during the Battle of Culloden.

The Battle of Bushy Run, while not a particularly bloody engagement as compared to the slaughter pen of Ticonderoga five years before, was still an important engagement in the history of the British military, and more specifically the history of Scottish influence in the British armed forces. Dixon credited this victory as perhaps the "most complete victory" of British forces over Native Americans.¹¹² It should not be lost on the minds of historians the significance of the stereotypical Highland warrior images that come out of this battle. The Highlanders that participated in Bushy Run are depicted as charging multiple times at the enemy, each time with

¹⁰⁹ McCulloch, *Through So Many Dangers*, 92

¹¹⁰ Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*, 188.

¹¹¹ Letter of Colonel Bouquet to Amherst, August 6, 1763; quoted from full-text letter in Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*, 280.

¹¹² Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again*, 193.

bayonets and broadswords at the ready. All these characteristics are similar to reasons why, at least in the opinions of the English, the Highlanders would be perfect candidates for defending the Empire against her enemies.

The Peninsular Campaign

Instances of martial misappropriation are not confined to the eighteenth century. The threat of radical revolutionary ideas from France and the conquests of Napoleon on the European continent caused patriotic fervor to reach a high in the early years of the nineteenth century in Britain.¹¹³ As a result, the British armed forces expanded exponentially, and one of the areas most affected was Scotland, specifically the Highlands.¹¹⁴ During this time, more Highland regiments were raised than at any point previous in British military history. An anonymous memoir of a soldier in the 71st Highland Light Infantry details the story of this regiment and their involvement in campaigns during the Napoleonic Wars.¹¹⁵ This text serves as an example of the involvement of Highlanders in the British armed services during the disastrous British operation in Argentina in 1806 to 1807 and the vicious fighting on the Iberian Peninsula between 1808 and 1814.

¹¹³ Colley, *Britons*, 287.

¹¹⁴ Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero*, 152; Mackillop, "For King, Country, and Regiment?" in *Fighting for Identity*, 199; Strachan, "Scotland's Military Identity," 321. Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 297; Langford, "South Britons' Reception of North Britons," 162, 165. Devine asserts that "52,000 Scots were serving as rank-and-file members of these [volunteer] regiments. With around 15 per cent of the British population, the nation provided 36 per cent of volunteers in 1797, 22 per cent in 1801 and 17 per cent in 1804."

¹¹⁵ Christopher Hibbert, et. al., ed., *A Soldier of the Seventy-First: The Journal of a Soldier of the Highland Light Infantry* (London: Leo Cooper, 1975).

While on campaign in South America, the Seventy-First encountered extreme weather conditions, excessive fatigue while marching long distances, and abnormal battle orders. The anonymous soldier described how he and his regiment were forced to work around the clock constructing fortifications while laboring in oppressive heat.¹¹⁶ The author detailed one particular battle in July 1807, when his regiment was ordered to attack a town at bayonet point with empty muskets. The enlisted men were taken aback by this order, commenting to one another, “We are betrayed.”¹¹⁷ From this assessment, the Highlanders were deployed as they would be in the stereotypical “Highland charge” manner, with muskets replacing broadswords and targets.¹¹⁸ Overall, the campaign in South America saw few British victories and many set-backs, such as the ill-fated assault by General John Whitelocke on Buenos Aires in July 1807.¹¹⁹

The British faced a formidable enemy once they joined the Portuguese on the Iberian Peninsula. However, the campaign season of 1808 proved better for the British and allied forces than what was originally expected. In August the French were turned back at the Battle of Vimeiro. It was here that the Seventy-First, while protecting a few artillery pieces captured during the battle, came under attack by French cavalry.¹²⁰ The winter of 1808-1809 was particularly harsh for the soldiers in the Seventy-First. The Highlander experienced heavy downpours of rain, bitter cold, and gnawing hunger. Many shared the author’s sentiment when

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 2-3.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 8-9.

¹¹⁸ Devine, *Scotland’s Empire*, 312; Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 321.

¹¹⁹ Ian Fletcher, ed., *The Peninsular War: Aspects of the Struggle for the Iberian Peninsula* (Staplehurst: Spellmount, Ltd., 1998), 4.

¹²⁰ *A History of the Campaigns of the British Forces in Spain and Portugal: Undertaken to Relieve Those Countries from the French Usurpation*, vol. 2 (London: T. Goddard, 1812), 80; William Francis Patrick Napier, *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France: From the Year 1807 to the Year 1814*, vol. 1 (London: Frederick Warne and Co., 1892), 138; Rory Muir, *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 1807-1815* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 50-51; René Chartrand, *Vimeiro 1808: Wellesley’s First Victory in the Peninsular* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2001).

he stated that “this was the most dreadful period of my life.”¹²¹ Donald McDonald, the author’s friend in the regiment, sobbed at the idea that he would never again see Scotland.¹²² Images such as these are problematic for scholars who believe that war was a unifying experience for the nations of Great Britain.

Between the campaigns for Lisbon and Fuentes de Oñoro in 1810-1811, the Seventy-First yet again met with demanding conditions on the battlefield while facing adverse weather and terrain. In October 1810, the regiment, deployed as skirmishers, fought French elements in and around the village of Sobral while the rest of the advance guard fell back.¹²³ The Highlanders, at first driven out of the barricades they erected, re-formed and pursued the French through the village and beyond, skirmishing with French elements for several days.¹²⁴ The Seventy-First was so far in advance they had trouble receiving supplies, going without even basic food such as bread.¹²⁵ The men of the Seventy-First were, according to the author, forced to forage or face starvation. The regiment finally halted their pursuit until supply wagons reached them. During the three-day battle of Fuentes de Oñoro in 1811, a battalion of the 71st, along with a battalion of the 24th Regiment of Foot and 79th Regiment of Foot (Cameron Highlanders) were thrown into one of the most important spots on the battlefield, a village near Fuentes de Oñoro, suffering

¹²¹ Ibid., 23-28.

¹²² Ibid., 38.

¹²³ Hibbert, *A Soldier of the Seventy-First*, 51; Napier, *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France*, vol. 2, 45-47; Jan Read, *War in the Peninsula* (London: Faber, 1977), 165-166; Muir, *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon*, 150-154; René Chartrand, *Fuentes de Oñoro: Wellington’s Liberation of Portugal* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002), 34.

¹²⁴ Chartrand, *Fuentes de Oñoro*, 34.

¹²⁵ Hibbert, *A Soldier of the Seventy-First*, 58-59.

over four hundred casualties; the regiment was reduced to an effective fighting strength of less than two hundred officers and enlisted men.¹²⁶

The fighting continued to rage in Spain between the latter months of 1811 through 1813, the British and Spanish forces slowly forcing the French out of the Iberian peninsula. During the battle of Almaraz in May 1812, the Seventy-First, along with elements of the 50th Regiment of Foot, were ordered to take a heavily-defended fort on the opposite bank of the Tagus River. The taking of the fort, and the subsequent retreat of the French and destruction of their bridge by the British, cut the main line of communications between the French commanders in the region, Marshals Nicolas Soult and Auguste Marmont.¹²⁷ An anonymous soldier of the Seventy-First, while on duty one evening, discovered some Highlanders singing: “Why did I leave my Jeanie, my daddy’s cot, an’ a’ /To wander from my country, sweet Caledonia.”¹²⁸ The song, according to the author, is one of “Scotland’s sweetest songs of remembrance.”¹²⁹ The Highlanders appear to lament their current state by singing nationalistic songs of Scotland, not of Great Britain. The singing of this counters the arguments made by historians who believe the sense of “Britishness” was forged on the battlefield.

While pursuing the French across the Pyrenees during the campaigns of 1813 to 1814, the Seventy-First saw some of the worst fighting, including the action at Vittoria on June 21, 1813.

¹²⁶ Napier, *History of the War in the Peninsula and the South of France*, vol. 3, 148-154; Hibbert, *A Soldier of the Seventy-First*, 63-64; Fletcher, *The Peninsular War*, 12; Chartrand, *Fuentes de Oñoro*, 66, 79-81.

¹²⁷ Napier, *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France*, vol. 6, 162-163; Ian Fletcher, *Salamanca 1812: Wellington Crushes Marmont* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 1997), 19-20.

¹²⁸ Hibbert, *A Soldier of the Seventy-First*, 67; MacKenzie, “Empire and National Identities,” 230. This is an excellent example that proves a theory put forth by John MacKenzie in his article where he asserts the process of mutual defense and expansion of the British Empire by the four nations composing the United Kingdom allowed for those nationalities to survive by “creat[ing] a loop beyond the English, a loop whereby ethnic myths could be reciprocally nurtured and developed.” By singing a song that demonstrates a desire to return to “Caledonia” and not Great Britain, the Highlanders chose to identify more with their own national identity (Scottish) and dismantled the greater British identity thought to be created in the shared process of conducting war against a common enemy.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

Heading the initial advance were battalions of the Seventy-First, 50th Regiment of Foot, and 92nd Regiment of Foot (Gordon Highlanders) under command of Colonel Henry Cadogan.¹³⁰ The Seventy-First bore the brunt of withering French fire as they tried to negotiate a ravine near Zumelzu.¹³¹ It was at this battle that the regiment suffered the most out of the entire Allied force engaged, where they incurred over three hundred casualties, including their commanding officer.¹³²

The plight of the 71st Highland Light Infantry is indicative of the way other Highland regiments in the British army were used in previous conflicts. In battle after battle, the 71st was thrust into the most savage of fighting, as seen in major engagements at Vimeiro, Fuentes de Oñoro, and Vittoria, and at comparatively minor battles at Sobral and Almaraz. Despite the fact that the Seventy-First was a light company, and would have been placed in front during opening movements on the battlefield, the extreme situations these Highlanders were under, whether battling the elements or fighting in seemingly impossible situations, suggests that the English, seeing the Highlanders through the English-constructed stereotypical lens of the Highlander's natural martial capabilities, deployed the Seventy-First in a manner conducive to what was expected of the Highlanders at this time.¹³³ The American defeat of British forces at the Battle of New Orleans at the close of the War of 1812 confirms this notion upon examination of how the 93rd Regiment of Foot (Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders) was employed in this engagement.

¹³⁰ Read, *War in the Peninsula*, 208, 213-215; Muir, *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon*, 264-266; Ian Fletcher, *Vittoria 1813: Wellington Sweeps the French from Spain* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 1998), 40.

¹³¹ Fletcher, *Vittoria 1813*, 41-44.

¹³² Hibbert, *A Soldier of the Seventy-First*, 86-88, 102.

¹³³ Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 305. Devine argued it was the accomplishments of the 42nd Regiment of Foot (Black Watch), regimented in 1743, that designated how future Highland regiments were to be created and deployed; MacKenzie, "Empire and National Identities," 220-221; Murdoch and Mackillop, "Introduction," in *Fighting for Identity*, xxxvii.

The Battle of New Orleans

The War of 1812 (1812-1814) provides another setting to examine the strains Highland forces were under when fighting for the British nation. This section will focus on the attack by the 93rd Regiment of Foot (Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders) on American forces outside New Orleans. The battle, and the role the Ninety-Third played, demonstrates the martial misappropriation of Scottish Highlanders by English officers in battle. The 93rd Highland Regiment became one of the last British regiments to suffer, perhaps needlessly, at the Battle of New Orleans, the last major engagement of the war.

In preparation for the attack on the southern United States, the British built up a strong force of nearly 10,000 men, including the Ninety-Third which sailed from Plymouth to the West Indies in September 1814.¹³⁴ By late November 1814, an invasion force of fifty ships set sail for United States territory; by now the American forces were well-aware of British intentions, and began assembling their forces near the anticipated British landing site.¹³⁵ Once the British landed, the race was on to New Orleans. Several days of skirmishing between American and British forces in late December precipitated the major engagement, allowing the Americans to improve their defenses outside the city. In almost every engagement, the British failed to assess their dominant position over the Americans, and the numerically-inferior American forces fell

¹³⁴ Charles B. Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1961), 54; Donald R. Hickey, *The War of 1812: The Forgotten War* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 208.

¹³⁵ Charles Gordon, *Record of the Services of the 93rd Highland Regiment of Foot*, University of Guelph Library, Guelph McLaughlin Archives, Scottish Collections, XS1 MS A103, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

back and re-organized.¹³⁶ By January 1, 1815 the British artillery was in position to commence the bombardment of the main American positions.

The British plan was to feign an assault on the American right flank while the main attack would come at the other end of the line, the British moving through swamps to surprise the American defenders. Colonel William Thornton was to lead several companies of infantry in the main assault during the night of January 7-8, but he did not begin moving troops until well after the designated start time; the element of surprise was lost.¹³⁷ The movement of Thornton's men dictated how General John Keane's brigade, consisting of the 93rd and 95th Regiments, would be used in the engagement.¹³⁸ If Thornton achieved success against the Americans, Keane would assist in drawing American attention away from Thornton so the breach could be further exploited. Despite a late start in his assault, Thornton was able to drive back the defenders and create a significant threat to the American position.¹³⁹ However, the attack on the American right flank began to falter, posing a risk to the opposite flank, and Thornton began a retreat back to the British lines.¹⁴⁰

The attack by the British left flank now became the focal point with the failure of Thornton. British skirmishers, made up of light companies of Keane's and Colonel Robert Rennie's columns, reached the American lines first with ladders.¹⁴¹ After a fierce fight, the British light companies were driven back. The main British thrust now commenced on the

¹³⁶ Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 210.

¹³⁷ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 220; Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 211; John K. Mahon, *The War of 1812* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1992), 365-66.

¹³⁸ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 220.

¹³⁹ Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 211.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁴¹ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 229; R. Simpson, "Battle of New Orleans, 8th January 1815," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* CXLIII, vol. XXIV, September 1828, 355.

American lines. The 93rd Regiment moved obliquely across the battlefield, supporting General Samuel Gibbs, drawing heavy fire from the Americans who used five rotating ranks of musket fire provided by the infantry and devastating grape shot by the artillery to obliterate the Highlanders as they moved across the battlefield.¹⁴² Despite the loss of over half of the men in the Ninety-Third, Keane decided to press on with the attack. Those that did approach near the American lines became bogged down in a canal, where a steady fire ended any hope of British success.¹⁴³ To the horror of the officers and men in the Ninety-Third, Keane ordered the regiment to halt and take what cover they could find while the British attempted to regroup and attempt another push towards the American defenses.¹⁴⁴ Realizing the American position was impregnable, General Sir John Lambert, acting commander of the British force for the mortally-wounded Packenham, ordered a retreat.¹⁴⁵

According to Donald R. Hickey, the Battle of New Orleans on January 8 was “the most lopsided engagement of the war.”¹⁴⁶ The battle was particularly harsh for the 93rd Highlanders, who suffered 545 casualties; this equates to just over one quarter of the entire casualty figures for the British.¹⁴⁷ The Highlanders appeared to be confused during the latter stages of the battle, and with the loss of so many officers, fifteen commissioned and over twenty non-commissioned, the

¹⁴² Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 234-236; Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 211-212; Mahon, *The War of 1812*, 367-368; Gordon, *Record of the Services of the 93rd Highland Regiment of Foot*, 10; Simpson, “Battle of New Orleans,” 356.

¹⁴³ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 241; Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 212; Gordon, *Record of the Services of the 93rd Highland Regiment of Foot*, 10.

¹⁴⁴ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 241; Gordon, *Record of the Services of the 93rd Highland Regiment of Foot*, 10.

¹⁴⁵ Gordon, *Record of the Services of the 93rd Highland Regiment of Foot*, 10.

¹⁴⁶ Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 212.

¹⁴⁷ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 252; Hickey, *The War of 1812*, 212; Gordon, *Record of the Services of the 93rd Highland Regiment of Foot*, 11.

regiment lost cohesion and began to falter.¹⁴⁸ One wonders why Keane ordered the Highlanders to continue their attack when so many officers were down.

The Ninety-Third already made an impression on its brigade commander, Keane, despite being formed a just over a decade before and not seeing much combat. According to Charles Brooks, the regiment, formed in response to the threat France posed to Europe in 1803, pleasantly surprised the English officers in the field and in Britain, as well as politicians in Parliament.¹⁴⁹ If the 93rd Regiment lacked experience on the battlefield, why was the regiment praised at this stage in their development? According to John MacKenzie, Highland clothing, notably the kilt, became the standard dress for nearly all Scottish regiments serving the British army.¹⁵⁰ The Highland regiments raised after the 'Forty-Five were a construct of the English who wanted the men in these regiments to wear the typical iconic clothing associated with the Highlands, its inhabitants thought of as militaristic by birth.¹⁵¹ The English wanted the Scottish soldier to appear strong and tenacious in battle; to achieve this they fashioned the new regiments in the manner of the stereotypical Highland warrior. In the case of the attack on American positions at New Orleans, the Highlanders of the Ninety-Third were perhaps thought of by their English officers as capable of completing the task at hand, regardless of the lack of officers to maintain stability within the faltering ranks.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Brooks, *The Siege of New Orleans*, 28, 66-67, 77.

¹⁵⁰ MacKenzie, "Empire and National Identities," 225-226.

¹⁵¹ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 177-178. Plank postulates the English, during the French and Indian War, appeared to create a mythical image of the Highlanders as naturally suited for warfare in North America. From the descriptions of the fighting around New Orleans, this image unfortunately devolved to the Highlanders of the Ninety-Third.

Opinion of Highlanders: Perspectives from English Generals and Politicians

After the end of the last Jacobite rising in 1746 and the extinguishing of virtually any Jacobite sentiment in the Scottish Highlands, Scots began to play a more important role in the British army. Studies on the impact of Scots in the British army prior to 1746 have analyzed how Scottish officers gained experience by serving in foreign armies in Europe. However, most of these officers were Lowlanders. The inclusion of the Highlands after the 'Forty-Five allowed for a fully integrated Scottish officer corps in the British army. The Lowlander officer was highly sought after due to his sophisticated martial education abroad; the Highlander was sought after for several reasons, including his own military experience and the added benefit (for the English) of the removal of possible Jacobite leadership. In the years after the 'Forty-Five more and more Scottish regiments, particularly Highland ones, began to appear in the British army. The total incorporation of the Highlands into Great Britain offered the British army a new pool of manpower from which to draw on. This was also one of the most important times for post-Jacobite Scotland and her relations with England.

James Wolfe, future commander of the British expedition against the French at Quebec during the French and Indian War, stated very strongly his feelings on Highlanders, and did so on more than one occasion. In one piece of correspondence, he lectured a friend on the qualities of the Highlander: “[The Highlanders] are hardy, intrepid, accustomed to a rough country, *and no great mischief if they fall.*”¹⁵² Wolfe’s opinion here, a few years after his service during the ‘Forty-Five, is an example not only of the Scotophobia that appeared during the eighteenth

¹⁵² Willson, *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe*, 141 (emphasis mine).

century in England, but also the opinion of some who thought that the Highlanders inherently suitable for combat.¹⁵³ Historian Hew Strachan examined a similar statement in regards to Wolfe's thoughts on the Highlanders. He quotes James Wolfe asking in 1751: "'How can you better employ a secret enemy than by making his end conducive to the common good?'"¹⁵⁴ The quote from Wolfe and Strachan's subsequent comments indicate that Wolfe was also of the opinion that by draining the Highlands of its male population and putting them into the British armed forces, the opportunity for any further Jacobite insurgency would diminish. These comments by Wolfe are excellent examples of the desire to take advantage of the Highlanders, not to mention common stereotypical English views of the Highlanders.

British politicians, while sometimes using somewhat softer language, still conveyed a sense of necessity for the use of Highlanders in military service in their speeches in and out of Parliament. William Pitt desired to get his thoughts out for posterity, perhaps in order to preserve his place in history as, according to him, one of the few Englishmen at the time to comment positively on the employment of Highlanders in the British army. Pitt commented in 1766 on the decision to use Highlanders: "I sought merit wherever it could be found; it is my boast that I was the first minister who looked for it and found it in the mountains of the north. I called it forth and drew into your service a hardy and intrepid race of young men...[who] fought with valour and conquered for you in every part of the world."¹⁵⁵ Pitt praised the Highlanders on their service during the French and Indian War in his address, citing their defense of British territories abroad.

¹⁵³ Langford, "South Britons' Reception of North Britons," in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 148-157; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 369-370.

¹⁵⁴ Strachan, "Scotland's Military Identity," 322.

¹⁵⁵ W. Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to 1803*, vol. 16 (New York: AMS Press, Inc. 1966), 98.

However, his speech could be construed as justifying the propaganda used to recruit the Highlanders.

In 1750 the Secretary of War, Lord Barrington, announced to Parliament his desire to incorporate “as many Scottish soldiers in the army as possible” but made note of his preference for “as many Highlanders as possible.”¹⁵⁶ Lord Barrington’s statement came at a time when the English were realizing the potential “benefits” of employing the Highlanders in the British army. These included, as James Wolfe stated a year earlier, the elimination of any possible Jacobite threats, while utilizing a new source of manpower for defending the Empire at home and abroad.¹⁵⁷ Lord Barrington concurred with the idea that Highlanders were perfect for service abroad, as, in his opinion, they were accustomed to living tough lives.

Charles, 3rd Duke of Richmond, expressed his feelings on the intermingling of Scots and English officers in the British army in a letter to his brother in 1757. The Duke expressed his sorrow at his brother’s wish to join an all-Highland regiment when he asked why he would want to serve in a regiment that is “commanded and composed of rebels?” The Duke continued his tirade by ordering his brother to “drop...[his] fondness for the Scotch in general...[and] do not choose among them your friends. It can never do you any honour and may be of disservice to you.”¹⁵⁸ The Duke of Richmond’s comments demonstrate the severe disdain some English politicians had of the Scots, especially after the ‘Forty-Five.

Louis Antoine de Bougainville, who was standing near Montcalm where the Highlanders assaulted Fort Carillon (Fort Ticonderoga) in July 1758, revealed later his thoughts on the

¹⁵⁶ Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to 1803*, vol. 14, 729.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. In the same address, Lord Barrington explained that “every soldier we take from some parts of the Highlands of Scotland may be looked on as a soldier taken from the Pretender.”

¹⁵⁸ Letter of Charles, 3rd Duke of Richmond to Lord George Henry Lennox, 1757; quoted in James Hayes, “Scottish Officers in the British Army, 1714-63,” *The Scottish Historical Review* 37 (1958): 29-30.

service of Highlanders in the British army. Bougainville claimed after the battle that the Highlanders who were deployed against the French “understand very well they are sent to America in great numbers by the British in order to depopulate their lands and even hopes of seeing some of them killed.”¹⁵⁹ It seems as though Bougainville may have been correct in his observations. The Highlanders suffered more casualties than any other British unit there, and Bougainville’s commentary highlights some of the sentiment of English politicians and officers on post-’Forty-Five Highlanders.

Conclusion

In the wake of the last Jacobite rebellion, the Scots, particularly the Highlanders, played a significant role in the British army. Before the ’Forty-Five some Scottish officers joined other officers from Great Britain in serving abroad in foreign armies to gain experience. These officers were sought after for the training they received. However, the antipathy for which the English held the Scots after the ’Forty-Five is reflected in the manner in which the Highlanders were recruited, where they fought, and the general opinions of influential English officers and politicians.

Highlanders did enlist on their own accord in some cases, yet many were also pressed into service, as is seen in the 77th Regiment of Foot (Montgomery’s Highlanders). The English took advantage of those Highlanders who wanted their lands and titles restored after the ’Forty-Five, or those not involved with the Jacobites but seeking to prove their loyalty to the

¹⁵⁹ Louis Antoine de Bougainville; quoted in McCulloch, *Sons of the Mountains*, 103.

Hanoverian dynasty, to recruit men for military service. The English took advantage of the Highlanders who wished to have returned to them cultural aspects, such as the kilt and bagpipe, which Parliament took away with the Proscription Act of 1746. The only place where Highlanders could use these and other treasured items was in the army. For the English, draining the Highlands of any lingering Jacobite threat was an important factor in deciding to employ large numbers of Highlanders into the British armed services.

The French and Indian War was the first conflict where a truly “British” army fought together, one that included Scottish Highland regiments. These regiments, some composed of men who were pressed into service or lured by the promise of the ability to wear their tartans, saw some of the fiercest fighting in the American theater. The Black Watch suffered nearly sixty-five per cent casualties during the attack on Fort Carillon, a casualty rate unheard of at the time. The Highlanders who accompanied Colonel Henry Bouquet to relieve Fort Pitt in 1763 experienced the type of warfare the English thought the Highlanders were accustomed to. These Highlanders fought on the frontier, exposed to all its dangers, a duty lamented by General James Wolfe. Fort Carillon and Bushy Run are only two battles from this conflict that exemplify the extent of the misunderstanding of Scots Gaels as natural warriors as a result of English demands for more men for the British army.

The beginning of the nineteenth century saw Highland regiments raised on an unprecedented scale. Yet, the manner in which these regiments were deployed did not change. As demonstrated by the experiences of the 71st Highland Light Infantry during the Peninsular campaign and the 93rd Regiment of Foot (Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders) at New Orleans, the English commanders on the battlefield continued to use the Highlanders as the English

thought they should be used. This included mass charges with empty muskets (a symbol of the “Highland charge,” where muskets substituted broadswords and targets), based on the notion that Highlanders were suited for combat on difficult terrain, and the disposition of Highland regiments during battle concurs with this theory.¹⁶⁰

The opinion of English officers and politicians on Highlanders and their incorporation in the British army was critical for this period in the wake of the last Jacobite uprising in 1745. The passing of the Proscription Act of 1746 allowed for influential English politicians to tempt the Highlanders who wanted to retain important cultural symbols to join the armed services. This relieved the English who feared another Jacobite rebellion. Some high-ranking English officers and politicians, however, held the Highlanders in contempt. Officers such as James Wolfe had such disdain for Highlanders that he went so far as to call for their use as cannon fodder. The Duke of Richmond advised his brother, an officer in the British army, to avoid socializing with any Scots he might encounter.

Scholars who study this topic have done tremendous work in re-interpreting the role and impact of Scots in the British army in the wake of the 'Forty-Five. Their works, aided by the utilization of new sources as a result of extensive archival research, significantly enhanced what is known of the Scots, particularly Highlanders, during this time. The Highlanders encountered more trials and tribulations than what is represented above, especially fighting the French on Guadeloupe. The analytical framework outlined above will offer scholars a more useful framework to see how Highland and Lowland Scots participated in the expansion and

¹⁶⁰ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 177-178; Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 322; Devine, *Scotland’s Empire*, 311-315. Devine notes: “The higher echelons of the British military were increasingly influenced by German military concepts which stressed that the people of mountainous areas were especially suited to the martial life.”

consolidation of the British Empire. Recent scholarship discusses only a small part of this, and there is ample room for further research. This framework will now be used to explain in the next chapter how English army officers and government officials employed Scottish Highlanders in the colony of Georgia allies during the War of Jenkins' Ear (1739-1748).

CHAPTER 3: SCOTTISH HIGHLANDERS DURING THE WAR OF JENKINS' EAR

The security of the southern frontier of British-occupied territory in North America was a key component of stability for the British in the region. South Carolina militia and regular British military units bore the brunt of this initiative in the first two decades of the eighteenth century, completing a vicious three-year war with the Yemassee in 1728.¹⁶¹ Skirmishes with the Yemassee and other Native American communities, as well as the Spanish, cost the South Carolinians financially and in manpower. According to Larry Ivers, the establishment of the colony of Georgia allayed the fears of South Carolinians on the possible destruction of their colony; it would “absorb the bloody raids” of the Spanish and their allies.¹⁶² Within a decade of its establishment as a chartered colony in 1733, Georgia and its inhabitants found themselves at war with a potentially destructive enemy just beyond its southern border. It was now up to the colonists of Georgia, a large part of them recruited from the Scottish Highlands, to patrol and defend the southern extent of British-controlled land in North America.¹⁶³

There was an intense rivalry between Great Britain and Spain during the early eighteenth century. Each side had grievances against the other, including British dominance over former Spanish possessions such as Gibraltar and Minorca, British and Spanish privateers hampering the other country's imperial trade, and, more recently, the border between British Georgia and

¹⁶¹ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 9.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 10-11.

¹⁶³ Unless noted, efforts have been made to maintain the original spelling of primary sources.

Spanish Florida.¹⁶⁴ Throughout the later-1720s and 1730s, Britain and Spain were locked in fierce negotiations over commercial trade and land rights in the Americas, aspects that, as H.W.V. Temperley argued, could threaten war.¹⁶⁵ What finally drove the two countries to declare war in 1739 not only included the failure of the British and Spanish diplomats to fully comply with the demands of the other country, but the threat of foreign intervention by France resulting in a grand Bourbon alliance between Spain and France, a partnership that drove even the most anti-war British politicians to change their mind.

Early in the 1730s, British diplomats met with their Spanish counterparts to negotiate a settlement in the numerous disputes each country had against the other. One of the main qualms between the two countries concerned trade, which was being hampered by Spanish and British privateers, in addition to the extra-legal trade involving British merchants in Spanish colonies.¹⁶⁶ With the British colonization of Georgia, there was a growing concern amongst the Spanish about the security of her possessions in southern North America and the Caribbean. Even the Duke of Newcastle, an agitator throughout the process of negotiations, had doubts about the legitimacy of British claims to Georgia.¹⁶⁷ Neither side wanted to go to war, and yet diplomats and politicians in Great Britain and Spain were not willing to back down from their demands of the other country.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁴ H. W. V Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," in *Essays in Modern History: Selected From the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society on the Occasion of its Centenary*, ed. Ian R. Christie (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968), 200; Reed Browning, *The War of the Austrian Succession* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 20-22.

¹⁶⁵ Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 201; Browning, *The War of the Austrian Succession*, 23; M. S. Anderson, *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748* (New York: Longman Publishing, 1995), 14-15.

¹⁶⁶ Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 202-203, 217.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 218. Temperley cites the Duke of Newcastle as arguing that despite the possibility the British had no right to claim territory south of Carolina, "it would be pretty difficult to give up Georgia."

¹⁶⁸ Anderson, *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*, 12.

Amongst the British who desired peace, none was more vocal than Sir Robert Walpole, then First Lord of the Treasury. Walpole equated peace with better trade and a booming economy, arguing these points even when war with Spain seemed inevitable.¹⁶⁹ Throughout the 1720s and 1730s Britain, and particularly Spain, desired to increase the amount of trade flowing between the metropole and the colonies.¹⁷⁰ There were pressing arguments for a war where British victory meant a more liberal sea passage for British ships and increased access to raw materials in the Americas and Caribbean.¹⁷¹ Despite the growing clamor for war, both sides began to back down from their bellicose statements, and between January and early March 1739, preparations for war came to a halt.¹⁷²

Negotiations broke down again for the last time in May 1739 when Spain refused to repay reparations to the British merchant group South Sea Company, not to mention a British fleet, recalled when relations were favorable between Spain and Britain in January, put to sea again on March 10.¹⁷³ In addition to payment and land grievances, the threat of a *pacte de famille* of the French and Spanish Bourbon monarchies led even those staunchly opposed to war like Walpole to consider action before this threat could materialize.¹⁷⁴ Hostilities began in June and July, with war formally declared on October 23, 1739.¹⁷⁵ One of the first theaters of the war

¹⁶⁹ Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 199; 225-226; Anderson, *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*, 13; Browning, *The War of the Austrian Succession*, 23-24.

¹⁷⁰ Anderson, *War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*, 13.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 14-15, 17.

¹⁷² Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 215-216, 225; Anderson, *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*, 15-16.

¹⁷³ Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 221, 224, 228-229; Browning, *The War of the Austrian Succession*, 21-22; Anderson, *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*, 15-16.

¹⁷⁴ Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 226-227, 230-232; Anderson, *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*, 15.

¹⁷⁵ Temperley, "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739," 229.

developed over the boundary dispute on what constituted British and Spanish territory along the southeastern coast of North America.

The formation of Georgia may be looked at within the context of the framework established in the previous chapter, where the Highlanders who participated in security operations and outright warfare on the Georgia-Florida border in the decades before receiving the status of a royal colony did so according to how the English perceived the Highlanders should be used in combat. A key purpose in the establishment of Georgia was that it would be a militarized colony; the colonists, males in this case, would serve as yeomen farmers (slavery was forbidden at this time), and maintain patrols against incursions from beyond the western and southern borders of Georgia.¹⁷⁶ In the first two years of Georgia's existence, the trustees of the colony, almost all of them English, developed a system of defense that incorporated Yamacraw allies, rangers and boatmen from South Carolina, and Highland rangers and militia from Georgia, the latter two units led by Captain John Mackintosh.¹⁷⁷ The original defense system developed by South Carolina was manned by no more than one hundred men, and served as a reference for how the trustees would set up the defensive system for Georgia in the 1730s.¹⁷⁸

Another component of the militarization of Georgia was building militarized positions along the Altamaha River. James Oglethorpe, a member of the Board of Trustees for the establishment of Georgia, was able to raise £26,000 from Parliament for his scheme, approved by the trustees, of constructing two fortified towns along the Altamaha River, one occupied by Scottish Highlanders and the other by a mix of English and Salzburger colonists.¹⁷⁹ The 138

¹⁷⁶ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 10; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 72.

¹⁷⁷ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 29.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 50-51.

Highlanders recruited by Georgia trustees embarked from Scotland in October 1735 and arrived in Georgia in January 1736 to settle the garrison of New Inverness, later renamed Darien.¹⁸⁰ Once in Georgia, the Highlanders received a broadsword, target, and, perhaps as a sign of decreasing government expenditures, a “poorly-manufactured musket.”¹⁸¹ According to the South Carolinians, Georgia and its inhabitants were to relieve the South Carolinians from the burdens of frontier guerilla-style warfare that had plagued the colony since the first decade of the eighteenth century. If the Georgians were to achieve any success against Britain’s enemies in North America, they should have been supplied with proper equipment. Instead, it appears the Highlanders were to rely more on their broadswords and targets, which complied with the English stereotypical view at the time of the Highland warrior brandishing his broadsword and conducting unconventional warfare against conventional foes.

During the first three years after the founding of Highland settlements along the Altamaha River, the inhabitants were under a near constant state of military preparedness. In his first visit to Darien in February 1736, James Oglethorpe inspected the town where the Highlanders turned out in their plaid uniforms with complete military kit.¹⁸² The display, of which Oglethorpe commented the Highlanders made a “manly appearance,” only reinforced his and the Trustees’ views on the use of Highlanders as perhaps the only reliable defense on the

¹⁸⁰Letter of Daniel McLachlan to the Trustees, February 26, 1736, in Allen D. Candler, et. al., ed., *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*, vol. 21, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe, and Others, 1735-1737* (Atlanta: Chas. P. Byrd, State Printer, 1910), 336-339. McLachlan saw the recruitment of Scottish Highlanders as a way to “effectually civilize our Highland-Clans, and Secure that rebellious Humor which used, upon the least Commotion, to fly out in the face of their Lawfull Sovereign.” See also, Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 50-51; Mills Lane, ed., *General Oglethorpe’s Georgia: Colonial Letters 1733-1743*, vol. 1 (Savannah: The Beehive Press, 1990), xxii-xxiii, 83, 235-236.

¹⁸¹Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 50-51.

¹⁸²Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, February 27, 1736, *CRSG*, vol. 21, 75-77.

border with Spanish Florida.¹⁸³ The Trustees themselves placed the Highlanders under strict living conditions which interfered with how the Highlanders desired to run their settlements, which included the restriction of slave labor.¹⁸⁴ By April 1736 two forts had been built under Oglethorpe's direction, one on Saint Simon's Island with an English garrison, the other on Cumberland Island with a Highland garrison.¹⁸⁵ It is interesting to note the Highland fort on Cumberland Island was situated far closer to the border with Spanish Florida than the fort on Saint Simon's Island, a linear distance of about twenty miles between the two fortifications. Whether this was intentional or not, the fact that the Highlanders built and manned the southernmost fort clearly demonstrates the intentions of the Trustees, specifically Oglethorpe. The Highlanders were to position themselves at a point where their supposed inherited natural fighting capabilities were to be used in conducting guerilla operations as well as manning troublesome frontier defensive positions.¹⁸⁶

Another fort, Fort Saint George, was rebuilt in September 1736 in northeastern Spanish Florida, near modern Mount Cornelia.¹⁸⁷ Fort Saint George was manned by Ensign Hugh

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 1, xi, xvi, xxiv-xxv. The Trustees conducted an elaborate propaganda campaign to recruit Highlanders for the garrison towns in Georgia. According to Mills Lane, recruiters informed potential Highland candidates that Georgia was a land rich in resources and potential wealth. However, the Trustees later contradict themselves when they stated they warned the Highlanders about the dangers they would face in Georgia.

¹⁸⁵ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, April 17, 1736, in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 1, 236; Ivers, *British Guns Along the Southern Frontier*, 58.

¹⁸⁶ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, March 28, 1736, *CRSG*, vol. 21, 121-124; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 58, 62. Many of the Highlanders who migrated in late 1735 to Georgia participated in the failed 'Fifteen Rebellion. This rebellion, as with the 'Forty-Five, included guerrilla-style tactics practiced by the Jacobite rebels. The practice of these tactics during the 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five rebellions conformed to the stereotypical opinion that *all* Highlanders had a natural capability to conduct such warfare efficiently and under any condition. The Highlanders who accompanied Oglethorpe to Cumberland Island for the construction of Fort Saint Andrews, forty in all, were also joined by an additional forty Yamacraw under the command of Tomochichi. The pairing of Highlanders and Native American warriors, who were also recognized by the English as having natural fighting capabilities, should come as no surprise.

¹⁸⁷ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 62.

Mackay, Jr. and Highland militia to alleviate the burden of constant vigilance on the frontier by other troops.¹⁸⁸ The following year, Highland militia from Darien under the command of Lieutenant John Mackintosh finished the project and began the detested process of patrolling the frontier for signs of the enemy. After weeks spent in a constant state of alert for Spanish raiding parties, the Highlanders were contemptuous of life on the frontier.¹⁸⁹ The families of the militiamen sent to the forts in southeast Georgia and Spanish Florida also suffered as a result of the prolonged absence of a majority of the labor force. The supplies given to Darien by the Trustees, meant only to last a year until the settlement became self-sufficient, were supplemented for an additional three years due to the lack of manpower in the town.¹⁹⁰ By the end of 1737 the only rangers that maintained patrols on the border were the Highland Rangers led by Ensign Hugh Mackay, Jr., as the others had been recalled for various duties in South Carolina.¹⁹¹

Throughout 1737 the fledgling colony of Georgia braced for an invasion from the Spanish and her allies in Florida.¹⁹² The Spanish never launched a full scale invasion, but sent raiding parties in the spring and summer of that year which alarmed the local populace as well as the Trustees.¹⁹³ Highlanders stationed on Amelia Island fought off one such incursion of thirty Spaniards; the garrison remained “in a constant state of alarm” until the threat ended later that year.¹⁹⁴ Oglethorpe sought immediate assistance from Parliament, and consulted with First Lord of the Treasury Sir Robert Walpole on procuring British regular units for the defense of

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 72-73.

¹⁹⁰ Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 1, xxix.

¹⁹¹ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 77.

¹⁹² Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 68-69.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 69-70.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 69.

Georgia.¹⁹⁵ Walpole remained cautious on sending regular troops to defend the frontier in Georgia, but finally consented to Oglethorpe's request.¹⁹⁶ He agreed to the dispatch of a regiment, the Forty-Second Regiment of Foot, to Georgia. Walpole's hesitation on whether any British military personnel should be stationed on the southern frontier conformed with his peaceful endeavors throughout much of the 1730s to avoid a major war with Spain. However, as colonist Hugh Anderson made clear to James Oglethorpe, the deployment of only the Forty-Second Regiment of Foot "would little suffice to withstand the enemy," and that in the near future posed a danger to the Trustees as the regulars might mutiny against the conditions imposed upon them.¹⁹⁷

In November 1737, the governor of Spanish Florida, Manuel de Montaino informed the governor of Cuba about the intentions of the British in regards to a possible invasion of Florida that were presented to the British Parliament by Governor Oglethorpe.¹⁹⁸ He was certain that Spanish Florida was susceptible to invasion, and that the British would do so before the decade was out. Montaino commented that the British, in his opinion, would attempt to conquer Spanish Florida because the area was "more useful to Great Britain than all its remaining Colonies and Islands in America."¹⁹⁹ Thus, the Highlanders stationed at the extremities of British territory in North America were to provide a strong, militarized colony as a base of operations against the Spanish and her allies in Florida. As will be demonstrated, the Highlanders, in part due to the

¹⁹⁵ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 78.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Letter of Hugh Anderson to James Oglethorpe, January 6, 1739 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 386.

¹⁹⁸ Letter no. 1, March 22, 1737, *Collections of the Georgia Historical Society* (hereafter cited as *CGHS*), vol. VII, part I, *Letters of Montaino, Siege of St. Augustine*, trans. Manuel Joseph de Justis (Savannah: Georgia Historical Society, 1909), 8.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

preference of the British government to rely on provincial troops to secure colonial investments, were used specifically for raid and counter-raid actions in Florida, a duty the Highlanders were thought particularly capable of handling given the apparent extensive training in guerilla warfare tactics in the Highlands demonstrated during the 'Fifteen Rebellion.

Conditions continued to deteriorate in Georgia as the year 1738 brought more hardships to the Highland colonists. A poor harvest the previous year led the Highlanders to discuss open revolt against the Trustees if the Highlanders did not have their demands met.²⁰⁰ The elite amongst the Highlanders, particularly those with better education, provided the voice for all Highland colonists in setting before the Trustees their concerns over the present disposition of the colony.²⁰¹ Oglethorpe, now the commander of all forces in defense of the southern frontier of British-occupied territory in North America, demonstrated his power over the colonists when he exercised his authority, backed by the other Trustees, in quelling the rebellious Highlanders.²⁰² Discontent amongst colonists reached a climax in November when forces stationed at Fort Saint Andrews mutinied over the extreme situations they faced on a daily basis; Highland militia units were sent to quell the uprising and restore order to the area.²⁰³

The first half of 1739 saw a flurry of diplomatic activity between the Spanish and British over the possibility of war between the two countries. One of the main factors in the cries for war on both sides was the establishment of Georgia and its purpose as a military buffer against the

²⁰⁰ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Georgia*, 69-70.

²⁰¹ Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 1, xxix.

²⁰² Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 1, xxix-xxx. Oglethorpe, when asked what laws were proper for the security and stability of Georgia, ruthlessly retorted: "Such laws as the Trustees think proper, what business have the poor people to do with laws?"

²⁰³ Letter of James Oglethorpe to Harman Verelst, November 22, 1738, in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 368-371.

Spanish in Florida.²⁰⁴ In June, Great Britain and Spain agreed to halt all efforts in their respective military build-up operations; Oglethorpe had other intentions.²⁰⁵ In early July, Oglethorpe gathered a force of nearly thirty men, composed almost entirely of Highlanders, and led a reconnaissance expedition into the activity of Spanish forces in Florida.²⁰⁶ This endeavor was successful in proving the Spanish continued to gather men and *matériel* after the agreement between Spain and Great Britain was signed and in securing alliances between Native American communities and the British. In late September a message from King George II reached Oglethorpe in Georgia that the uneasy peace with Spain had deteriorated, and that Oglethorpe was to “annoy the Subjects of Spain” in any manner he sought fit.²⁰⁷ This order, coupled with Oglethorpe’s choice of Highlanders to accompany him in his expedition into Florida in early 1740, demonstrates the mindset of the English on how the Highlanders should be best used to fully utilize them for their martial capabilities. The Highlanders, apparent experts on hit-and-run tactics necessary for movement through enemy territory in Spanish Florida and for the manner in which King George II desired to harass the Spanish in the two months before war broke out in October, were to be a significant feature throughout the war between Spain and Britain.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁴ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 74.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

²⁰⁷ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, October 8, 1739, *CRSG*, vol. 35, *Original Papers, Governor Oglethorpe, Trustees, Others, 1735-1742* (N.P), 218-219.

²⁰⁸ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, October 20, 1739 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe’s Georgia*, vol. 2, 418. Oglethorpe praised the progress the Highlanders at Darien were making as opposed to colonists in Savannah “who have been most idle.” Oglethorpe perhaps made this comment to show the benefits of using the Highlanders to stabilize Georgia for those invested in the colony, as the Highlanders were thought to be accustomed to harsh living conditions in Scotland. This statement by Oglethorpe refutes the assessment put forth by Larry Ivers that the Highlanders in Darien were indolent.

Outbreak of War

The necessity of having a force to use in patrolling and security operations along the southern frontier became even greater after October 1739. On the twenty-third of that month, war was officially declared between Spain and Great Britain; preparations began almost immediately when word of this reached Georgia.²⁰⁹ Oglethorpe appeared to have become tremendously excited over the declaration of hostilities between the British and Spanish, a fact not entirely unexpected given his past with the militarization of Georgia.²¹⁰ One of the first major actions occurred in mid-November 1739 and involved, not surprisingly, Highland militia units. In the early hours of November 13, the garrison on Amelia Island, consisting of sixteen Highlanders, twelve regulars from the Forty-Second Regiment, and a handful of women and children were startled by an ambush of a dozen Yemassee warriors allied with the Spanish.²¹¹ Two unarmed Highland guards were killed, the sole casualties in the attack.²¹² Their deaths were the result of the defensive measures enacted by Oglethorpe and the Trustees to use the supposed inherent martial capabilities of the Highlanders on the southern frontier of British-occupied North America.

²⁰⁹ Robert Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain from 1727 to 1783*, vol. 1 (London: J. Chalmers and Co. Printers, 1804), 33, 42; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 75.

²¹⁰ Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain*, 71. It is noted here that Oglethorpe was “full of the most sanguine expectations” for a successful campaign against Spain, and that most of his forces would come from Georgia.

²¹¹ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, November 15, 1739, *CRSG*, vol. 35, 229; William Stephens, journal entry of November 22, 1739, in Allen D. Candler, et. al., ed., *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*, vol. IV, *Stephens’s Journal* (Atlanta: The Franklin Printing and Publishing Company, 1906), 456-458; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Georgia*, 75.

²¹² Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, November 16, 1739 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe’s Georgia*, vol. 2, 420-421; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 90.

Shortly after the raid on Amelia Island, Oglethorpe collected a force consisting of nearly two hundred militia, regular troops, mounted rangers (including the newly-formed Troop of Highland Rangers raised from the Highland garrison at Amelia Island less than a week after the ambush there), and allied Native Americans for an excursion into Spanish Florida.²¹³ These soldiers were to conduct unconventional warfare against the Spanish and her allies, and gather intelligence on the strength and size of the enemy in Florida.²¹⁴ The British, under General James Oglethorpe, operated under the orders presented to them by King George II: to harass the enemy wherever found. This allowed Oglethorpe to deploy his men, specifically the Highland infantry and mounted rangers, into extreme combat situations where they were constantly thrust onto the front line of most engagements in order to please the English military and political leaders who misappropriated them for their supposed natural fighting prowess.

Darien was drained of manpower for the British invasion of Spanish Florida in 1740. The removal of the men from the Highland communities, particularly at Darien, put a tremendous strain on the families they left behind, and threatened their existence in Georgia.²¹⁵ Highlanders not already under arms in a ranger detachment or militia companies were hastily assigned to

²¹³ Letter no. 203, July 6, 1740, *CGHS*, vol. VII, part I, 58; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 91. This force later expanded to contain over one thousand soldiers and sailors from both South Carolina and Georgia, as well as warriors from allied Native American tribes.

²¹⁴ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 103; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 77. Oglethorpe and his men discovered that the Spanish had over six hundred dispersed amongst several garrisons on the northern frontier of Spanish Florida.

²¹⁵ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 101; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 77. In May 1740 John Mohr Mackintosh, commander of the Highland militia in Darien, was ordered by General Oglethorpe (different from the call of volunteers amongst the English populace in Georgia and South Carolina) to raise another infantry unit, the Highland Independent Company, and an additional troop of Highland Rangers. The combined strength of these was to be around 150 men, but Mackintosh was only able to recruit seventy for the Highland Independent Company and barely enough for the ranger detachment; there were simply not enough men to fill the quota and maintain the existence of Darien.

units created especially for the expedition.²¹⁶ Those that did serve wore the traditional uniforms and equipage of the average Highland soldier: tartans, muskets, broadswords and target.²¹⁷ The mounted rangers employed similar items, but made more use of dirks and claymores; they transitioned to English-style clothing later in the campaign.²¹⁸ Whether by choice or not, the Highlanders initially went into battle armed and clothed in the fashion known to the English to be the standard look of the Highland soldier, but ill-suited for the inhospitable conditions in southern Georgia and northern Florida.

The first major encounters of the war occurred in January 1740, when elements of the British and Spanish forces clashed at Fort Picolata and Fort Pupo.²¹⁹ At both locations, the Highland Rangers and Chickasaw, Uchee and Creek warriors played major roles in procuring victories for the British. At Fort Picolata, these men launched a surprise night assault that carried the garrison within a couple hours.²²⁰ At Fort Pupo, Ensign Hugh Mackay, Jr. and his Highland Rangers once again were at the forefront of the battle, this time acting as a diversion while elements of the Forty-Second Regiment positioned artillery pieces to bombard the fort.²²¹ After a day-long struggle, the garrison at Fort Pupo surrendered. This action, according to Ivers, was an “effective harassment” of the Spanish forces.²²² The Highland Rangers, who played a crucial role in these two battles, became the image of how the military and political leaders in Great

²¹⁶ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 76.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 77.

²¹⁸ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 100.

²¹⁹ Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain*, 71; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 98-99; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 77.

²²⁰ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, January 22, 1740 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 442; Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain*, 71; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 77.

²²¹ Letter of Mark Carr to James Campbell, January 28, 1740 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 447; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 94.

²²² Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 103.

Britain, as well as the Board of Trustees for the establishment of Georgia, desired to conduct military operations against the Spanish. While British forces, whether regulars or provincials, had a history in fighting in difficult terrain and unfavorable conditions, the extreme recurring conditions the Highland militia and rangers faced, such as nearly-impassable swamps and marshes, unbearable heat and humidity during the spring and summer months (in addition to bitter cold in the winter), and swarms of insects and other potentially dangerous wildlife, not to mention a constant state of alarm for counter-raid operations by the Spanish and their Native American allies, one sees that these men were placed into some of the most hazardous situations possible during this war.²²³

The Highland Rangers and Highland Independent Company continued to suffer as the campaign wore on. In early May 1740, Lieutenant Robert McPherson of the Highland Rangers patrolled the area around Darien, searching for any signs of the enemy and waiting on promised reinforcements from South Carolina that would never arrive.²²⁴ A few weeks later, elements of the Highland Independent Company and the Forty-Second Regiment, composed more of Highlanders, were ambushed by a party of Yemassee warriors while on a supply run for British troops occupying Fort Diego.²²⁵ General Oglethorpe desired to use the Highland Independent Company extensively when on reconnoitering movements in Florida. For example, Oglethorpe deployed nearly five hundred men in his attempt to secure Fort Diego from a possible attack by the Spanish. The force stopped just short of the fort; General Oglethorpe decided to press on with

²²³ Edward Kimber, *A Relation or Journal of a Late Expedition to the Gates of St. Augustine on Florida, Conducted by the Hon. General James Oglethorpe with a Detachment of His Regiment, etc. from Georgia* (Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed & Co., 1935), 4, 15, 19, 21-28; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 18-19, 25; Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 1, xi.

²²⁴ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 113.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 106.

a guard provided by the Highland Independent Company.²²⁶ They soon discovered that the raid was a false alarm, and that Fort Diego was in no immediate danger. While on one particular scouting mission, Oglethorpe, along with commanders of some of the detachments under his command and accompanied by soldiers from the Highland Independent Company and British-allied Indians, gathered intelligence from Point Quartell, a distance from Saint Augustine of just over a mile.²²⁷ Oglethorpe and the officers were on horseback, and rode at such a fast pace that the Indians had enough and left, while the Highlanders continued to maintain contact with the mounted officers through stifling heat and difficult sandy beaches.²²⁸ The next major engagement at Fort Mosa would cost the Highlanders dearly and place the entire British invasion in jeopardy.

Ambush at Fort Mosa

While General Oglethorpe planned his siege of Saint Augustine, he ordered a “flying column” of Highlanders (infantry and rangers), a company from the regiment sent by South

²²⁶ J. H. Easterby, et. al., ed., *The Colonial Records of South Carolina* (hereafter cited as the *CRSC*), *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, from the 1st Day of December, 1741 to the 8th Day of March, -1742* (Columbia: The Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1953), 106.

²²⁷ *CRSC*, 95-97; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 107.

²²⁸ *Ibid.* Ivers, in one of his few criticisms of Oglethorpe, stated: “Oglethorpe’s disregard for personal safety was often so...reckless that one must suspect that he deliberately encountered dangerous situations, yet later defended the general by saying the general was “still learning to be a general” while preparing for the siege of Saint Augustine. Apparently this is supposed to clear Oglethorpe of any mistakes conducted on the campaign. Ivers dismissed previous claims that Oglethorpe wandered around northern Florida, wasting time and manpower before attempting a siege that ultimately failed. While Oglethorpe did not face an easy task of conducting this invasion, he was put in charge by the Trustees who trusted his military judgment, and there appears to be no doubt from the Trustees over whether they placed the right man in command. Yet they put a man incapable of achieving victory in charge of this operation, a man, in Ivers’ words, who felt more comfortable at the head of a “charging detachment of rangers or Highlanders.” Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 108, 111.

Carolina, and allied Indians to deploy and occupy Fort Mosa, a position within two miles of Saint Augustine on June 10; the majority of the force was composed of Highlanders.²²⁹ From the beginning, there was a rift in relations between those from the Anglicized colony of South Carolina and those from the predominantly-Scottish colony of Georgia. Colonel William Palmer, commander of the South Carolinians, fought almost constantly with John Mohr Mackintosh and Hugh Mackay, commanders of the detachments from the Highland Independent Company and Highland Rangers and his ranking seniors.²³⁰ One of the first disputes the commanders had with each other was the positioning of troops at the fort. Palmer wanted the force to set up camp outside the fort so that in the event of an attack, Palmer could deploy his men in a manner advantageous to him.²³¹ Mackintosh and Mackay preferred to billet their men inside the old fort, and began immediate preparations to do so, while Palmer went off into the adjacent woods and set up camp with his South Carolinians.²³²

Another issue arose regarding the posting of sentries once the force had settled in. The result of this was inadequate security of the entire area, an important factor in the disaster about to befall the flying column.²³³ The Highlanders began to distrust the English and only took commands from Highland officers.²³⁴ Palmer feared that Oglethorpe had sent the force to Fort Mosa as a “sacrifice”; if anyone would be sacrificed, it was the Highlanders due to the fact that

²²⁹ *CRSC*, 104, 107; Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain*, 71-73; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 114-116; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 78.

²³⁰ Letter no. 205, July 28, 1740, *CGHS*, vol. VII, part I, 62-63. Governor Manuel de Montiano understood the Carolinians and Georgians (English and Highlanders) were at odds with each other. See also, *CRSC*, 108-109, 113.

²³¹ *CRSC*, 108-109.

²³² *Ibid.*

²³³ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 117.

²³⁴ *Ibid.* This case is contrary to what Linda Colley and Diane Henderson argued, where war in this case disunites the British soldiers and splinters them back into their distinct nationalist units, instead of creating one British unit fighting together for a common cause.

the majority of the men present were of Scottish Highland origin.²³⁵ The in-fighting continued as Palmer desired to beat to arms at four in the morning daily, a routine detested by the Highland militiamen occupying the fort.²³⁶ Colonel Palmer went into the fort when no movement was seen “sometimes twice...to rouse the Men up, but they little regarded it.”²³⁷ Tensions were high throughout the first days the flying column bivouacked at Fort Mosa, and continued when the Spanish made their attack.

In the early morning hours of June 15 word reached Palmer and his English Rangers that an enemy raiding party was approaching their position.²³⁸ Palmer attempted to rouse the Highlanders inside the fort, and encountered the usual difficulty in doing so. When Spanish troops became visible, an order was issued not to fire until ordered so; it was disregarded by Highland sentries posted around the fort.²³⁹ The Spanish forces split and attacked the fort from different sides, but the Highlanders inside and the English Rangers from without repulsed the Spanish.²⁴⁰ The position of the English Rangers was the safer of the moment, as the Spanish and their allies desired only to breach the walls of the fort.²⁴¹ Shortly before daybreak, however, the Spanish concentrated their efforts and were able to clear the main gate.²⁴² The British forces inside did their best to fight their way out of the fort; one report, however, claims several of the

²³⁵ CRSC, 113; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 116, 119; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 80. According to Palmer, Oglethorpe also neglected to send any promised reinforcements to the flying column at Fort Mosa.

²³⁶ CRSC, 113.

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Letter no. 203, July 6, 1740, CGHS, vol. VII, part I, 56-57; CRSC, 114; Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain*, 72-73.

²³⁹ CRSC, 114. Palmer was moved to question, “are these Men I have to trust to? I thought so before.”

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 114-115.

²⁴¹ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 121.

²⁴² CRSC, 115.

officers and men from the Forty-Second Regiment and detachment of the company sent from South Carolina fled as the battle was just beginning.²⁴³

The British force incurred a severe number of casualties while defending Fort Mosa. Of the Highlanders involved in the action, over half were killed or captured, the highest number of casualties amongst the different detachments amalgamated into the flying column.²⁴⁴ The devastating loss of life at Fort Mosa proved the most difficult for the Highland settlements in Georgia, particularly the severely-depopulated Darien.²⁴⁵ One colonist wrote he had no news to report other than “the number of widows are much increased at Darien by their husbands being killed or taken at the late expedition.”²⁴⁶ The incident at Fort Mosa and the resulting failed siege of St. Augustine forced General Oglethorpe to end the offensive operation against the Spanish and retire back into Georgia.²⁴⁷

²⁴³ Letter of Thomas Jones to John Lydes, September 18, 1740 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 474-475.

²⁴⁴ Letter no. 203, July 6, 1740, and Letter no. 205, July 28, 1740, *CGHS*, vol. VII, part. I, 56-57, 60; *CRSC*, 115; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 122; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 81-83. The most recent estimate provided by Anthony Parker notes over seventy-five percent of the Highlanders recruited to fight in Spanish Florida became casualties at Fort Mosa.

²⁴⁵ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 139; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 81-84.

²⁴⁶ Letter of Thomas Hawkins to Benjamin Martyn, August 9, 1740 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 467; Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, May 6, 1741, *CRSG*, vol. 23, *Original Papers, Correspondence, Trustees, General Oglethorpe and Others, 1741-1742* (Atlanta: Chas. P. Byrd, State Printer, 1914), 30-31.

²⁴⁷ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 32, 58-59; Smout, “Introduction,” in *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603-1900*, 4-5. The collapse in the command structure amongst the British forces in some aspects epitomizes the complex nature of the complex nature of relations between Scotland and England as seen prior to and after the Union of 1707, where a propaganda war antagonized much of the populations of the two nations, particularly the Highlands, to mistrust the other.

Tense Tranquility

Much of time between the end of the British invasion of Spanish Florida and the Spanish offensive into Georgia in mid-1742 was spent placing blame on what caused such a dramatic failure. Many, including Oglethorpe himself, thought that if Oglethorpe was given more troops and allowed to carry out a proper siege of Saint Augustine, the British would have had no problem in taking all of Spanish Florida.²⁴⁸ In an accurate assessment of Oglethorpe's character, Larry Ivers judged that Oglethorpe was ready to press his attack to Cuba if Parliament allowed him to do so.²⁴⁹ The most surprising assessment of the investigations that followed the failed invasion of Spanish Florida came from a committee designated within the Commons House of Assembly in South Carolina. Their conclusions lay the blame of defeat with General Oglethorpe, where the committee thought it foolish to dispatch a relatively small number of men with limited provisions and no reinforcements to garrison a strategic fort (Fort Mosa), while possibly giving up their location by sending small parties out to round up stray horses from the Spanish.²⁵⁰

A mutual animosity formed between members of the South Carolina Assembly and Oglethorpe. South Carolinians were furious over the bungled invasion, and demanded the return

²⁴⁸ Letter no. 210, August 7, 1740, *CGHS*, vol. VII, part. I, 65; Letter of Thomas Jones to John Lydes, September 18, 1740 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 474-475. In his assessment of the campaign and the failure at Fort Mosa, Jones concludes that Oglethorpe would not use the company of Carolinians for the next offensive against the Spanish due to their ineffectiveness in the field. It is important to read what Jones did not write, specifically that the Highlanders were better suited for the type of warfare demanded by the conditions in northern Spanish Florida; by reading against what Jones wrote, one notices that the Highlanders were misappropriated to defend the southern frontier because they are considered better soldiers and adapt easier to various fighting conditions in part due to the stereotypical militant nature of the Scottish Highlander developed after the 'Fifteen Rebellion discussed earlier.

²⁴⁹ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 98-99.

²⁵⁰ *CRSC*, 162.

of £2,000 loaned to Oglethorpe and promised no aid in future operations against the Spanish.²⁵¹ Less intense feelings were shared between Parliament and the Board of Trustees for the establishment of Georgia. An officer in the provincial militia, Lieutenant William Horton, begged Parliament for additional money and regular soldiers for the defense of the colony; Parliament ignored the request, yet agreed to it after the invasion was over.²⁵² At the time, the British government attempted to scale back expenditures on defensive measures in Georgia and appropriated more funds to the escalating conflict in Europe. Perhaps Parliament was correct in its decision to allocate more funds for the forces on the Continent than in Georgia. However, Georgia was still essential for guarding the rest of the British colonies in North America, and served as a staging area for British incursions into Spanish Florida.

The cessation of major hostilities between Georgia and Florida between late-1740 and early-1742 allowed the trustees to rebuild Georgia. In April 1741 the Board of Trustees began another recruiting campaign in Scotland to acquire new colonists to replace those lost during the invasion into Florida and improve the local economy.²⁵³ Anthony Parker noted that the new wave of colonists, forty in all including twenty-five men, were to be used specifically for martial purposes, as they were outfitted with “a ‘Musquet’ . . . flints, bullets, gunpowder, and cleaning supplies.”²⁵⁴ Between the arrival of the new Highland Gaels and the resuming of hostilities the following year, the colonists participated in the maintenance of fortifications along the southern

²⁵¹ Letter no. 205, July 28, 1740 and Letter no. 210, August 7, 1740, *CGHS*, vol. VII, part. I, 62, 65; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 133

²⁵² Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, June 29, 1741 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 585. Oglethorpe argued the Georgians made an tremendous effort to patrol and participate in a large invasion of Spanish Florida mostly on their own, whereas the Spanish enjoyed reinforcements from Cuba and Spain. See also, Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 136.

²⁵³ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 84-86.

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 85.

frontier, as well as training for possible future fighting with the Spanish. This allowed them to become accustomed to the military efforts required of those involved in the military campaigns in this theater of the War of the Austrian Succession.

Oglethorpe, after recovering from the disastrous campaign, set out to bolster the defense of Georgia. Once again, the Highlanders would be at the heart of security operations where boats piloted by one hundred men of the Highland Independent Company, as well as two troops of rangers, became a crucial force in patrolling the southern frontier.²⁵⁵ Despite an unsteady economy to support his military endeavors, Oglethorpe necessitated the deployment of troops on the frontiers, and made use of the new wave of colonists for this purpose.²⁵⁶ The Highlanders, by Oglethorpe's design, were to maintain a constant patrol of the border with Spanish Florida. This was proven detrimental to those Highlanders ordered to do so prior to the declaration of war in 1739. The Highland militia units and ranger troops stationed in garrisons on the southern frontier during that time quickly became exhausted, and in certain cases mutinous, due to constant patrols, incessant alarms, lack of supplies, and poor living conditions. The situation was the same in May 1742, when Oglethorpe assessed that Darien was in good condition despite some grievances amongst the colonists.²⁵⁷ These were in regards to how the Highlanders in Darien and colonists in other towns were kept on the alert for Spanish incursions, as well as enduring attacks by Spanish who managed to slip past the security net.

²⁵⁵ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, April 28, 1741 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 572-573; Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, May 12, 1741 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 580.

²⁵⁶ Letter of James Oglethorpe to Harman Verelst, December 7, 1741 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 600.

²⁵⁷ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Trustees, May 28, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 612.

The Spanish Invasion of Georgia

In late October 1741 the Spanish began to develop a planned invasion of their own, under the control of the governor of Cuba Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas and commanded by the governor of Spanish Florida Manuel de Montiano.²⁵⁸ Once assembled, the Spanish fleet sailed for Georgia in mid-June 1742. The forces of Georgia and South Carolina were still reorganizing after their defeat in 1740, and relations between Oglethorpe and the South Carolinians had not fully improved. Prior to the sailing of the Spanish fleet, Oglethorpe had less than one thousand men at his command, with most of them dispersed amongst several outposts along the border with Spanish Florida, to defend against a Spanish force of 2,000 to 3,000 men.²⁵⁹ An order was received in Darien for the immediate dispatch of the Highland Independent Company to assemble in Saint Simons Sound, the eventual landing place of the Spanish invasion force.²⁶⁰ As the Spanish fleet approached, they attempted to pass through and land the soldiers on Amelia Island, but British artillery firing from Fort William prevented this.²⁶¹ Governor Montiano then chose a spot just over a mile from Fort Saint Simons, and disembarked his force there on the evening of July 5.²⁶²

Oglethorpe quickly gathered a guard of men from, not surprisingly, the Highland Independent Company, rangers, and allied Indians and began to scout the Spanish positions.²⁶³

²⁵⁸ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 87.

²⁵⁹ Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain*, 152; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 154-155.

²⁶⁰ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 155.

²⁶¹ Letter of Francis Moore to the Trustees, September 11, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 627.

²⁶² Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 160; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 89.

²⁶³ Letter of Francis Moore to the Trustees, September 11, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 632; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 90.

Montiano had to move fast if he was to retain the initiative and achieve victory against the British opposing forces around him. He moved much of his men out of the landing area and began searching for the large British formation thought to be in the vicinity. The Spanish spent most of July 6 occupied in establishing their beachhead and launching patrols to locate the British. Oglethorpe chose to deploy his forces in the woods surrounding the Spanish positions, a tactic he thought necessary to keep the Spanish from forming ranks in open fields and fighting pitched battles.²⁶⁴ This strategy became important as the British prepared to strike the following day.

On the morning of July 7, word of movement by enemy forces prompted Oglethorpe to gather troops in the immediate area to halt the Spanish advance “in the defiles of the woods before they could...form in the open grounds.”²⁶⁵ The majority of his force consisted of rangers, a few allied Indians, a company from the Forty-Second Regiment, and the Highland Independent Company.²⁶⁶ The Highlanders were the only ones ready to move out at the time, and were immediately deployed in the woods to monitor the Spanish.²⁶⁷ During the first part of the battle, Oglethorpe led a charge of the Indians and Highlanders against the Spanish as they moved closer to the woods.²⁶⁸ The attack forced the Spanish to retreat with the British in close pursuit. The

²⁶⁴ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 90.

²⁶⁵ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, July 30, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 620; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 163; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 90.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

²⁶⁷ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 163-164

²⁶⁸ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, July 30, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 620-621; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 164; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 90. Ivers describes the charge of the Indians and Highlanders, “all warlike by tradition,” as “life at it's best.” This statement is grossly misleading, as the Indians and Highlanders were not bred for combat. In the case of the Highlanders, this statement represents how Oglethorpe and the Trustees used the Highlanders in combat on the southern frontier. This was made known to them through the stereotypical views and opinions of English tradition, particularly after the 'Fifteen Rebellion. As stated above, the Highlanders were the only ones prepared to march and

Spaniards, accompanied by around two hundred grenadiers, regrouped and marched down a small road surrounded by woods, wary of another attack by the British forces.²⁶⁹ The order to open fire was given as the Spanish grenadiers approached the British who were hidden behind piles of logs and thick brush.²⁷⁰ The Spanish returned a disciplined fire, and soon units of the British command, almost exclusively those from the Forty-Second Regiment, began to fall back.²⁷¹ The Highlanders, however, held their position despite the fact that they were in a position to be outflanked once the English soldiers of the Forty-Second led by Captain Raymond Demere fled, in part because of the conditions on the battlefield (dense wooded terrain and thick smoke from the firefight) allowed for such confusion to occur.²⁷² The British position held with only the company of Highlanders under the command of Lieutenant Charles Mackay along with the single remaining platoon of fifteen men from the Forty-Second Regiment.²⁷³ The fierce firefight continued for about an hour before the Spanish retreated back to their camp, the British following closely behind. Oglethorpe desired to annihilate the Spanish before they could board their ships in Saint Simon's Sound. On July 12, he gathered the Highland Independent Company along with elements of the Fort-Second Regiment and rangers and prepared to attack, yet before

meet the Spanish in battle. If the Spanish were able to form their ranks in the open, the Highlanders would be, in the opinion of the English, more susceptible to defeat. However, one must consider if Oglethorpe consciously or subconsciously used the Highlanders because of their inherited expert martial abilities when ordered to deploy into the woods and fight the Spanish on terrain and using tactics (unconventional) the Highlanders were thought to be the best at.

²⁶⁹ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, July 30, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 621; Letter of Francis Moore to the Trustees, September 11, 1742 in Lane *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 632-633; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 165; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 90-91.

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

²⁷¹ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, July 30, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 621-622; Letter of Francis Moore to the Trustees, September 11, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 633; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 164-166; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 91.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 166.

the assault commenced, a stray shot from one of Oglethorpe's men alerted the Spanish and cost the British the element of surprise.²⁷⁴

The victory at what became known as the Battle of Bloody Marsh effectively ended the Spanish invasion of Georgia and turned the tide of the war in favor of the British.²⁷⁵ Credit for the triumph over the Spanish was and is given to Oglethorpe by leading contemporary figures and modern historians alike.²⁷⁶ While European soldiers of this period needed officers to lead them, to dispense orders and maintain cohesion in the chaos of combat, the true victor of the battle, the common soldier, is lost. In this case, the efforts of Oglethorpe are lauded more than those of the Highlanders who held the Spanish at bay from overtaking the British position. Recent scholarship, such as the work compiled by Anthony Parker on the settlement of Darien, begins to place the credit for the British triumph with the common soldier, specifically the Highlanders from said settlement.

²⁷⁴ Letter of Francis Moore to the Trustees, September 11, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 634-635.

²⁷⁵ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 91.

²⁷⁶ Letter of James Oglethorpe to the Duke of Newcastle, July 30, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, vol. 2, 621-622. Oglethorpe does, however, offer more praise to those who held the line against the withering Spanish fire. See also, Letter of Francis Moore to the Trustees, September 11, 1742 in Lane, *General Oglethorpe's Georgia*, 633-635; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 172-173. Ivers offers a top-down approach to his history of the frontier warfare in Georgia before its proclamation as a royal colony in 1748. Ivers demonstrates this when he argued that, in view of all military activity during this time, "there is little reason to believe that either the regulars or the provincials would have taken offensive action without Oglethorpe's leadership." While understanding the fact that leadership in war at this time was important according to European standards, Ivers does not properly acknowledge those who suffered on the frontlines under Oglethorpe's occasional reckless behavior, specifically the Highlanders of various formal and informal units including the Highland Independent Company and Highland Rangers. Attention must now be focused on the common soldier, whether in a regular or provincial unit since all lived and fought under the same stressful combat conditions.

Conclusion of the War

The Spanish invasion of Georgia was the last major event of the War of Jenkins' Ear: threats of similar attacks were issued by both sides, but nothing materialized from them.²⁷⁷ Frequent skirmishes between British and Spanish forces in the south and French to the west and southwest occurred that kept the civilian population on the alert for the duration of the war.²⁷⁸ In March 1743, General Oglethorpe led an expedition against the Spanish at Saint Augustine, but failed to achieve success due to detrimental weather and severe ailments amongst the soldiers.²⁷⁹ As always, the Highlanders of the Highland Independent Company and ranger troops played a crucial role in the defense of the colony.²⁸⁰ After some time, however, the Highland Independent Company could only muster half its necessary strength due to a lack of willing participants amongst the Highland population and few new colonists to Georgia.²⁸¹ This was supplemented in late 1743 with the arrival of thirty Highlanders of the nascent Royal Highland Regiment of Foot (The Black Watch).²⁸² When the 'Forty-Five Rebellion broke out in the Scottish Highlands, the business of patrolling the southern frontier of British territory in North America occupied most of the colonists' time and efforts.²⁸³

²⁷⁷ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 92-93.

²⁷⁸ Kimber, *A Relation or Journal of a Late Expedition to the Gates of St. Augustine on Florida*, 5; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 175-176; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 92.

²⁷⁹ Kimber, *A Relation or Journal of a Late Expedition to the Gates of St. Augustine on Florida*, 5; Ivers, 176, 180-181.

²⁸⁰ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 93.

²⁸¹ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 193-194.

²⁸² *A Short History of the Highland Regiment; Interspersed With Some Occasional Observations As To The Present State of the Country, Inhabitants, and Government of Scotland* (London: Golden Lion, 1743); 47, 51; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 194.

²⁸³ Letter of William Stephens to Harman Verelst, January, 22 1744, *CRSG*, vol. 24, 205-213; Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 196-197.

In mid-1747, after much deliberation, the War Office in London decided to disband the Highland Independent Company, most of the ranger troops, and nearly all sailors who monitored the numerous streams and waterways in Georgia and northern Spanish Florida, an act that stunned the colonists who perpetually feared another Spanish incursion.²⁸⁴ This action placed the Georgians, as well as South Carolinians, in a difficult position, as they did not have enough men and resources to maintain a proper defensive posture on their borders with the Spanish and French. Without adequate troops to guard the frontier, a good portion of British territory in southern North America was in jeopardy. What had once been an overwhelmingly militarized colony was reduced to a few ranger and militia units to fight against the stronger Spanish forces and their Native American allies. Fortunately for the Highlanders, peace was declared between Spain and Great Britain the following year in October 1748, and soon after became a royal colony.²⁸⁵ It was the first time since early 1736 that the Highlanders could live at ease and not worry about the possible threat of invasion or fight off the Spanish or their allies in one of the numerous skirmishes that occurred during the War of Jenkins' Ear.

The time when Georgia was a militarized border between British territory in North America and Spanish Florida took its toll on the Highlanders who participated in defending the frontier. The stress of maintaining a constant defensive posture and absorbing the impact of raids and other unconventional attacks by the Spanish and allied Indians had a severe detrimental affect of the progress of the colony itself, particularly its struggling economy. The Highland colonists voiced their concerns over their deplorable living conditions, where more time was

²⁸⁴ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 202-204; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 96. Anthony Parker stated the presence of the Highland Independent Company and Highland Rangers, constant traveling companions of General Oglethorpe, "brought assurance throughout the colony."

²⁸⁵ Ivers, *British Drums Along the Southern Frontier*, 214-215; Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 94

devoted to security operations on the border with Florida than farming. Several Highland colonists left Georgia for the relative safety of South Carolina, or returned to the Scottish Highlands to take part in the 'Forty-Five or post-'Forty-Five peace initiatives.²⁸⁶ What the Highlanders faced in Georgia was what the English thought the Highlanders were exposed to in the supposed wild and uncivilized country of the Scottish Highlands.²⁸⁷ According to English stereotypical opinions, the Highlanders were natural warriors suited for the type of unconventional warfare experienced during the War of Jenkins' Ear in Georgia and Florida, a possible indication of the effects the 'Fifteen had on the martial identity of the Scots Gaels when armed insurrection was associated with the Scottish Highlands.

The Highlanders saw much action, whether manning garrisons near Spanish-occupied territory or on the battlefield, while deployed during the War of Jenkins' Ear. Governor James Oglethorpe, commander of all British forces, made frequent use of the Highland Independent Company and Highland Rangers, including similar militia units gathered from communities in central and southern Georgia. Military service proved necessary for provincial units and those enlisted in the regular forces if the British were to solidify their position in North America, including the southern border with Spanish Florida, and those Highland colonists that served in the militia units lived up to their original designation as militarized yeomen.

As demonstrated with this case study, the experience of Scottish Highlanders who served in defense of the southern frontier of British-occupied land in North America fits the framework established in the previous chapter of how Highlanders were utilized for their inherent martial

²⁸⁶ Parker, *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia*, 95-96.

²⁸⁷ Pittock, *Inventing and Resisting Britain*, 56; Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 308; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, 3-4, 10-13; Whatley and Patrick, *The Scots and the Union*, 1-2

abilities in the defense and expansion of the British Empire. The Highlanders recruited for colonization efforts in Georgia were not highly-skilled warriors, a concept contrary to popular English mythology.²⁸⁸ In reality, the Highlanders had to adapt to conditions in Georgia, not only in developing communities but on the battlefield as well, something previous colonists failed to accomplish. This was a difficult task to overcome, as is seen in the eyewitness accounts of civilian and military life provided by some of the Highland colonists and the Trustees and officials in the British government. The certain instances, the Highlanders paid a heavier price for their efforts than did their English counterparts while the British were engaged in war and colonization in Georgia, particularly during the years of the trusteeship.

²⁸⁸ Strachan, "Scotland's Military Identity," 320-322. Strachan claims the Scotland was not a dominant military force until the 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five developed the stereotype of the Scot, particularly the Highlander, as a savage warrior, despite the fact that not all of the Highlanders participated in these events. The iconic image for the English to prove this concept was the "Highland charge" seen during the Jacobite rebellions, a tactic that worked in only certain combat situations and anachronistic by the mid-eighteenth century. Yet, the Highlanders were still employed by the English, with the fate of many Highlanders sealed in the dense woods and difficult terrain of North America.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

Throughout the period of military endeavors that drew upon the manpower of the nations of Great Britain between 1739 and 1815 to fill the ranks of the British armed forces, one particular group, the Scottish Highlanders, were deployed in large numbers during the several wars of this period. Indeed, the act of employing such men in disproportionate numbers for service on the frontiers of imperial territory, combating enemy troops the Highlanders were thought to be naturally capable of defeating in battle, demonstrates the mindset of those in the British government and military who were desperate to remove the Jacobite threat from Britain. This threat became a problem in relations between Scotland and England as both sides began to negotiate a political union.

The Act of Union in 1707 not only created one British government, but effectively established the British army, composed of men from England, Wales, Scotland, and parts of Ireland. Sharing the experience of warfare and empire-building were, according to some historians, key in solidifying the relationship between the nations of Great Britain.²⁸⁹ Since the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the need for a standing Scottish army declined, in part due to the economic strife in the country, which in turn diminished the image of Scotland as a reservoir of men for military use.²⁹⁰ There was, however, a strong demand for men to fight in armies on continental Europe, and men from all nations in the British Isles answered the call. It was here that Englishmen and Scotsmen fought together as mercenaries, both gaining valuable

²⁸⁹ Nenadic, "The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families," 75-76.

²⁹⁰ Strachan, "Scotland's Military Identity," 319-320.

experience for the next threat to Great Britain: the House of Stewart's attempt to reclaim the British throne.

The Scottish Highlands, however, became a problem in the development of relations between Scotland and England. There was mutual resentment against the Act of Union of 1707 which provided the Jacobites in Scotland and England with further cause to not only overthrow the Hanoverian dynasty but to restore the Scottish legislature as well.²⁹¹ The 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five Rebellions, violent reactions in 1715 and 1745 to the House of Hanover that supported a restoration of the exiled Stuart dynasty, generated much disdain of the Highlanders amongst those loyal to the Hanoverians in both countries.²⁹² Yet many Scots were not in favor of restoring the Stuarts to the throne, and saw better opportunities within the union of Great Britain under a Hanoverian monarch.²⁹³ The Jacobite rebellions, particularly the 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five, did more to tarnish the image of *all* Scots, as they were contrived as militant Jacobites by English propaganda.²⁹⁴ The Scottish Highlanders had to prove their loyalty to the British Parliament and the House of Hanover; one option was to utilize the Highlander's supposed natural superiority as warriors, a construct developed by the English during the uprisings in the early- and mid-eighteenth century, to develop and secure loyalty to the British government, as well as quelling any rebellious activity in the region.²⁹⁵ Many agree that the Scottish Highlanders

²⁹¹ Ibid.

²⁹² Stephen Conway, "War and National Identity in the Mid-Eighteenth Century British Isles," *The English Historical Review* 116, no. 468 (September 2001): 868-869. Conway argued that the marching into England of the Jacobite army did not necessarily mean an invasion so much as an army of national (in this case, Britain, not Scotland) liberation from the rule of a foreign monarch.

²⁹³ Ibid, 873.

²⁹⁴ Conway, "War and National Identity," 873; Mackillop, "For King, Country, and Regiment?" in *Fighting for Identity*, 186.

²⁹⁵ Colley, *Britons*, 103; Conway, "War and National Identity," 866; Horsbroch, "Scottish Military Identity," in *Fighting for Identity*, 128-129; Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 303; Strachan, "Scotland's Military Identity," 322.

finally became integrated into the British state after participating in several global conflicts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, particularly after the colonization process of “Anglicizing” the Highlands was complete.²⁹⁶ However, recent scholarship seems to reject this idea, resulting in a shift in the correct direction of where future inquiry into this topic should be focused.

Revisionist opinion on the contribution of the Scottish Highlands to the British military deconstructs the positive outlook military service had on the Scottish Gaels and focuses on the detrimental effects of martial life on not only the Highlanders themselves, but later images of the Highlands (indeed, all of Scotland) and the strong Scottish nationalist identity that persisted despite the idea of sharing a larger British identity with the rest of the British Isles.²⁹⁷ The retention of a Scottish national identity despite efforts to create one British identity is demonstrated with the case study on Highland provincial units in the War of Jenkins’ Ear. Instead of forging a British identity in the process of bolstering the British Empire, the sub-nationalities of Scotland and England are developed throughout the war. This proved dangerous as the combined forces from South Carolina and Georgia fought off the invading Spanish forces. Yet, service in the British military allowed the Highlanders to prove their loyalty to the British government, in addition to having returned to them cultural objects lost after the ’Forty-Five; the Scots Gaels, including those in the army and those at home in Scotland, paid a heavy price for the return of such objects. Stana Nenadic argues that expanding and defending the British

Strachan claims outright: “The British state exploited clan loyalties to form regiments while simultaneously destroying the clans themselves.”

²⁹⁶ However positive the descriptions of the Highlanders and their achievements on the battlefield were, the images are still stereotypical constructs of the Gaels after this process was complete.

²⁹⁷ MacKenzie, “Empire and National Identities,” 230; Conway, “War and National Identity,” 863-864; Murdoch and Mackillop, “Introduction,” in *Fighting for Identity*, xxviii; Horsbroch, “Scottish Military Identity,” in *Fighting for Identity* 124; Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 315-316.

Empire had a “socially and culturally disruptive” impact on many Highland families.²⁹⁸ Many Highland officers went to great lengths to prove themselves equal to their English counterparts, and in doing so squandered family fortunes, abandoned large estates for long periods of service abroad, and often met an untimely death. This is applicable to what many common Highland soldiers experienced when fighting to establish their “Britishness” and participate in “defence patriotism.”²⁹⁹

The British army incorporated significant numbers of Scottish Highlanders, nearly sixty Highland units in all, for service at home and abroad between the Seven Years’ War and the end of the Napoleonic Wars.³⁰⁰ Scottish, particularly Highland, regiments accounted for sixteen per cent of the total land force raised during the Seven Years’ War, not to mention Scots composing nearly a third of the officer corps.³⁰¹ Thomas Devine wondered why so many would enlist a decade after the violent repression of the Jacobites during and after the ’Forty-Five, arguing that given a martial identity before the ’Fifteen and ’Forty-Five was almost non-existent in the Highlands, these and other smaller insurrections in the region gave rise to this image where “Gaeldom became even more militarized than in the past.”³⁰² The objective of the British government was to eradicate all substantial threats to itself by enlisting the Highlanders in the British army in record numbers in order to stabilize northern and eastern Scotland and utilize a new pool of recruits thought to be experts in the type of warfare needed to consolidate the Empire.

²⁹⁸ Nenadic, “The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families,” 78.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 75-78.

³⁰⁰ Colley, *Britons*, 287; Mackillop, “For King, Country, and Regiment?” in *Fighting for Identity*, 199; Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 325.

³⁰¹ Clyde, *From Rebel to Hero*, 152; Conway, “War and National Identity,” 877, 879; Nenadic, “The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families,” 76.

³⁰² Devine, *Scotland’s Empire*, 307.

Once a pattern of recruitment was established, the British government was able to drain more manpower out of the Highlands and into service across the Empire. This was certainly the case once a call to arms was put out during the American War of Independence and the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.³⁰³ The contribution of the Scottish Highlander to the defense of the British Isles and its Empire allowed for their image as rebellious savages bent on the destruction of the British state to be reformed into that of a loyal citizenry ready to be called upon in service of their nation. As Andrew Mackillop argued, this was “the replacement of a hostile stereotype with a positive one, but a stereotype nonetheless.”³⁰⁴ The result of this was a severely-depopulated Scottish Highlands in the nineteenth century, coming at a time when a new wave of foreign wars threatened the stability of Britain’s overseas possessions.³⁰⁵ The development of the Scottish Highlander as a martial race thus had its origins in the bloody conflicts between Jacobite supporters of the House of Stuart and the British government, providing further insight into why the Highland Gaels became the stereotypical image of British prowess in battle. However, as argued above, it was the participation of the Scottish Highlander in the War of Jenkins’ Ear, which began a pattern of martial usage of the Scots Gaels to be copied in the larger wars of the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The North American theater of the War of the Austrian Succession, fought primarily in British-occupied Georgia and Spanish Florida, provides an early example of Scottish Highland participation in the British military system. The colony of Georgia was established primarily to relieve the burden of the South Carolinians who were under pressure to maintain patrols against

³⁰³ Ibid., 313.

³⁰⁴ Mackillop, “For King, Country, and Regiment?” in *Fighting for Identity*, 187; Langford, “South Britons’ Reception of North Britons,” in *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, 168.

³⁰⁵ Strachan, “Scotland’s Military Identity,” 326.

the Spanish and their allies. Within the first six years of the colony's existence, the Georgia colonists, in particular the Highlanders, encountered numerous difficulties not only in attempting to establish a means of living, but in creating an effective defense system against enemy incursions as well. The governor and overall commander of the armed forces for the defense of Georgia, General James Oglethorpe, forced the Highlanders to make extreme sacrifices in the early years of the colonization of Georgia. While the colonization process was by no means meant to be easy, Oglethorpe singled out the Highlanders time and again for some of the more difficult assignments, particularly those relating to the defensive system.

In securing the colony's southern border, a series of fortified outposts were established between 1736 and 1739 with many, including the southern-most fort on Cumberland Island, defended by Highland militia units or detachments of the Highland Rangers.³⁰⁶ As noted earlier, the Highlanders were armed with inadequate muskets at first, having either to purchase better arms or rely on their broadswords and targets. Much time and effort was spent patrolling southern Georgia and northern Florida to identify any threats against British-occupied land. The placement of Scottish Highland militia on the frontier of British-occupied territory in North America concurred with doctrine of the time, where the Highlanders were thought to be experienced in the type of unconventional warfare experienced in this part of the Empire.

When war broke out between Great Britain and Spain in late-1739, Georgia was put on full alert in anticipation of larger raids by the Spanish. To counter this, Oglethorpe conducted his own incursions into Spanish Florida, with the Highland militia and ranger units at the forefront.

³⁰⁶ That is not to say the Scottish Highlanders were the only ones defending the border with Spanish Florida. There were several English units, such as the English Rangers and other militia units from South Carolina, boatmen who patrolled the extensive waterways between the British Georgia and Spanish Florida, as well the Forty-Second Regiment of Foot, a regiment of British regular infantry.

Indeed, the first casualties after the official commencement of hostilities were two unarmed Highland militiamen stationed on Amelia Island. Within the first two months of 1740, Oglethorpe gathered an army composed of provincial units from South Carolina and Georgia, as well as the recently-arrived regular Forty-Second Regiment, and led an expedition to capture the heart of Spanish rule in Florida, St. Augustine. The Highlanders became a bodyguard for Oglethorpe, who surrounded himself with them when scouting possible enemy positions. One Highlander died of exhaustion as he and other Highlanders and allied Indians tried to keep up with the mounted general and his entourage when observing the Spanish in the Castillo de San Marcos.

The rout of British forces at Fort Mosa was the turning point of the invasion of Florida by General Oglethorpe. The “flying column” sent by Oglethorpe to this fort, a mere two miles from the main Spanish positions in St. Augustine, became embroiled in internal fighting amongst the officers in command. Arguments raged on issues such as overall command and where to bivouac the troops to provide maximum protection for the force. Highlanders Hugh Mackay and John Mackintosh, senior in rank to the Englishman William Palmer of South Carolina, wanted the column to establish a base within the fort, while Palmer preferred the open country, where the troops could form quickly in case of attack. Palmer also wanted to capture loose Spanish horses in the vicinity, an act that ultimately gave away their positions to observers in St. Augustine.³⁰⁷ Prior to and after the defeat of the force by an early-morning attack conducted by the Spanish and their allied Indian forces a rift in relations had developed between the English South

³⁰⁷ In a surprising statement from the committee of the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly assigned to investigate the failure of the General Oglethorpe’s expedition into Spanish Florida, the committee concluded that one of the main reasons for the ambush of the British force at Fort Mosa, apart from Oglethorpe’s lapse in judgment when he sent insignificant numbers of men to said fort, was Palmer’s insistence in rounding up the Spanish horses which led the Spanish to the British position. *CRSC*, 162.

Carolinian officers and the Highland officers of Georgia, which trickled down to the Highland militia who refused to follow orders from Colonel Palmer. This mutual distrust appears to go beyond one of opposing plans or squabbling amongst the officers, and conforms to the reality of Anglo-Scottish, especially Anglo-Highland, relations unfolding in Great Britain. While the column suffered needlessly due to poor coordination from General Oglethorpe, the presence of so many Highlanders must be seen as an attempt by Oglethorpe to deploy the Highlanders in a complicated reconnaissance mission as a way of utilizing their supposed superiority at conducting such operations.

When heavy fighting flared up in mid-1742, the Highlanders were once again put into a position where Oglethorpe took full advantage of their misunderstood martial capabilities. The Spanish invasion force that landed in Georgia met determined resistance from all British troops in the area. On July 6, General Oglethorpe led a party of Highlanders, regulars from the Forty-Second Regiment, and Indians in an effort to scout the enemy positions and lure the Spanish into the woods where the British had a better chance of achieving victory if a battle occurred. The Highlanders played a pivotal role in defeating Spanish troops as they maneuvered through narrow paths and difficult terrain when an intense firefight broke out in what became known as the Battle of Bloody Marsh. Companies from the Forty-Second Regiment attached to the British force fell back, yet the Highlanders held their ground despite mounting casualties, an act that turned the tide of the battle in favor of the British.

The Battle of Bloody Marsh effectively ended the Spanish invasion, and while threats of similar incursions into British territory loomed over the southern British colonies, the warring sides chose to conduct smaller raids until the end of the war in 1748. As the war died down in the

North American theater, Parliament chose to cut back on military spending in the southern British colonies, particularly Georgia. This came as a shock to the colonists who feared the Spanish would take the opportunity to conquer Georgia. While years of war took its toll on the Highlanders in Georgia, the idea that they were now more vulnerable than ever to invasion seemed to create a greater sense of fear amongst the colonists.³⁰⁸ The demobilization of the Highland Independent Company and the Highland Rangers, two significant forces in the defense of the southern frontier, came at a time when relations back in Great Britain were strained after the defeat of Jacobite forces at the end of the 'Forty-Five Rebellion. While monetary issues were deciding factors in the decision to disband these provincial forces, this should not be taken out of the context of the Jacobite threat to the Hanoverian dynasty and all disarming acts that followed the failed uprising in Scotland.

Given the case study presented in the third chapter, there was a period of misrepresentation of Highland manpower in the colony of Georgia during the War of Jenkins' Ear that conforms to the analytical framework established in the second chapter. The Highlanders who participated in the fighting against the Spanish and their allies encountered extreme difficulties in attempting to secure the southern border of British territory in North

³⁰⁸ Conway, "War and National Identity," 882-884. Stephen Conway argued the Spanish in the eighteenth century posed no critical danger to Great Britain itself. The French replaced the Spanish as the main enemy of Great Britain starting in the seventeenth century, who threatened the British with invasion until the end of the Napoleonic Wars. This, according to Conway, was a major factor in unifying the various populations of the British Isles under one cause, that of the defense of their nation, Great Britain. However, he fails to properly assess the danger posed by the Spanish on the southern frontier of British territory in North America. The importance of this area is made clear by nearly every person who took part in the settlement of Georgia, including the relieved South Carolinians and the governor of Spanish Florida, Don Manuel de Montiano. Yet the War of Jenkins' Ear disproves Conway's argument that the threat of invasion served as a rallying point for the defense of British territory. As demonstrated with the military disaster at Fort Mosa and the squabbling between the South Carolinians and Georgians on the defensive system and contributions in troops by each colony, the threat of invasion by the Spanish divided rather than united the "Britons" in said colonies along cultural and nationalistic lines, despite combining their forces for mutual defense in 1742.

America. It was this kind of warfare, in many instances unconventional, experienced here that the British government thought the Scots Gaels were capable of countering. This theory was developed as a result of the failed Jacobite uprisings that occurred in the Scottish Highlands in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, and came to be stereotypically seen as a movement almost exclusively composed of Highlanders determined to restore an oppressive Catholic royal family.

This study, however, presents only one example of how Scottish Highlanders were initially deployed in the British military system for a period of nine years. With the establishment of a pattern of martial misappropriation, new studies may be conducted on this subject. Thomas Devine made clear in his research the importance of further study of Scotland's impact in the Royal Navy in the mid-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries in order to fully appreciate the role Scotland played in the expansion and defense of the British Empire at this time.³⁰⁹ Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop asserted that, in terms of military service, Scots are examined primarily in an army role; the Highlanders are exclusively examined only in this capacity because of the iconic image of the Gaels in the army.³¹⁰ More research must be conducted at the county level to gain sufficient knowledge of enlistment records and patterns to establish how Scots in general participated in the British military system within the context of English use of Scottish, specifically Highland, manpower.

Employed in this study was a technique of reading against British, particularly English, discourse of officers and government officials on Scottish Highlanders. These sources provided a

³⁰⁹ Conway, "War and National Identity," 876; Devine, *Scotland's Empire*, 297-298. Conway demonstrated future problems associated with a study on Scotland's naval contribution as there is no mention of where enlistees were born in Royal Navy recruiting records prior to 1765.

³¹⁰ Murdoch and Mackillop, "Introduction," in *Fighting for Identity*, xxxv.

valuable look at English opinions of the Scots Gaels at the time, as well as a way of examining how the Highlander reacted to military service. These sources were used in this manner due to the lack of sufficient written material from the Highlanders, specifically those who were involved with the colonization of Georgia, as many of them were illiterate or could converse only in Gaelic. While the technique used here proved beneficial for this study, more archival research and translation of Gaelic sources will enhance the understanding of the Highland viewpoint on their contribution to the British military in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

This study predominantly approaches the subject of the misunderstanding of the martial capabilities of the Scottish Highlanders from the perspective of the Gaels themselves, utilizing British government and military sources to gain insight into how the English and the Scottish Highlanders viewed the deployment of Scots Gaels in the British army. It does not examine how the common English or Welsh soldier experienced warfare during this period. While their views on participating in the shared process of Britainization through warfare and defense of the Empire are important, their opinions were left out to focus more on how the Scottish Highlander perceived his role at this time, particularly while combating the Spanish in Georgia and Florida during the War of the Austrian Succession. Proper comparisons must be made in order to establish if Scots, specifically Highlanders, encountered more difficulties within the British military system than other nationalities. Once this and the afore-mentioned studies are completed will a stronger argument be made available to effectively counter assertions that military service was necessary and beneficial for Highlanders in the wake of the 'Fifteen and 'Forty-Five to show

loyalty to the British Parliament and monarchy as well as creating a new sense of “Britishness” within the realm of Great Britain and the Empire.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Government Sources/Archival Collections

Candler, Allan D., et. al., ed. *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia*, 32 Vols. Atlanta and Athens: various publishers, 1904-1916, 1976-.

Cobbett, W. *Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to 1803*. 36 Vols. New York: AMS Press, Inc. 1966.

Collections of the Georgia Historical Society, 20 Vols. Savannah: Georgia Historical Society, 1840-.

Easterby, J. H., et. al., ed. *The Colonial Records of South Carolina, Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, from the 1st Day of December, 1741 to the 8th Day of March, 1742*. Columbia: The Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1953.

Mackay, David N. *Trial of Simon, Lord Lovat of the '45*. Edinburgh and Glasgow: William Hodge & Company, 1911.

United Kingdom. Laws, Statutes, etc. *The Disarming Act, 1746*, 19 Geo. 2, c.39.

Songs

“A New Song,” [ca. 1756]. John Carter Brown Library Collection, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

“A Song of Departure, 1757,” trans. Michael Newton. Quoted in Ian Macpherson McCulloch. *Sons of the Mountains: The Highland Regiments in the French and Indian War, 1756-1767*, 2 vols., Fleischmanns, New York: Purple Mountain Press, Ltd., 2006.

Regimental Histories

A Short History of the Highland Regiment. London: Golden Lion, 1743.

A History of the Campaigns of the British Forces in Spain and Portugal: Undertaken to Relieve Those Countries from the French Ursupation, 3 vols. London: T. Goddard, 1812.

Beatson, Robert. *Naval and Military Memoirs of Great Britain from 1727 to 1783*. 6 Vols. London: J. Chalmers and Co. Printers, 1804.

Gordon, Charles. *Record of the Services of the 93rd (or Sutherland) Highland Regiment of Foot.* University of Guelph Library, Guelph McLaughlin Archives, Scottish Collection, XS1 MS A103, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Keltie, John, ed. *A History of the Scottish Highlands, Highland Clans, and Highland Regiments, With an Account of the Gaelic Language, Literature, and Music by the Late Rev. Thomas MacLauchlan, LL.D., F.S.A. Scot., and an Essay on Highland Scenery by the Late Professor John Wilson.* Edinburgh: A. Fullarton & Co., 1875.

Stewart, David. *Sketches of the Character, Manners, and Present State of the Highlanders of Scotland, with Details of the Military Service of the Highland Regiments.* 2 vols. Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and Co., 1822.

Letters

Lane, Mills, ed. *General Oglethorpe's Georgia: Colonial Letters.* 2 Vols. Savannah: The Beehive Press, 1990.

Letter of Colonel Bouquet to Amherst, August 5, 1763. Full-text letter found in David Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America*, Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.

Letter of Colonel Bouquet to Amherst, August 6, 1763. Full-text letter found in David Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America*, Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.

Letter of Archibald Macdonell to Lord Beauclerk, July 17, 1757. Quoted in Ian Macpherson McCulloch. *Sons of the Mountains: The Highland Regiments in the French and Indian War, 1756-1767*, 2 vols., Fleischmanns, New York: Purple Mountain Press, Ltd., 2006.

Letter of Captain James Murray to John Murray, July 19, 1758. Quoted in Ian Macpherson McCulloch. *Sons of the Mountains: The Highland Regiments in the French and Indian War, 1756-1767*, 2 vols., Fleischmanns, New York: Purple Mountain Press, Ltd., 2006.

Letter of Charles, 3rd Duke of Richmond to Lord George Henry Lennox, 1757. Quoted in James Hayes, "Scottish Officers in the British Army, 1714-63," *The Scottish Historical Review* 37 (1958): 23-33.

Willson, Beckles. *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe.* London: William Heinemann, 1909.

Diaries

Hamilton, Edward P. *Adventure in the Wilderness: The American Journals of Louis Antoine de Bougainville, 1756-1760.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964.

Hibbert, Christopher, ed. *A Soldier of the Seventy-First: The Journal of a Soldier of the Highland Light Infantry, 1806-1815*. London: Leo Cooper, Ltd., 1975.

Kimber, Edward. *A Relation or Journal of a Late Expedition to the Gates of St. Augustine on Florida, Conducted by the Hon. General James Oglethorpe with a Detachment of His Regiment, etc. from Georgia*. Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed & Co., 1935.

McCulloch, Ian Macpherson and Timothy Todish, ed. *Through So Many Dangers: The Memoirs and Adventures of Robert Kirk, Late of the Royal Highland Regiment*. Fleishmanns, N.Y.: Purple Mountain Press, 2004.

Periodicals

The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle 28, 1758.

Simpson, R. "Battle of New Orleans, 8th January 1815." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* CXLIII, vol. XXIV, September 1828: 354-357.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, M. S. *The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748*. New York: Longman Publishing, 1995.

Armitage, David. *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Barnes, Robert Paul. "Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 3, no. 4 (Autumn 1971): 116-127.

Brooks, Charles B. *The Siege of New Orleans*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1961.

Browning, Reed. *The War of the Austrian Succession*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Brumwell, Stephen. *Redcoats: The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Chartrand, René. *Vimeiro 1808: Wellesley's First Victory in the Peninsular*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2001.

_____. *Fuentes de Oñoro: Wellington's Liberation of Portugal*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002.

Childs, John. *The British Army of William III, 1689-1702*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.

- Clyde, Robert. *From Rebel to Hero: The Image of the Highlander, 1745-1830*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, Ltd., 1995.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Conway, Stephen. "War and National Identity in the Mid-Eighteenth Century British Isles." *The English Historical Review* 116, No. 468 (September 2001): 863-893.
- Cookson, J. E. *The British Armed Nation, 1793-1815*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Devine, T. M. *Scotland's Empire and the Shaping of the Americas 1600 – 1815*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 2003.
- Dixon, David. *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.
- Fletcher, Ian., *Salamanca 1812: Wellington Crushes Marmont*. Oxford. Osprey Publishing, 1997.
- _____. *The Peninsular War: Aspects of the Struggle for the Iberian Peninsula*. Staplehurst: Spellmount, Ltd., 1998.
- _____. *Vittoria 1813: Wellington Sweeps the French from Spain*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 1998.
- Hayes, James. "Scottish Officers in the British Army, 1714-63." *The Scottish Historical Review* 37 (1958): 23-33.
- Henderson, Diana M. *Highland Soldier: A Social Study of the Highland Regiments, 1820-1920*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, Ltd., 1989.
- Hickey, Donald R. *The War of 1812: The Forgotten War*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Horsbroch, Dauvit. "'Tae See Oursels as Ithers See Us': Scottish Military Identity from the Covenant to Victoria 1637 -1837." In *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience*, edited by Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop, 105-129. Leide, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002.
- Ivers, Larry. *British Drums on the Southern Frontier: The Military Colonization of Georgia, 1733-1749*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1974.
- Kidd, Colin. "Eighteenth Century Scotland and the Three Unions." In *Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1603-1900: Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. 127, edited by T. C. Smout, 171-187. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Langford, Paul. "South Britons' Reception of North Britons, 1707-1820." In *Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1603-1900: Proceedings of The British Academy*, vol. 127, edited by T. C. Smout, 143-169. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- MacKenzie, John M. "Empire and National Identities: The Case of Scotland." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., vol. 8 (1998): 215-231.
- Mackillop, Andrew. "Military Recruiting in the Scottish Highlands, 1739-1815: The Political, Social, and Economic Context." Ph.D. diss., University of Glasgow, 1995.
- _____. *More Fruitful than the Soil: Army, Empire, and the Scottish Highlands, 1715-1815*. East Linton, Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 2000.
- _____. "For King, Country, and Regiment? Motive and Identity Within Highland Soldiering, 1746-1815." In *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience*, edited by Steve Murdoch and Andrew Mackillop, 185-212. Leide, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002.
- Mahon, John K. *The War of 1812*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 1992.
- Manning, Roger B. *An Apprenticeship in Arms: The Origins of the British Army, 1585-1702*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- McConnell, Michael. *Army and Empire: British Soldiers on the American Frontier, 1758-1775*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004.
- McCulloch, Ian Macpherson. *Sons of the Mountains: The Highland Regiments in the French and Indian War, 1756-1767*, 2 vols., Fleischmanns, N. Y.: Purple Mountain Press, Ltd., 2006.
- Montgomery, Carina A. "The Gurkhas and Colonial Knowledge: Habitat, Masculinity, and the Making of a 'Martial Race,' c. 1760-1830." Master's thesis, The University of Calgary, 1998.
- Muir, Rory. *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 1807-1815*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Murdoch, Steve and Andrew Mackillop, ed. *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, 1550-1900*. Leide, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002.
- Napier, William Francis Patrick. *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France: From the Year 1807 to the Year 1814*, 6 vols. London: Frederick Warne and Co., 1892.
- Nelson, Paul David. *General James Grant: Scottish Soldier and Royal Governor of East Florida*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993.

- Nenadic, Stana. "The Impact of the Military Profession on Highland Gentry Families, c. 1730 – 1830." *The Scottish Historical Review* 85, 1: no. 219 (April 2006): 75-99.
- Nester, William R. *The Epic Battles for Ticonderoga, 1758*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2008.
- Parker, Anthony W. *Scottish Highlanders in Colonial Georgia: The Recruitment, Emigration, and Settlement at Darien, 1735 – 1748*. Athens, G.A.: The University of Georgia Press, 1997.
- Pittock, Murray G. H. *Inventing and Resisting Britain*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997
- Plank, Geoffrey. *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Pockett, Christopher. "Soldiers of the King: British Soldiers and Identity in the Peninsular War, 1808-1814." Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1998.
- Reed, Jan. *War in the Peninsula*. London: Faber, 1977.
- Roberts, John L. *The Jacobite Wars: Scotland and the Military Campaigns of 1715 and 1745*. Edinburgh: Polygon at Edinburgh, 2002.
- Shy, John. "History and the History of War." *The Journal of Military History* 72, 4 (October 2008): 1033-1046.
- Smith, Donald. "From Swords to Ploughshares: The Context for Highland Soldier Settlement in Nova Scotia, 1710-1775." Master's thesis, Saint Mary's University, 2003.
- Smout, T. C., "Introduction." In *Anglo-Scottish Relations from 1603 to 1900: From Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. 127, edited by T. C. Smout., 1-12. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Strachan, Hew. *The Politics of the British Army*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- _____. "Scotland's Military Identity." *The Scottish Historical Review* 85, 2: no. 220 (October 2006): 315-332.
- Szechi, Daniel. *1715: The Great Jacobite Rebellion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Temperley, H. W. V. "The Causes of the War of Jenkins' Ear, 1739." In *Essays in Modern History: Selected from the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society on the Occasion of its Centenary*. Edited by Ian R. Christie, 196-233. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968:
- Whatley, Christopher A. and Derek J. Patrick. *The Scots and the Union*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.