From Lobby to Party: Organisational Development and Change in the Scottish Home Rule Movement, 1880-1930

by

Jeffrey Michael Roberts

Abstract

In this thesis I trace the processes of organisational development and change in the Scottish Home Rule movement between 1880 and 1930. Employing an ecological framework, I detail the field of organisations that developed in two distinct periods, 1886-1914 and 1918-1930, and the way their interactions facilitated the emergence of new organisational forms, principally lobbies and parties. To bring discipline to this jumble of events, I employ three formal models to colligate the qualitative data presented: 1) co-evolutionary dynamics; 2) ecological control; and 3) the garbage model of organisational choice. My argument follows three broad moves. The first is movement away from nationalism to contentious politics as a frame of reference for these events. The second move is away from substances to a focus on intercalated processes. This entails a focus on networks of interaction, sequences of attention and social matching dynamics. The third is a move away from teleology and to a realisation of the contingent nature of these events. There was no necessity for either lobbies or parties to form. Rather organisational emergence was a contingent process of refunctionality—the use of existing organisational forms for new purposes. Operationalizing these processes I focus on the way that changes in the operating environment shaped three mechanisms: careers; organisational embedding; and ecological control. What I discover is that organisational change in the Scottish Home Rule movement was product of the matching of availability, attention and authorisation to act.

From Lobby to Party: Organisational Development and Change in the Scottish Home Rule Movement, 1880-1930

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

provided opportunities for further reflection on the conversation between theory and method as only an academic post can.

My deepest debts, though, are owed to my family who have in many ways written this thesis with me. My brother Mark's near daily calls during the autumn of 2000/spring of 2001 pestering me to complete the applications for PhD study in the UK were a welcome distraction from my MS thesis, a much-needed stimulus to focus my ever-wandering attention, and healthy injection of humour and support. His consistent support, ready jokes and willingness to laugh at and with me (in the ways only an older brother can) continue to shape my everyday experiences. His death in February 2002 made the academic study of vacancy and relational decay all too real. However, just like the process of structural encoding illustrated in this thesis, the history of our interactions continues to shape my present. I owe a huge debt to my parents Brenda and Winston Roberts who have provided me with ongoing support. They stood behind me during what must have seemed at the time as one of my most harebrained ideas—a move 3,800 miles away to study for a PhD. Any reservations they may have had about the wisdom of such a move they keep to themselves, offering me instead their love and support. Over the phone, over the dinner table during holidays, through letters and over the internet they have supported, reassured, listened, offered advice, cajoled, sent good vibes and loved me without obligation. Thank you.

And to the woman who was the root of it all, Lanny Walker, my partner, I owe perhaps my deepest debt. Had we not had a chance encounter in Hull in 1998, I probably would have never countenanced the idea of a PhD in the UK. Our time together over the past eight years has been some of my best so far. Her calming ways, unwavering support, rolling of eyes at my excesses, laughter at my ridiculous jokes, ability to force my attention and unwavering love are largely responsible for the

production of this thesis. Sharing a house with a grumpy academic who is experiencing faltering attention, writer's block, job woes and impending deadlines, is a fate I hope never to experience. Throughout it all, though, Lanny has suffered my calamities with grace. And in no small part she has proven critical to the production of the work in front of you now. It is for these reasons and a million others that I dedicate this work to her.

Abbreviations

Publications:

FC:	The Fiery Cross (Edinburgh)
LHR:	The Liberal Home Ruler/The Leader
SHR:	Scottish Home Rule Association News-Sheet/Scottish Home Rule
SI:	The Scots Independent
SN:	The Scottish Nationalist
TSN:	The Scottish Nation
YS:	The Young Scot
YSH:	The Young Scots Handbook

Organisations:

GUSNA:	Glasgow University Scottish Nationalist Association
ILP:	Independent Labour Party
ISHRL:	International Scots Home Rule League
SHRA:	Scottish Home Rule Association
SNL:	Scots National League
SNM:	Scottish National Movement
STUC:	Scottish Trade Union Congress
SWRP:	Scottish Workers' Republican Party
YSS:	Young Scots Society

Chapter 1: From Nationalism to Contentious Politics

Prime Minister Gladstone's 1886 announcement of support for Irish Home Rule brought with it promises of Home Rule not only for Ireland, but also for Scotland and Wales. By 1888, the Scottish branch of Gladstone's own Liberal Party, with its long history of independence of the national party, made Home Rule for Scotland its official policy (Kellas 1965a). The Grand Old Man's conversion to the cause of Home Rule for Scotland, albeit only after providing a suitable solution to Irish problem, gave shape to variety of developing grievances and signalled the beginning of an organisational proliferation in the emerging Home Rule movement.

Hot on the heels of Gladstone's proclamation, the Scottish Home Rule Association (SHRA) was established. A sprawling organisation composed of right-leaning Liberals, romantics, radicals and trade unionists, the SHRA took shape as a lobbying group with one main goal: to ensure that the issue of Home Rule for Scotland was not lost in the search for an answer to the Irish question. Writing in *The Liberal Home Ruler*, Charles Waddie, Honorary Secretary of the SHRA outlined the contours of the problem and the necessity of the organisation:

> As the principle of Home Rule has been adopted by the Liberal Party, few acquainted with the history of politics in this country can doubt of its final application in some sort; but there is a danger to the nationalities of Scotland and Wales, which we humbly desire to bring to your notice.
>
> The case of Ireland is generally assumed to be the most urgent, as it has been the most vehemently advocated, and the agricultural pursuits of the greatest bulk of the population there have brought more prominently forward the agrarian distress, and the necessity of Irish-made laws to promote the welfare of the people.
>
> But Scotland and Wales, although they have been quieter and more prosperous, ... have been suffering from even more neglect and arrears of legislation, and have at least an equal claim for a legislative assembly to manage their respective national and domestic concerns; and if Ireland is satisfied first, and the Imperial Parliament relieved from the pressure she now brings to bear upon it, the two smaller nationalities will be left to face the overwhelming majority of England, and it will entail at least as many years of

unnecessary agitation before they can force the English people to recognise their right to self-government.

There is the greatest danger to Scotland and Wales if they allow Ireland to be settled first in the hope that their case will immediately follow. *The passage of the Irish Bill alone might mean for them national extinction.* The best hope for Scotland and Wales lies in a general measure of self-government alike granted to all four nationalities, who can, as at present unite in an Imperial Parliament for Imperial Affairs. Ireland deserves much for resolute patriotism, but must, for her own and the common good, retain her present position in the Imperial Parliament...it would be found unworkable to have one of the four nationalities managing her own affairs in a Parliament at home, while retaining her voice in a Parliament managing both the Imperial and domestic affairs of the other three.

We humbly entreat all good friends of our national cause to be on their guard in this great crisis of our history, and to insist on a general settlement of the question, and not a partial one, or the consequences will fall heavy upon the smaller nationalities of Scotland and Wales, whose united Members of Parliament would be outnumbered by nearly five to one were Ireland excluded from this discussion (LHR 5 February 1887: 46, emphasis original).

In March 1887, Waddie went a step further in the SHRA's efforts to alleviate the threat of national extinction, publishing a draft Home Rule bill outlining separate Parliaments for England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, all under the jurisdiction of the Imperial Parliament in London (LHR 18 March 1887: 122). The SHRA's programme, as outlined by Waddie captured what was a burgeoning feeling in amongst many in Scotland:

...[that it] was being usurped from the special niche it had carved out in British politics because of the antics of Irish Home Rulers. After all, the Scots acted as model citizens of the Empire, whereas the Irish were perceived as being rewarded by a welter of special legislation on account of their obstinate and at times, terrorist behaviour (Finlay 1997: 41).

Over the following two decades, the SHRA was joined by other political lobbies pressing for Home Rule. Groups such as the Scots Home Rule Council, the International Scottish Home Rule League and the Young Scots Society all actively fought to maintain Home Rule as a priority of the Liberal and Labour Parties. For all of these groups Home Rule for Scotland was both necessary and urgent. For many, the attention lavished on Ireland was symptomatic of the larger problem denying Scotland its rightful place in

2

British politics. The administrative structure of Westminster was simply

incapable of handling the work required to properly manage both Imperial

and domestic responsibilities.

As the inaugural issue of *The Scottish Nationalist* explained:

> The British Parliament is so overloaded with work, that, as a natural
> consequence, Scottish business is thrust aside, for, however
> important it may be thought in Scotland, English members look upon
> it with supreme indifference, and having the power of an
> overwhelming majority, take no heed of our protests. Yet although
> Scotland has no larger a population than London, her wants are very
> different. The latter live under nearly the same conditions, namely
> urban or city life, the former is as varied as England herself, and
> requires as much attention if she is to be well governed. It is
> impossible that such consideration can be given in a British
> Parliament charged with the management of a world-wide empire
> (SN March 1903: 1).

The management of Scotland was something that was best left to the Scots

who better knew their own affairs and how the problems of land reform,

drink, local administration and labour relations might be managed.

Joining these political lobbies were a host of other organisations

whose political credentials were less obvious. Labour unions in Scotland

were closely involved in the Home Rule movement. When the SHRA was

founded in 1886, Keir Hardy (founder and leader of the Scottish Labour

Party) was a vice president. Before the turn of the twentieth century, many

trade unions in Scotland operated as separate entities from their English

counterparts largely as a result of the radically different organisation of

labour north and south of the Tweed. For example,

> The Scottish National Operative Tailors' and Tailoresses' Association
> was engaged in chronic disputes with the corresponding English
> Union throughout the nineteenth century, and in 1900 the Scottish
> Trade Union Congress (STUC) recommended that the two societies
> should 'confine themselves to the well-defined boundaries of Scotland
> and England' (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 35).

The locally focused, multi-occupation representation of Scottish trade

councils differed considerably to English trade unions, with their focus on

national mobilisation of individual trades. As a result, they regularly pressed

for separate legal and organisational representation. When in 1895, the

Trade Union Congress was unwilling to accept Scottish trade councils into its membership, the Scottish Trade Union Congress (STUC) became the main voice of Scottish labour and a vocal advocate of Home Rule.

The labour movement's support of Home Rule was largely reliant on its ties to the Highland land reform movement, and the ongoing plight of the crofters. Inspired by the Irish land reform movement, a coalition of crofters, socialists and lowland radicals organised the Highland Land Law Reform Association (HLLRA) in 1883. For these land reformers, The Crofter's Act of June 1886, which finally provided the Crofter's security of tenure, compensation for property improvements and the establishment of a government commission to establish fair rents, was simply not enough. For the HLLRA and its successor, the Highland Land League, Home Rule for Scotland as the only viable option for the resolution of the crofter's plight (Hunter 1975).

The issues of Parliamentary neglect, land reform and labour rights remained inextricably intertwined with calls for Home Rule well into the beginning of the twentieth century. All-party lobbies such as the International Scots Home Rule League (ISHRL) worked with labour lobbies such as the STUC to press their claims for Scottish self-government. Perhaps the most striking element of this broad organisational coalition was its demand for *Home Rule*, not separation. As ISHRL's official newspaper, *The Scottish Nation*, explained:

> The struggle has brought out the fact that the government of the people is too huge a matter to be carried out by a centralised authority. It is only by breaking up the bulk into pieces and handing over each piece to those that understand it best that satisfactory results are obtained (TSN August/ September 1917: 452).

For these Home Rule organisations, both the problems and their solution were clear. Only self-rule for Scotland could alleviate Scotland's multiple woes by removing the dead hand of Westminster and re-establishing a Parliament in Edinburgh.

4

World War I marked the beginning of a transformation of both the demands of Home Rulers and how they organised to press them. While Home Rule's claims continued to focus on the problems of centralised government and the necessity of local administration for improving land reform, drink and labour, both the ways they were organising to press claims as well as the proposed remedies were changing. Before, and largely during, the First World War demands for Scottish Home Rule had focused on the development of a federal system of government. Those making such demands had organised as lobbies, pressing their claims through broad coalitions against national parties. By the 1920s, though, these claims were being joined by demands for independence and a separate Home Rule party.

Leading this call for an independent party, as well as an independent Scotland, was the Scots National League (SNL). As their official newspaper, *The Scots Independent*, reported:

> Now, the words Home Rule have unfortunately, through long usage by Irish parliamentarians at Westminster, degenerated to have a nasty flavour of bartering, scheming and squabble—methods eventually repudiated by the Irish people as of no avail.
>
> The Scots National League, is out, not for Home Rule, but for an Independent Parliament, and even our friends of the Scottish Home Rule Association are rapidly outgrowing the idea with which many people invest the words Home Rule (SI September 1927: 7).

The radical SNL was soon being joined by more mainstream Home Rule organisations in its demands for an independent party. With the Liberal Party in precipitous decline following the War, the Labour Party was soon the main party-based proponent of Scottish Home Rule. While Labour's Home Rule promises served mainly as a catchall, providing assurances of change in place of well-formulated policies, it nevertheless made them the central outlet for Home Rule claims. However, after the failure of the 1924 and1927 Home Rule Bills, the Labour Party became an increasing target of derision for Home Rulers who had focused their lobbying efforts through it (Finlay 1994: 19-21).

While the SHRA had long served as the Home Rule mouthpiece of the Labour Party, their relationship was changing, largely because of Labour's unwillingness to champion Scottish Home Rule. The extent of the decay of the relationship between the SHRA and the Labour Party was made evident by the organisation's president, Roland Muirhead, and his 1928 call for a Home Rule party.

> It transpires that the English Labour members take a very similar view about Scottish Home Rule to what the English Liberals did when Gladstone was in power many years ago.... It is well known that among Scottish Labour members the English Labour members are not at all anxious to give Scotland Self-Government.... It did not find a place in any of the manifestos issued by the three Parliamentary parties [Labour, Liberal, Conservative] at the 1924 General Election. To me, personally, this was the death knell of my reasonable hope of the Labour Party, or any other mainly English party, passing a Scottish self-government measure of its own accord (SI April 1928: 81-83).

As Muirhead continued, he outlined the solution to this predicament:

> Lately there has been a marked increase in the number of those who have come to realise the hopelessness of expecting any effective steps to be taken by one or other of the present London controlled parties. Although there are still a larger number of earnest Scotsmen and women, potential nationalists, who fail to perceive the futility of continuing to expect a national Parliament through the initiative of the present parliamentary parties, there is a very evident and large increase in the number of thorough going Scottish Nationalists who realise the need for an independent Scots National Party to ginger things up at Westminster and force to the foreground the demand for self-government (ibid.).

These demands for an independent party came to fruition with the development of the National Party of Scotland (NPS) in April 1928. Built through the recombination of the SHRA, SNL, Scots National Movement and the Glasgow University Scots National Association, the NPS represented a new way of pressing Home Rule claims: a political party. With existing political outlets closing, Scottish Home Rulers developed a new way of raising and airing claims for self-government.

Announcing its organisation to the world on Bannockburn Day, 23 June 1928, the NPS quickly declared a slate of candidates for the upcoming elections. Roland Muirhead (formerly of the Scottish Home Rule Association)

6

would contest the Renfrewshire West seat. John MacCormick (formerly of the Glasgow University Scottish Nationalist Association) was to stand in Glasgow-Camlachie. Hugh MacDiarmid (formerly of the Scots National League) was put forward as the Home Rule candidate in Dundee. And Lewis Spence (formerly of the Scottish National Movement) was to contest a Midlothian seat. Exchanging their lobby-party relationships for direct electoral competition, Scottish Home Rulers were anxious to begin using their new organisation to press for self-government.

What Happened?

If I continued the discussion through the 1930s, we would see that the NPS limped along, battling internal disagreements as well other parties. In 1934, it merged with the Scottish Party forming the Scottish National Party, the contemporary SNP. Through the remainder of the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries, the Home Rule movement in Scotland has oscillated, with factions splintering and continual internal debates about the meaning of Home Rule. However, despite the rise and fall of the movement's popularity in the polls, its electoral successes and failures, the method by which it has organised to press claims has remained a continual feature. Once a party dedicated to Scottish Home Rule had been developed, it has remained the central organisational method used by the self-government movement.

Understanding the emergence of the National Party of Scotland and the new party-driven trajectory on which it took the Scottish Home Rule movement requires the investigation of the multiple lineages that preceded it. The emergence of the NPS was driven not only through the interactions of the founding members, but was inextricably tied to changes in the British state, labour relations, land reform, party politics and international affairs. At its core, the transformation from lobby to party represents a reconfiguration of the means by which claims were organised and pressed.

7

These innovations were shaped by the practices out of which they grew, the transactions between those organisations making claims and the objects of those claims and the larger environment in which they were embedded.

From this brief narrative, we can begin to develop a sense of what was involved in the development and transformation of these Home Rule organisations. The British state is deeply involved, not only as a target of claims, but as an organisational actor, opening and closing opportunities to challenge its actions and policies; extending its jurisdiction into new areas; and responding to claims made. The Reform Acts of 1832, 1867 and 1884, the re-establishment of the Scottish Office in 1885 and the forceful quelling of the crofter's land war on the Isle of Skye in 1882 all represent the changing nature of the relationship between the British state and the population of Scotland: a zigzagging pattern marked by the reduction of inequality and systematic repression.

The development of national political parties in Scotland during the 1880s provided new ties to national politics as well as new ways to form and articulate grievances (Dyer 1996); the governing of Scotland was being more closely connected to Westminster. As these parties realigned, largely in response to seemingly non-political events such as expanded union membership, these routines changed. Looking beyond the obviously political, the increasing involvement of labour unions in political affairs and the national politicalisation of long-standing local issues such as land reform, brought with them existing methods of claim-making and response, which interacted to provide new methods of developing and expressing collective claims.

This short introduction to the problem highlights two issues central to making sense of the changes that occurred in the Scottish Home Rule movement. The first point appears so obvious as to defy need of mention. However, focusing on organisational development and change moves the

8

study of the Scottish Home Rule movement away from its traditional base of analysis. Most commentators of the movement have set out to study it from the perspective of nationalism (see e.g., Brand 1978; Coupland 1954; Hanham 1969; Harvie 1998; Nairn 1996 [1974]; 1981; Webb 1977). Beginning from such a perspective, they have focused on different issues altogether. More concerned with identifying relevant discourses or explaining particular outcomes, they have largely elided the processes of mobilisation, claim formation and transformation. Developing and making claims is centrally an organisational problem. As such, efforts at understanding how and why the Scottish Home Rule movement changed require a review of how it organised.

The second point is recognising its connection to other types of activity, political and non-political, contentious or otherwise: labour movements; land reform; socialism; and party politics. Despite its overtly political nature, the Home Rule movement was connected with other forms of non-political contentious activity such the crofters' struggles over land, regulation of labour and the splintering of the Liberal Party over the issue of Home Rule. Shifts in one of these sets of relations often had far-reaching consequences for others. This makes it impossible to fully understand the changing organisational forms used by Scottish Home Rulers without recognising their deep relations with other, seemingly distinct movements and organisational actors, in conjunction with their histories of claim-making and response. That is, we have to understand the ecology of Home Rule.

Finally, the Home Rule movement was not latent, perennial or intangible, but rather, it emerged from the relations and transaction of multiple strands of activity taking shape at the end of the nineteenth century and subsequently changing with these activities over the course of the fifty years examined. The Home Rule movement did not emerge de novo, but

rather started as a series of other problems that were only later harnessed together into what we now call the movement for Scottish self-government.

In this thesis, I investigate the emergence and transformation of the Scottish Home Rule movement between 1880 and 1930. Taking a broad view, I examine the related transformations that were involved in, affected by and related to the development and change of the organisational methods used by the self-government movement in Scotland. Three changes, of the many that occurred during this period, stand out as crucial for understanding the transformation from lobby to party:

1) The reorganisation of Scotland's relationship to the United Kingdom across numerous relations, but principally politics and economics;

2) The development and transformation of national political parties and their activities in Scotland; and

3) The shifting relations amongst those involved in the coalition out of which Home Rule organisations developed and changed.

Fundamentally, this study focuses on organisational development and change in contentious politics. By contentious politics I refer to

> episodic, public, collective interaction among makers of claims and their objects [where] (a) at least one government is a claimant, an object of claims, or a party to the claims and (b) the claim would, if realised, affect the interests of at least one of the claimants (McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly 2001: 5).

The demands for Home Rule in Scotland were contentious because, if realised, they would have directly affected the interests of other directly or indirectly involved parties. By making the problem of Home Rule the heart of the investigation, the broader field of contentious interaction in Scotland comes into clearer view. Many of the major contentious issues of the period were involved in demands for Home Rule. From the crofter's plight in the Highlands to the radicalisation of elements of the labour movement during the First World War, demands for Home Rule were intricately intertwined with these episodes of claim-making and response.

10

The fifty years spanning 1880 to 1930 were a period of significant change in Scotland broadly and the Home Rule movement in particular. Understanding how these changes were implicated in Home Rulers' changing patterns of organisation is the central question I confront. The means by which contentious politics is carried out is deeply related to the relations through which mobilisation occurs and the transactions between those making and responding to claims. Clarifying the connections between changes in the state, parties and the shifting coalition of organisations involved in pressing demands for Home Rule all provide the key pieces in reconstructing the puzzle of the transformation of lobbies into parties.

Potential Explanations

Most commentators of the Home Rule movement in Scotland have uncritically labelled it simply another form of nationalism. While they argue about its roots, whether residing in uneven development (Nairn 1996 [1974]; 1981), a lack of intellectual vigour (Harvie 1998) or a response to its colonial position (Hechter 1975; 1985), the central argument remains the same: the Scottish Home Rule movement is primarily a *nationalist* movement. Categorising it as such comes with significant intellectual baggage, making strong assumptions about how and why "nations" come to confront the state. Distilled to its essence, the argued runs as follows: nations proclaim their existence, involving discourses focused on a) recognition, or b) independence. How exactly this process emerges, takes shape and is enacted is one of the great debates amongst scholars of nationalism.

Understanding precisely what the claims of the nationalist programme entail and the way they have been applied to Scotland requires further review. Despite the profusion of linguistic, ethnic, symbolic, economic, elite-drive and state-oriented explanations, they share common themes of invariance and teleology. In the next section, I review contending

explanations of nationalism and the way they have been employed to explain the emergence and transformation of the Scottish Home Rule movement. I begin with nationalism as a concept and conclude with a review of its application to Scotland.

Typologies of Nationalism

The study of nationalism is rife with cleavages. These divisions centre on the nature of nationalism: what are the foundations of nationalism and how is it developed. Is it primarily ethnic (e.g., Calhoun 1993; Smith 1989; 1991; 1994) or is it an elite driven project (Harvie 1998; Hroch 1985; Kellas 1991)? Is it a primordial (Gorski 2000; Greenfield 1992; Smith 1989; 1991; 1994) or a modern phenomenon linked to industrialisation and modern, particularly European, state building and economic development (Calhoun 1993; Gellner 1983; Hall 1993; Hechter 1975; 1985; Hobsbawm 1990; Nairn 1996 [1974]; 1981)? Does the nation have a "real" existence (Hayes 1965; Kohn 1955) or is it "imagined" (Anderson 1991)? A simplified typology aligns these divisions along two axes: subjective versus objective and modern versus ethnic. As many of the arguments made fall into multiple categories, this typology is not strictly ordered. However, it provides a way of organising the discussion and introduces the frames used to evaluate the Scottish case.

Subjective versus Objective

The subjective/objective debates about nationalism pivot on the question of whether or not nations are historically or biologically given or socially constructed. The early work of scholars of nationalism (e.g., Hayes 1966; Kohn 1955) accepted this former view, albeit recognising that the "hard work of intellectuals was needed to convince large numbers of people that this was so" (Eley and Suny 1996: 4). For the proponents of an objective school of nationalism, the world was divided into nations, based on linguistic, cultural, ethnic and/or historic characteristics.

12

Contemporary work in this vein posits that biology, not necessarily history, is at the root of nations. Sociobiologists argue that nationalism, and ethnocentrism as whole, emerge from the fundamental problem of engendering and ensuring cooperation. Pierre van den Berghe's (1987 [1981]; see also Kellas 1991) work typifies this argument: arguing that gene-level activity, primarily the demand for reproduction and survival, decisively shapes behaviour. As such, nationalism is simply an outgrowth of gene-level demands for stable reproduction. Demands for ethnic purity, local control or separate states represent innate biological drives for survival.

Both of these approaches may be dismissed almost immediately. A brief survey of European history, particularly of the era of modern state building, illustrates a shifting array of city-states, principalities, duchies, kingdoms and empires that developed, stabilised and transformed into new entities through amalgamation, conquest or diplomacy (see Ertman [1997] for a recent overview). With allegiances to any one of these shifting arrays of entities arguably strong, there is no reason to believe that nations and nationalism are historically essential. Historically essentialist arguments do not fit the facts.

Similarly, relying on a sociobiological approach requires turning an empirical blind eye to reality. As such, Pierre van den Berghe's (1987 [1981]) conjectures may be rejected almost out of hand. Sociobiology's presumptions about genes and the role they play do not represent the biological reality of genes and, more disturbingly, reduce the organism out of existence (Goodwin 1994).[1] As an explanation, it provides only a crudely

---

[1] As Goodwin (1994: 4-5) explains, "Genes do have some remarkable properties, but there is a definite limit to what they can tell us about organisms...[They can replicate themselves and organise slightly different bases into RNA polymers]. Of course the DNA does not achieve these feats on its own. There is an elaborate machinery of other molecules and structures inside the cells that are essential for DNA copying (replication) and for the production of mRNA and protein. So the capacity of DNA to make accurate copies of itself and to produce proteins via

reductionist, circular argument: genes seek reproduction, this forces cooperation against our basic, selfish instincts, and therefore nationalism represents a tightrope between the essentialist drive of genetic survival and forced cooperative behaviour. Essentially, nationalism is because it is because it is.

Most popular theories of nationalism dismiss this essentialist view of the nation, opting instead for an understanding of the nation as socially constructed. The sources of this construction vary depending on the case being examined, but in general, nationalism is presumed to reside in *nationalist discourses* operating mainly at the psychological level (Anderson 1991; Eley and Suny 1996; Kellas 1991). Calling on shared claims to a common ideology, sentiment or myth, the social constructionist camp has made ideological discourse the centre of the nationalist programme.

Benedict Anderson's (1991) work typifies this approach. For Anderson, the nation is centrally imagined.

> It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (1991: 6; emphasis original).

Proceeding from this assumption he clarifies that this process of imagination proceeds via cultural development, particularly its embodiment in the homogenisation of language and print culture (ibid. chapter 3). Nations comes to know themselves through their shared cultural heritage. The ideological discourse exemplifying nationalism has three central claims: "1) There exists a nation with an explicit and peculiar character. 2) The interest and values of this nation take priority over all other interests and values. 3) The nation must be as independent as possible" (Breuilly 1982: 3). If movements make these claims, they are generally placed under the larger rubric of nationalism.

---

mRNA relies on a highly organised context: the living cell." Sociobiology and other reductionist arguments simply miss the organisational context of emergence.

Despite their differences, scholars of nationalism agree, almost without exception, that it is primarily an ideology, and that this ideology is manifested in discourse. Acceptance of this definition has had far reaching effects on its study. It has focused the terms of the debate and provided the main criteria for evaluating what counts as nationalism, how it has developed, when it developed and who developed it. With the terms of definition demarcated, conflicts have raged over the issues of when nationalist discourse developed, who developed it and for what ends. These debates broadly fall along two lines, modernist versus ethnic explanations.

Ethnic versus Modern Explanations

Modernist theories of nationalism view it as an activity inherently bound to the development of the modern state and the pinning of national status to this construction (Anderson 1991; Calhoun 1993; Gellner 1983; Hall 1993; Hechter 1975; 1985; Hobsbawm 1990). Hobsbawm's (1990:12) equation parsimoniously sums this approach: "nation = people = state". The central argument is an historical one. With the rise of industrialisation came the formation or reorganisation of states and the reframing of states as legitimate representatives of nations. In addition, modernisation brought with it improved communication and transportation links (Calhoun 1993; Gellner 1983; Hall 1993) that facilitated the development and linking of these "imagined communities" (Anderson 1991).

John Hall's (1993) review offers a thorough discussion of the numerous types of nationalism falling under the modernist umbrella, with the added benefit of coherently illuminating the divergent works in the field. Three types of nationalism designated by Hall, asocial society, revolution from above and Risorgimento, are all sub-types subsumed under this rubric. All of these were facilitated by changes linked to the state building, including increasing infrastructure, the expansion of education and the rationalisation

15

of political and economic processes. These transformations were met with differing responses.

Asocial society, according to Hall, was a nationalism spawned from the arms race between Britain and France in the eighteenth century: the need for an expanded war machine led to the intensification of state infrastructure. The expansion of state activities (especially taxation, which fostered greater communication networks) had the unintended consequence of strengthening civil society by similar communicative mechanisms. The increasing demands of the state helped to bridge segmented cultural groups and led to the formation of national symbols representative of the "unified nation". Most importantly, this type of nationalism was grounded in the joint practices of political elites and actors in civil society.

Nationalism that manifests itself as a revolution from above is relatively self-explanatory. The focus again is on the need of political elites to respond to a threat (real or perceived) from other surrounding states. Political elites co-ordinate and orchestrate the use of propaganda to unify the nation and state to confront the challenges of neighbours who may be more industrialised, imperialist or otherwise ascendant (see also, Kellas 1991). In contrast to revolution from above, Risorgimento nationalisms are based on a civic conceptualisation of national identity. The impetus of nationalist organisation comes from bourgeois actors embedded in and operating through civil society. Again, a threat is perceived, and is normally based on a belief that a unique minority face oppression of its unique cultural rights. In both cases, a similar course of action is followed with integration being the goal.

Ethnic theories, on the other hand, serve as a foil to the dominance of modernist theories of nationalism. The works of Smith (1991; 1994) and Greenfield (1992) typify this approach, standing in stark contrast to modernist arguments. Their central contention is that national identity is

16

ancient, as old as human organisation itself. Where modernist theories of nationalism see both national identity and nationalism as modern constructs (more often than not attributing both their roots to the French Revolution of 1789), most ethnic theories view national identity as perennial and nationalism as modern.

However, even this distinction has been challenged. Gorski (2000) argues that Hebraic discourses in the early modern Netherlands clearly count as nationalistic in their ideology. For Gorski, early modern nationalism is not necessarily the same as contemporary nationalism as Greenfield (1992) argues; and it is not necessarily built on the foundations of primordial ethnicity as Smith (1991; 1994) claims. Gorski presses for a view of early modern nationalism that focuses on the lineages of its discourses. Even though Gorski directs the debate into new territory— arguing that nationalism is neither perennial nor linearly descended with a straight road from past to future—he remains true to the basic arguments of the nationalist programme: nationalism is centrally an ideological discourse.

Fitting Scotland into the Nationalist Programme

Students of the Home Rule movement in Scotland have employed, extended, tested and debated with almost every aspect of the nationalism programme. The terms of engagement, however, have been largely sympathetic to the goals of the programme. As a result, most efforts have concentrated on two interrelated issues: 1) Developing an explanation of the development of nationalism in Scotland, especially when it occurred; and 2) Explaining the movement's failure to achieve independence.

Political scientists, sociologists and historians have all provided their own explanations for the infirmity of the Scottish Home Rule movement. Their explanations have generally followed the modernist line, but they share affinities with ethnic arguments as well. Perhaps the best-known arguments discussing the failures of Scotland and its nationalism are those

17

emerging from the Marxist camp (Hechter 1975; 1985 and Nairn 1996

[1974]; 1981). These arguments have helped to push the discussion of

Scotland into the mainstream, involving it in a significant amount of the

discussion on nationalism in general (see discussions in Anderson 1991; Eley

and Suny 1996; Kellas 1991; Özkirimli 2000).

Hechter's argument may be paraphrased as follows: The integration

of Scotland, Ireland and Wales into the United Kingdom were acts of colonial

domination. With these areas conquered, coloniser/colonised relations

developed. These relations manifested themselves as different

developmental tracks with England marking itself as centre and the "Celtic"[2]

periphery as the colony. Systematically, these areas were exploited, surplus

value extracted and underdevelopment ensued. What development took

place was largely geared for export and the aggrandisement of the central,

English core. Exacerbating these economic differences were cultural ones.

As Scotland was a distinct cultural unit, interaction with English hegemony

was distressing. These differential relations developed resentment in the

periphery, giving way to nationalism and demands for independence as a

corrective to years of colonial exploitation.

Tom Nairn's explanation follows a similar argument. Like Hechter,

Nairn focuses on the "logic of capitalist development". For Nairn, Scotland's

problems—its perverted sense of national identity, its cultural sub-

nationalism, the late development of its nationalist movement—developed

as a result of capitalism's late arrival there. Nairn's strongly Marxist stance

lumps Scotland together with the other nations without history. As the

Scots recognised the advanced development of their neighbours, nationalism

became the shortcut for advancement. As he explains:

---

[2] The use of Celtic to describe Ireland, Scotland and Wales is at best misleading. As historian
H.J. Hanham explains in his review of Hechter's book: "there is no evidence that I know of that
[the] Scottish or Irish...have more than a few drops of Celtic blood in their veins" (Hanham
1978: 174).

18

> It is through nationalism that societies try to propel themselves
> forward to certain kinds of goal (industrialisation, prosperity, equality
> with other people's etc.) by a certain sort of regression—by looking
> inwards, drawing more deeply upon their indigenous resources,
> restructuring past folk heroes and myths about themselves and so on
> (1981: 348).

The mechanism by which this process proceeds according to Nairn

and his intellectual compatriot, Harvie (1998), is elite leadership. Heavily

influenced by Gramsci, both Nairn and Harvie lay the blame for Scotland's

impotent nationalist movement at the feet of the intelligentsia. Bought off

by the British Empire, they were unwilling to guide Scotland to its inherent

telos: independence. Instead they ingrained themselves into Britishness,

exploiting the opportunities of following England's lead and turned their back

on Scotland until the decline of Empire in the early twentieth century. With

the empire in decline, some intellectuals finally realised Scotland's place, but

as their timing was so retarded, they turned instead to cultural nationalism

and wrapped themselves in tartan, resurrecting Scotland cultural heritage.

A similar argument has been promoted by less dogmatically

ideological scholars of the movement. The romantic and radical label

promoted by Hanham (1967; 1969) typifies demands for Home Rule in the

period before 1914 as predominantly romantic requiring radical resurrection

of distinctly Scottish culture as a counterbalance. Hanham argues that

Home Rulers of this period were backward looking, calling upon Scotland's

former glories as they faced increased immigration from Ireland and the

Anglicisation of everyday life (Hanham 1969: chapter 1; see also, Brand

1978: 24-28; Harvie 1998: 15-33; Finlay 1993: 20). As the demands being

made were not for independence or a separate parliament, the movement

was at best "proto-nationalism" (Hobsbawm 1990). Or as Nairn explains in

his description of the movement before the development of the NPS in

1928:

> There is much to say about the precursors of nationalism in the 19th
> century, like the romantic movement of the 1850s and the successive

Home Rule movements between 1880 and 1914....But all that need be said here is that they were quite distinctly precursors, not the thing itself remarkable in any wider perspective for their feebleness and political ambiguity rather than their prophetic power (1996 [1974]: 81).

This line of argument has been extended by others, albeit in a less doctrinaire manner. Arguing that "[t]he roots of Scottish nationalism go far back, even into the eighteenth century", Jack Brand (1978: 173) posits that *modern* nationalism, however, did not begin until after the First World War (see also Webb 1977; Harvie 1998 argues that modern nationalism did not emerge until after 1945, see esp., chapter 4). By modern nationalism, most commentators classify it as a "pure political interest" (Webb 1977: 46). What occurred before the NPS's founding in1928, was, assumedly, simply an ethnic revival, a nation coming to know itself. Commentators could almost be forgiven for reaching such a conclusion as a vocal minority of claims from the Home Rule camp were precisely of such a variety. In 1901, *The Fiery Cross* proclaimed "The Decay of the Scottish Race" (FC May 1901: 4), and in 1913, the *Scottish Nation* was heralding "The Call of the Race" (TSN November 1913: 4).

Despite the ethnic rhetoric, classifying pre-World War I Scottish Home Rulers proto-nationalists and post-War claimants as modern nationalists obscures more than it clarifies. Looking past these limited instances of essentialist proclamations, we discover a plethora of claims being made on political parties, labour unions, Parliament and other Home Rule organisations. As will become apparent in the course of discussion, there were repeated claims of Scotland's suitability for Home Rule, and Home Rulers' commitment, unity and worthiness as carriers of these demands involving a shifting array of actors, ranging from land reformers and socialists to Home Rulers and MPs. The practice of holding Home Rulers' claims up to the light, squinting, scratching our heads and

proclaiming their discourses to have met the burden of being nationalistic is not simply limiting, but misleading.

The Invariance of Nationalist Models

The limited explanatory power of nationalism as a classification derives from its inflexibility. The search for invariant laws with standard stages readily employable to identify nationalism makes its use as a frame of reference unhelpful. The epistemology of nationalism is constraining, its ontology faulty. Attempting to building covering law-like statements about what may be defined as nationalism has lead to the production of checklists of necessary and sufficient causes that must be met for the case under review to qualify as "proper" nationalism (see e.g., Kellas 1991: 171-173) and standard stages through which nationalists develop, mobilize and enter politics (Hroch 1985). The problem with such an approach lies at its invariant heart.

"The general structure" of such invariant models, Charles Tilly explains, "runs like this:"

1. All *A*'s have characteristics X, Y, and Z.
2. Case *a* is *A*.
3. Therefore *a* has characteristics X, Y, and Z.

The argument does not assert that all instances of *A* are identical, but it does assert that they share essential properties setting them off from all cases of non-*A*; those essential universals mark any such model as invariant . . . .In the domain of large-scale politics, at least, such reasoning so badly describes what actually occurs as to hinder sociological analysis (Tilly 1995a: 1596-97).

This is precisely the problem that has plagued examinations of the Scottish Home Rule movement. Despite Scotland's unwillingness to squeeze into an ideal-typical nationalist mould, this is precisely the model employed by most of its chroniclers. Nationalism is wielded like an academic truncheon, bludgeoning the Home Rule movement in Scotland for refusing to act appropriately (see esp., Hanham 1969; Harvie 1998; Nairn 1996 [1974]; 1981). These commentators have stressed that for nationalism to be of the

proper variety, demands must be made for an independent state. However, the Home Rule movement in Scotland refused to follow the "proper" trajectory until well into the twentieth century, and even then with significant qualifications.

In response to this problem, I could extend or modify existing explanations derived from the nationalist programme, identify relevant discourses and attempt to link these discourses to changing mentalities, either individual or group, and claim that these mentalities were manifested in through some set of static institutions (Kirk, education and law being the standard implements of the Scottish arsenal). However, such a procedure "is peculiar both because it makes implausible allegations of invariance and because it attenuates whatever empirical grasp the previous model attained" (Tilly 1995a: 1597).

What is required is a framework that recognises, incorporates and explains variation by producing "valid analyses . . .[of] plausible ontologies— representations of what is to be explained in terms of a given process's boundedness, continuity, plasticity, and complexity . . ." (ibid. 1605). Incorporating variation allows for the understanding of the Home Rule movement as a cluster concept, involved in multiple time-lines and overlapping relations, each moving at different speeds and subject to different generative rules (Hull 1975: 258-260). In the words of Arthur Waldron (1986: 427):

> Nationalism in general is a powerful and comprehensible idea. Yet, while it defines general situations, it is not very useful in explicating specific events. In cases where such events have in past been explained by invoking nationalism, we will have to search for another analysis.

Escaping the traps imposed by standard application of nationalism and developing a better understanding of what *actually* happened versus what *should* have happened requires a new set of intellectual tools. In place of invariant models with static categories and stock lists of necessary and

sufficient conditions interacting in the same way to produce the same outcomes, we require a more dynamic way of conceptualising the various processes under consideration. Remarkably, some of the most important salvos on the fortress of nationalism have come from within its own walls. Philip Gorski (2000: 1459-60) demands that an effective understanding of nationalism should dispense with use of strong definitions, such as those discussed above. He explains that

> instead of looking for some essential characteristic or roster of characteristics…we [should] try to identify the various 'threads' of which 'the fabric of (modern) nationalist discourse' is composed, recognizing that each of these threads has its own particular history, and thereby dispensing with the assumption that nationalism has any natural or inherent unity.

Proposing that we examine the multiple processes implicated in nationalist movements is a step in the right direction. However, simply disaggregating nationalism into its constituent discourses and searching for dubious explanatory histories (à la Foucault) is not sufficient. While his assault on the epistemology of nationalism is well taken, his reliance on Foucault's notion of genealogies and his presentation of nationalism as primarily a discourse replicates many of the problems inherent in the nationalism programme.

Charles Tilly distinguishes between two types of solipsism: hardcore and softcore. "Hardcore solipsism," he explains, "denies the possibility of any knowledge beyond that of the owner's individual experience" (2002: 16). The softcore variety is not as doctrinaire, claiming instead that we can know something about collective actors and what they thought by focusing on what they said (ibid.). As is readily apparent from this review, most studies of nationalism rely on softcore solipsism as a mode of explanation (see especially the essays collected in Eley and Suny 1996). Setting ideology as its central pillar, the search has been for a discourse that clearly expresses their shared consciousness.

23

This presumed ontology is strongly reductionist. Assuming all that exists is individual consciousness as expressed by language mislabels what is a relational, interactional phenomenon as individual attributes. If nationalism is a discourse, an ideology, a sense of being, then what separates it from any other discourse? Such an extremely subjectivist interpretation elides reality. Even language is inherently relational; conversation involves the ongoing negotiation of existing and emergent meaning, the history of past interactions, and is shaped by the organisational context. Furthermore, a false dichotomy is proposed by equating nationalism with discourse, where identity, and for the Scots this has generally meant national institutions (Kirk, law and education) or cultural artefacts (e.g., kilts and Robert Burns), is opposed to action, which is presumed to be calculated, normally at the individual level.

What happened in Scotland between 1880 and 1930 was not the resurrection of long simmering "national sentiments" (Brand 1978; Harvie 1998; Kellas 1991; Webb 1977), or a redevelopment of an eternal national identity manifested through an ideology of nationalism. Reducing the Home Rule movement to an ideology or a discourse ignores the organisational changes taking place. What happened was an organisational transformation working across numerous levels, affecting a multitude of actors and their projects, producing new problems resulting in innovative ways to approach them.

An Alternative Approach

A more thorough examination of these processes requires a framework capable of recognising and fruitfully examining all of the relations and transactions involved, even those that generally fall outside of the traditional category of nationalist. In order to move the understanding of the Scottish Home Rule movement forward, we require a broader, more encompassing framework that provides a way of understanding mobilization,

24

the formation and transformation of problems, the shifting array of actors that emerge and recede into the background and the myriad of other processes involved.

Developing such a framework is only possible by turning away from nationalism as a frame of reference. Its overwhelming focus on discourse, ideology and outcomes has meant those applying it in Scotland have done more violence than explanation with the term. In its place, I build an explanatory framework which draws on contentious politics, the Chicago Schools notion of ecology and organisational theory. As noted earlier, contentious politics involves a relationship of claim-making and response between at least two collective actors, one of which is governmental; and the claims, if realised, would affect the interests of at least one claimant. This approach places relations, transactions, mobilisation and response at the heart of the investigation.

Where contentious politics provides a way out of the morass of nationalism, it requires accompaniment by a shift in the terms of study, from substances to processes. One of the seductive illusions limiting the explanatory ability of those studying the Scottish Home Rule movement has been the acceptance of pre-formed actors with well developed and clearly articulated interests which only subsequently become contentious. In place of this strongly substantialist argument which presumes that actors, whether people, states, political parties or lobbies, come first and relations between them only later, a processual approach begins with relations and sequences, then examines how they are yoked together to form coherent actors, changing over time.

Shifting the point of departure from substances to processes provides a way of explaining emergence and change without resort to teleology. A processual approach to contentious politics offers a framework for examining how and why issues become contentious at specific historical junctures, how

25

particular relations become involved in contentious activity and how these issues and relations change over time. My central organisational framework is ecologies of contention. As noted at the outset, the Scottish Home Rule movement involved a variety of different actors, relations and sequences which were tied together into the problem of Home Rule for Scotland. Defining and examining this ecology provides a way of systematically describing the problem and how it changed over time by exposing the variety of processes involved.

Building from these twin foundations, this thesis sets out to investigate and provide answers to two sets of related questions. The first set of questions deals directly with the Scottish Home Rule movement.

1) How did the problem of Home Rule develop as a contentious issue?

2) Why did it emerge at the end of the nineteenth century?

3) How and why did it transform after World War I?

4) What was the ecology of Home Rule?

5) How was the ecology organised?

6) How and why did it reorganise over the fifty years examined?

7) How did the organisational means by which contentious politics was practiced develop and change?

Developing answers to the first set of questions requires answers to a second set of queries.

8) How do we account for the development and transformation of actors—the genesis problem?

9) What processes are involved in emergence and transformation?

10) What mechanisms account for genesis and transformation?

Possible answers abound, but my analysis concentrates on three fundamental elements: relations, sequences, and ecologies. By relations, I refer to ties between social sites (e.g., people, organisations, states). By

sequences, I mean a series of transactions of varying lengths, scales and intensities. All actors are cluster concepts, relations to various strands of activity and events, collections of functionalities which are inseparable from the processes which constitute them. By taking such an approach, the central historical problem becomes identifying how these various ways of organising relations and producing actors, change over time. Moving away from nationalism to a process of organisational development and change in contentious politics repositions the study of the Home Rule movement in Scotland from a language game to an organisational problem.

Explaining how these three elements worked across the multiple relational and temporal frames of reference to be reviewed, I employee the concept of social mechanisms. My use of mechanisms follows Stinchcombe (1991: 367) in defining them as:

> 1) a piece of scientific reasoning which is independently verifiable and independently gives rise to theoretical reasoning, which 2) gives knowledge about a component process (generally one with units of analysis at a "lower level") of another theory (ordinarily a theory with units at a different "higher" level), thereby 3) increasing the suppleness, precision, complexity, elegance, or believability of the theory at the higher level without excessive "multiplication of entities" in that higher level theory, 4) without doing too much violence (in the necessary simplification of the lower level to make the higher level theory go) to what we know as the main facts at the lower level.

Together these four elements provide a way of making the process of organisational invention dynamic.

What's Coming

In the next chapter I explore the building blocks of contentious politics. I fill-in the contours of the outline sketched here, explicating relations, sequences and ecologies and the mechanisms that shape them. In Chapter 3, I explore in detail question one, unpacking the social organisation of Scotland and how it was changing at the end of the nineteenth century. I also detail the emergence of the problems which were to become the Home Rule movement in Scotland. Chapter 4 explores the

processes of mobilisation and reorganisation in response to questions five through ten, examining the mechanisms that facilitated the emergence of a new organisational form that came to work with this new jurisdiction. Chapter 5 details the transformation of the Home Rule ecology in the wake of World War I. Chapter 6 details its effects on the organisational patterns of Home Rulers discussing the transformation from lobbies to parties and its relationship to changes in Britain as a whole. Chapter 7 brings the pieces together and exploring the key issues arising from this work. Given my focus on the Scottish Home Rule movement as an organisational problem, it seems appropriate to trace the problem and the responses developed as they developed and changed through time, hence the chronological ordering of my argument.

Throughout, the discussion proceeds at two levels. On one level, I am interesting in detailing organisational changes in the Scottish Home Rule movement by examining the ecology in which it developed and changed. On another, I explore the epistemology of historical sociology: detailing a processual approach. The transformation of the Scottish Home Rule movement provides more than simply insights into organisational emergence and change in contentious politics, but also serves as an opportunity for theory building and methodological reflection.

In setting out to accomplishing this task and, in turn, to provide discipline to my analysis, I seek to bridge, however incompletely, the gap between description and formal modelling. As Peter Bearman notes,

> There is a seemingly enormous gulf in the sociological literature between those whose work focuses on models and those whose work focuses on description. This mismatch has to do with the necessary duality of views that organise any real setting. That is, settings are interfaces for multiple views conceived here in simple terms as the 'underside', where views of lived experience and cognition percolate up to discourse and are related to self and others…and the 'upper side', wherein lie systematic processes, dynamics, and the flows that give rise to structures not necessarily observed or theorised by those who live and work in the setting….The central idea of those who focus on the underside is that through description, deployed as a lever,

> new insights arise. In general social science modelers are interested
> in formalizing processes that appear to operate across settings – that
> is, in upper side views. In this instance, the model is the lever that
> allows one to see what participants may not, or cannot, see, or may
> see but have no words for (Bearman 2005: 34).

In what follows, I combine the historians' tools of thick description by
employing qualitative descriptions gleaned from archival and secondary data
sources, with the sociologists' tools of formal models. Principally, I
employee, both explicitly and implicitly, three central models – co-
evolutionary dynamics, ecological control and garbage can models of
organisational interaction – to better illuminate the processes invention and
transformation.

Finally, the metaphor of travel and transformation serves as a
guiding force throughout the discussion.[3] As the title indicates—*From Lobby
to Party*—development and change lay at the core the entire enterprise.
While this metaphor provides a useful device for classifying and colligating a
complex set of events into a coherent story (McCullagh 1978), it is more
than simply a narrative tool. The central focus on travel, change, movement
and transformation is a way of clarifying what happened, bringing dynamism
to what has long been studied as a static phenomenon.

Travel as an event, or set of events, involves multiple time lines and
interaction with an array of different actors across a myriad of settings. This
metaphor provides shorthand for understanding how Charles Waddie's
claims for Scottish Home Rule are connected to Roland Muirhead's demands
for a Home Rule party. The problems faced by Waddie and the SHRA, the
responses they developed to them and their interaction with objects of their
claims helped to lay the tracks down which Home Rule travelled for the next
fifty years. As other tracks were connected to these, a Home Rule railway
took shape with stops in Labour-Park, Land Reform-Way and Liberal-On-

---

[3] I owe the inspiration of this metaphor to the work of Roberto Franzosi (2004) and Andrew
Abbott (2001b).

Sea. However, like the British rail system it parallels, not all stations were equally frequented, some tracks fell into disrepair and some stations, grown derelict, were closed.

Organisational development and change, like travel, is sometimes slow and meandering and sometimes rapid and direct. For the business traveller and the tourist sharing a flight, the final destination may be the same, but the activities connecting point A with point B are very different. While their relational and temporal paths may cross on the plane, the content of those relations and the length and intensity of these sequences are very different.

My goal in this thesis is to piece together the various paths taken by the Home Rule movement in Scotland between 1880 and 1930, to connect the various travellers, illustrate how their paths intertwined, constituting one another, and how they often parted to separate destinations. And by examining how these processes took shape in one very specific case, I hope to develop insights in the larger processes of social change, actor building and dissolution, and the epistemology of a truly processual sociology. My approach is necessarily eclectic and, as will become apparent in the next chapter, I bring together a variety of elements in constructing the train that will carry us along the remainder of the journey. Welcome aboard.

Chapter 2: From Substance to Process

Having hacked a path through the brambles and undergrowth of nationalism, I want to assess the terrain now visible from this clearing. In this chapter, I load the necessary provisions for the remainder of the journey. My argument draws resources from two key stores: 1) a processual and 2) ecological approach to social life. My main goal in this chapter is to develop the tools necessary to approach the questions introduced at the end of the last chapter by building a framework that takes the study of the Scottish Home Rule movement in a new direction. This involves two steps. The first step is the adoption of a problem-driven approach.[1] The second step is following the problem, even as it transcends narrow sub-disciplinary boundaries.

Being necessarily eclectic, I draw insights from numerous academic fields: theories of history, professional development, economic sociology, organisational theory, state building and evolutionary biology, as well as the literature on contentious politics. Anticipating the obvious complaint that such an approach can only lead to muddled thinking, devoid of the tight focus that disciplinary arguments provide, I point to the classics of sociology: Weber, Marx, Durkheim, Simmel, as well as the more contemporary classics of the Chicago School: Hughes, Park, Wirth and Zorbaugh.[2] All of these authors followed the problem, not the discipline, as they worked to make sense of the issues they studied. Part of the problem social scientists have with explaining social phenomenon in general and the Scottish Home Rule movement in particular is that they are constrained by

---

[1] As Margaret Somers explains: theories should be "problem-driven and judged by grappling with the difficult question of what—beyond the elegance of the theory itself—makes an explanation convincing" (1998: 724). To be prescriptive, problem-solving is precisely the approach sociology should take.

[2] My addition of Chicago ecologists to the classical European pantheon hails from my rather late introduction to these works while working on my PhD. However, having finally discovered the Chicago tradition, I am working to take advantage of many of its insights.

needless sub-disciplinary debates.[3] Most who approach the problem of explaining organisational change in the Scottish Home Rule movement begin by asking, would a rational choice, resource mobilization, cultural framing or breakdown approach offer the *best* explanation? Perhaps some combination of these can provide an improved frame of reference? Similar to the problems inherent in applying invariant models of nationalism to any movement that checks most of the necessary boxes, continued battles over how best to explain an issue within the narrow confines of a specific sub-discipline cannot take us much further in explaining it. This is the case because, despite all of our internal squabbles over sub-disciplinary boundaries, social life does not take shape in narrowly defined arenas.[4]

A cursory overview of the Scottish Home Rule movement reveals the involvement of numerous processes and varieties of actors: labour unions, political parties, land reformers, Co-operative societies and socialists interacting with party restructuring, changes in the organisation of labour power, state expansion and war. Traditionally, the study of each one of these elements has taken place in isolation from the others. This has generated two divergent results: 1) well-focused debates in these particular subfields; and 2) an inability to recognise how these various activities are mutually interdependent. While the benefits of well-defined arguments are many, the presumption that social life takes shape in clearly demarcated arenas is imprudent, and in terms of explanation, faulty.

This means that a fuller answer must move from a focus on things to interactions. This entails an investigation of two basic elements of social

---

[3] Naturally, I am not the first person to make such a claim. Three authors whose works have most significantly influenced my thinking are Andrew Abbott, John Padgett and Charles Tilly. All three have refused to be bound by disciplinary distinctions, and in my opinion, are involved in some of the most interesting work in contemporary sociology.

[4] As I am reframing the problem as one of multiple interacting processes and the ways in which they were organised I focus my analytic attention on fields other than the social movement literature. This explains my limited attention to this literature and my greater focus on other bodies of knowledge which I believe advance the understanding of the phenomenon under review.

life, relations and sequences, and the mechanisms responsible for their concatenation into actors operating in complex ecologies, where everything interacts (although not simultaneously or with equal impact).

> To make progress in understanding [how such ecologies form and change, it is imperative] to embed the analysis of transformation in the routine dynamics of actively self-reproducing social contexts, where constitutive elements and relations are generated and reinforced.
>
> Biological evolution stands as one exemplar that theoretical analysis (without prediction) is possible even in open-ended, endless generative system of self-reproducing recombination and feedback. From biology comes the fundamental insight that organic entities, structures and artifacts are not static 'objects'; they are vortexes of cross entity chemical flows that reproduce themselves. Among other things social systems are forms of life. As such, uncovering social analogues, to cross-entity chemical flows, which transform and reproduce actors through interaction, is a prerequisite for systematically analysing punctuated tippings or inventions in the reproductive dynamics of any human entity, be that a body, an organization, a market, or a city (Padgett and McLean 2006: 1464).

Explicating this process in the particular context of Scottish Home Rule over the 50 year period examined, I detail discontinuous networks of interaction, the manner in which they coupled and decoupled and the mechanisms driving such transformations. To situate the intricacies of this approach let me begin with a brief review of the chief alternative.

Substantialist Alternatives

Confronting a particular phenomenon, most social scientists (historians included) assume one of two approaches: substantialist or relational. Substantialist approaches begin by assuming that essences, invariant cores and hard kernels lie at the heart of the social world. At one end of the scale are the individualists promoting rational choice making, norm-following or interpreting- individuals. Included in the individualist's line up are the respondents of survey analysis with their static core and shifting mentalities. At the opposite end of the spectrum are the holists. Holists presume self-sustaining systems and encapsulated sequences of events, such as social movements, revolutions or the rise of capitalism that

33

operate according to some inherent telos. Despite differences in their level of aggregation, both share a common belief in self-contained actors capable of acting independently, occasionally interacting, but remaining unaffected by transactions in which they are involved.

When confronting a problem like the emergence and transformation of the Scottish Home Rule movement, substantialists quickly unpack their tools and begin building an explanatory frame. In line with the invariant models of nationalism outlined in the previous chapter, they identify a standard set of necessary and sufficient conditions and employ individuals, holisms or both as the stable core of explanation. Jack Brand's (1978) discussion of the development of the Scottish Home Rule movement exemplifies the holistic side of the substantialist approach.[5] Writing in the late 1970s, when devolution for Scotland seemed assured, he set out to explain how Scotland had reached this point in its history. Providing a holist account, he argued the then current demand for Home Rule was a direct descendent of nationalist contention from 1707 onwards.

The title of his second chapter, *The Substance of Nationalism*, clearly indicates his position: nationalism has an essence, a core, an enduring quality. "To understand the substance of Scottish nationalism", Brand explains,

> it is necessary to recognise the existence of such feelings at an early stage of Scottish history. It is worth remembering three major points. The first consideration...is that 270 year ago Scotland was a separate state and it could not be said that the two kingdoms were good neighbours. The second point is related to this.... [T]here were several statements during this period [of the early fourteenth century between the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314 and the signing of the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320]...showing that a certain stratum of the Scottish people were aware of Scotland as a community to which they had a loyalty. It is, moreover, Scotland in some sense which seems to have this loyalty rather than the Scottish king.... Finally, in this consideration of national feeling in Scottish history, there is ample evidence that the Union of Parliaments in 1707 was unpopular....The point of this discussion is that some sentiment akin

---

[5] My use of Brand's work as an example is no reflection on its scholarly merit. Rather, I have chosen it as an exemplar of a number of issues I am mobilising against in this thesis.

to nationalism has a very long history in Scotland (Brand 1978: 12-13).

For Brand, as well as most commentators of the Home Rule movement, despite the passage of time, the entity we call Scotland and the movement noted as nationalist is invariant. A substance with deep roots that remains constant while everything else around it changes. Brand's holistic description of the Home Rule movement makes it a substance with a timeless quality that endures separate from other relations.

Brand's holistic account of the substance of Scottish nationalist life is reproduced in the individualism of David McCrone and colleagues in their discussion of contemporary Scottish identity (McCrone and Kiely 2000; Kiely, Bechhofer, Stewart and McCrone 2001; McCrone 2001: 149-74).[6] For McCrone and his collaborators, identities, whether national, civic or ethnic, are shifting properties of biological individuals. In their discussion of Scottish identity (Kiely et al. 2001), they note the difference between markers of identity such as speech, dress, or length of time in residence and the rules for claiming an identity, ancestry, place of birth or current/former residence. As they explain, identity markers are "any characteristics associated with an individual they might choose to present to others, in order to support a national identity claim" (ibid. 35-36). They continue, defining identity rules as "probabilistic rules of thumb whereby under certain conditions and in particular contexts, identity markers are interpreted, defined or given precedence over others" (ibid. 36).

With such a definition, these Edinburgh sociologists have simply presented the reductionist complement to Brand's holism. Identity, an infinitely relational phenomenon is reduced to variable characteristics of otherwise static entities. In many ways, their qualitative research replicates

---

[6] As with Brand, I am not casting aspersions on the scholarly merit of this work, rather I am using it to illuminate several of the basic assumptions undergirding a great deal of contemporary sociology.

the basic assumptions of variable-based quantitative approaches. The general linear model (OLS regression and its relatives) presumes a stable entity (more often than not a biological person) with variable attributes, such as race, sex, age, occupation or social class (see Abbott 2001a: 37-63). The person is presumed static, their attributes flexible. The same assumption is inferred by McCrone and his collaborators. Identity markers are attributes of individual people (which in turn reflect a substance called Scotland, itself assumed to posses independent existence), which may take on different meanings depending on their use. McCrone and company have reduced an interactive phenomenon to a substance, a shifting element of unchanging individuals.

A Processual Approach

Brand's argument that Scottish nationalism is an enduring entity and McCrone et al.'s reduction of national identities to individual attributes illustrate two sides of the same coin. Substantialist arguments do have a seductive resonance. Positing long-standing arrangements enacted by self-contained individuals or invariant structures, they reassure our commonsensical understanding of social life. Despite their reassuring familiarity, though, they fail in their primary theoretical task: to offer plausible mechanisms for understanding the phenomena under study. Discussions of enduring nationalism and pick-and-mix identities obscure the relational underpinnings—the transactions, networks and shifting array of interactions—that bring these phenomena into existence and how they change over time.

In the course of their discussions, however, both Brand and the Edinburgh camp confront the difficulties of these substantialist arguments and make fleeting swipes at the processual foundations of the phenomenon they seek to explain. Confronted with the problem of fitting increasing electoral support for the SNP into the encapsulated history of Scottish

36

nationalism he had earlier described, Brand shifts the terms of his explanation. "My argument", he clarifies,

> is that the rise in support for the SNP is explained by two processes which took place at the same time. On the one hand is there is the European phenomenon of distrust towards established political parties and towards the political system itself....[On the other is] an endogenous change in Scottish society: a greater concern for the condition of Scotland leading to political action to achieve improvement (Brand 1978: 22, 24).

While I disagree with terms of his explanation[7], Brand's recognition that the Home Rule movement emerged from the interaction of specific activities at distinct historical junctures is a welcome departure from an explanation that posits the Home Rule movement as a self-contained, invariant entity. A similar flash of recognition is evident in the work of McCrone and colleagues on national identities. In drawing conclusions about their work on identity rules and markers, they explain that they "are sustained in day-to-day dialogues people have with each other, in the course of which they make judgements, about who people are, or whether they belong or not" (Kiely et al., 2001: 52).

While the obscuring fog of reductionism still hangs heavy, we can make out the contours of a processual understanding. Drawing parallels with conversation, identity is built through the ongoing interaction of social actors (whatever their scale, whether persons, organisations or states). The act of making a claim immediately implicates an irreducible relationship between the maker of the claim and the object of those claims (McAdam et al. 2001; Tilly 1998a). In contrast to Kiely et al., the claim is not a trait of the claimant but a relationship between the claimant and the object of the claim. Such relationships are irreducible; they are the sites of efficacious action. Whether we are trying to make sense of identity claims or Home Rule

---

[7] Brand's discussion continues the traditional nationalist explanation I attacked in the introduction, equating nationalism with consciousness. Furthermore, his argument begins to dovetail with McCrone et al.'s as he focuses almost exclusively on individualistic explanations of the SNP's popularity.

movements, our focus should be, as Goffman (1967: 3) notes, "[n]ot men and their moments. Rather moments and their men."

A processual approach shifts the terms of investigation from static entities with shifting attributes to dynamic ties, multiple connections and overlapping sequences of events, moving at different speeds. Such an approach "reject[s] the notion that one can posit discrete, pre-given units such as the individual or society as ultimate starting point of sociological analysis..." (Emirbayer 1997: 287). It is *transactions between social sites unfolding over time*, not encapsulated holisms or self-propelled individuals, which are the foundations of the social world. All social actors, regardless of their scope, must be accounted for as they only take shape within specific relational configurations at specific historical junctures; therefore, finding actors means finding relations and explaining how they change over time (Abbott 2001a: 261-298; Cederman 2003; Emirbayer 1997; Franzosi 2004; Simmel 1950; White 1992).

The strongly processual stand I take relies rests on two closely related pillars: relations and sequences. A processual view of social life begins with relations and transactions and then examines the actors that develop through these transactions and how they change over time, sometimes disappearing, often mutating into new actors. Such an approach provides three significant advantages over substantialist approaches, which reverse this order of events, beginning with actors and only then searching for relations.

> Since interaction is primitive, the very existence of continuous individual actors is a matter to be explained.... A second reason for making interaction primitive flows out of the first. Making interaction primitive makes it possible to give an account of [actors]. By making [actors]...continuously recreated in the flow of interaction we bring [them] out of the realm of assumptions and into that of investigation.... Finally, and more broadly, taking action and interaction as primitive is really our only effective way to deal with change in social actors and structures. It is far easier to explain permanence as an accidental outgrowth of change than vice versa... It should be noted that by making perpetual change foundational—

something we do when we take interaction as primitive—make explaining change relatively trivial. Explaining stability becomes the central theoretical challenge (Abbott 1996: 6-8).

A processual approach to social life, despite its counterintuitive feel, provides a framework for explaining the emergence, stability and change of actors and social structures. Let me begin with the basic building blocks of relations and sequences.

Relations

A relational understanding of social life has two central elements: 1) the social world is a world of relations; and 2) transactions form the bedrock of these relations.

A world of relations: A relational approach begins with the presumption that social life consists of bonds not essences (Tilly 1998b). These bonds are ties between social sites, which may be people, Home Rule organisations, labour unions, land reformers or states, to simply note a few. They may be equal, as in the ties between offices of the same rank in bureaucracies, or hierarchical, as in caste systems. Relations may be short-term links such as transactions in a shop when buying a pint of milk, or more durable, involved and intense ties such as links between colony and colonizer. Relations, not mentalities or all-encompassing holisms constitute social life.

In contentious politics, relationships are developed along a number of dimensions. Recalling its definition, contentious politics involves bundles of relationships manifested through claim-making and response where at least one participant is a government and the claims, if realised, would affect the status quo. Here we encounter the first relational element of contentious political activity: claim-making. "The great meeting in favour of Home Rule for Scotland, held in Edinburgh, on 8th November [1913]," as reported in *The Scottish Nation* highlights this process of raising and airing claims. "In certain quarters [of those in attendance] complaint was made that Mr.

39

[Thomas] McKinnon Wood [Secretary for Scotland, who was present] had not given details of the [proposed Home Rule] Bill and the date of its introduction." In reply, the paper urged patience: "one step at a time…. Hitherto, Scottish Home Rulers have had to fight the battle in the Parliament, so to speak, single-handed" (TSN December 1913: 18).

During this rally, the assembled Home Rulers made claims on Secretary McKinnon Wood asking for more timely information regarding the government's plans for Scottish Home Rule. They had after all organised a civic forum, educated members on the issues under consideration, and were, therefore, worthy of consultation as equals. As the paper explained, "[t]he crowed and enthusiastic gathering bore dramatic testimony to the strength of the national demand for self-government" (ibid. 18). Given their establishment as worthy political advisors, the assembled Home Rulers pressed for greater inclusion in the process they were participating in as lobbyists and citizens.

In response to the claims made on the Scottish Secretary, the IHSRL (*The Scottish Nation* was its official paper) urged patience, explaining, "It should be remembered that it is the fate of all great movements to pass through three stages—the stage of ridicule, the stage of opposition, and the stage of acceptance. To this experience Scottish Home Rule is no exception" (ibid.). We evidence additional contentious ties in the conclusion of the article, as the ISHRL explains that

Scotland's grievance is not now, as in the old days, that she gets legislation thrust upon her against her will, but that she gets practically no legislation at all…. Election after election Scotland sends to Westminster a majority of Liberal members. When they leave their constituents these members are full of energy and enthusiasm, but when they reach Westminster they are stricken, as it were, with a kind of parliamentary paralysis. When the Unionist are in office Scotland gets nothing from lack of

40

will; and when the Liberals are in power she gets practically nothing from lack of time. As matters stand, no blame attaches to the Scottish Liberal members, who are chafing under intolerable conditions (ibid. 18-19).

The ISHRL's concluding remarks illustrate two further varieties of relationship involved in the claim-making aspect of contentious politics. Their advice to fellow Home Rulers that patience is necessary underscores inter-organisational relations. And their accusations of "parliamentary paralysis" highlight their relationships to political parties. Specifically, by allocating blame to Unionists and absolution to Liberals, the ISHRL has differentiated its ties, separating worthy organisations (the Scottish Liberals) facing corrupting environments (the "intolerable conditions" of Westminster) from the Unionists, who lack the required will for change.

As this example illustrates, ties between claimant and object of claims are joined by inter-organisational relationships built through collaboration (Powell, Koput and Smith-Doerr 1996; Galaskiewicz 1985), but also developed through shared membership (Breiger 1974; Rosenthal et al. 1985), career mobility as Home Rulers move from organisation to organisation (Abbott 1988; Padgett 2001) and ties to common projects (Bearman 1993; Mische and Pattison 2000). This brief sketch brings the relational underpinnings of contentions politics in specific and in social life in general into focus. What is important to realise is that these relationships are multiple and overlapping, implicated in every aspect of contentious politics, from mobilization to resource acquisition, claim formulation and grievance airing.

These multiple relationships embed social life into rich matrixes constituted through and channelling numerous forms of interaction (Granovetter 1985; McLean 2002; Padgett 2001; Zelizer 1996; 2000). Put another way, social life is inherently organised: no free-floating people, disembodied forces or collective mentalities. Relations clump together

41

forming networks and the concatenation of these networks organises the world into structures. Prominent examples involved in the Scottish Home Rule movement include unions, political parties, land reform organisations and of course the Home Rule lobbies. Less obvious, yet equally important forms of organisation include friendship, community ties, neighbourliness and workplace relationships.

The problem facing any movement is not one of involving isolating individuals or recruiting entire classes, but rather one of stapling existing bits of social organisation together to confront recurrent or developing problems. The solutions developed via reorganisation are not always appropriate nor successful and certainly not functionally perfected. However, understanding that social life is inherently organised *reframes the issue of Scottish Home Rule an organisational problem*. Further evidence of the mechanics involved is forthcoming. However, it is sufficient at this point to acknowledge that the social world is a world of relations; these relations congeal into recurrent patterns making all social life organised; and this organisational undergirding reframes most issues as organisational issues.

Transactions: Claim-making, advice, careers, collaboration, union membership, community relations and political party activity are not simply static ties, but ongoing flows of interaction; the stuff of "raw social life", to borrow Stinchcombe's (2001: 5) phrase. Returning to the Edinburgh Home Rule rally of 8 November 1913, the claims made on Secretary McKinnon Wood and the ISHRL's response that patience was required, form a variety of conversation.[8] The fact that the claims made could potentially impact upon the interests of the parties involved makes it contentious conversation

---

[8] I should stress that this does not reduce social life to text as post-modernists and deconstructionist would have us believe. To the contrary, the metaphor of conversation helps to explicate the ongoing transactions between social sites; the activities of real people, organisations, states and communities doing concrete things in specific times and places. The nature of such conversations involves processes of trial and error and the parties involved call upon historically developed patterns of interaction, innovate within the context of these relations, and respond to emergent elements of the transactions themselves.

(Tilly 1998a). Such interactions "are conversational in the sense of proceeding through historically situated, culturally constrained, negotiated, consequential interchanges among multiple parties" (ibid. 508). "If we regard conversation as continuously negotiated communication and contention as mutual claim-making that bears significantly on the parties' interests…then the two social phenomenon overlap extensively" (ibid. 495).

The conversational character of this particular cluster of claim-making and response was joined by interactions involving flows of information about government policy, demands for increased involvement in this policy and presentations of worthiness in the form of civic rallies (particularly when contrasted to the increasingly uncivil Irish). This single rally involved a myriad of interactions, connecting Home Rulers with one another, the state and public at large. Moving out from this example of contentious conversation, we witness similar interactions across the whole range of relations involved: interorganisational conflict over how best to proceed; flows of personnel between organisations, including Home Rule groups, unions and political parties; government response by way of Home Rule legislation; and the interaction of political parties contesting seats, building policy platforms and collaborating with Home Rulers.

Just as there are multiple relationships involved in every aspect of contentious politics, so too are there multiple simultaneous conversations. This is not to say that equal attention is given to every relation and conversation in play at any one time (McLean 2002; Mische and White 1998; Padgett 2001), but rather to highlight the multiple transactions involved, how they interact and co-constitute one another. The emergence and modification of these ties and the transactions they channel depends primarily on three interrelated issues: the nature of existing relationships; the prior history of relationships and interactions; and the nature of the conversation itself (Tilly 1998a: 495).

43

Different types of ties facilitate different types of transactions and the meaning attached to any transaction is largely a product of the tie. This point is perhaps most evident in economic transactions. For example, should we witness two people engaged in conversation when one hands the other a £20 note, we cannot be certain of the meaning of that exchange—bribe, tip, repayment, allowance, payment for service—unless we know what the nature of the relationship: contractor/building inspector; waiter/patron; roommates; father/son; carpenter/client (Zelizer 1996).

The same is true in contentious politics. We cannot understand the meaning of a claim-making transaction unless we understand the relationship between the claimant and the object of the claim. Advice advocating patience takes on different meanings depending on the relationship in which it is offered. The ISHRL's advice within the interorganisational relationship between Home Rule organisations, for instance, may be accepted as friendly conversation amongst peers. However, the same advice when offered by governmental agents to Home Rule organisations becomes condescending and patronising.

The prior pattern of interaction also significantly affects the way transactions take shape because

> each shared effort to press a claim lays down a settlement among parties to the transaction, a memory of the interaction, new information about likely outcomes of different sorts of interactions, and a changed web of relations within and among the participating set of people (Tilly 1995b: 37).

In effect, prior exchanges establish tracks down which future transactions travel. I will further explore the implications of this shortly, but for now, what is crucial to understand is that the past bears heavily, and is readily implicated in "present" activity by shaping the context for action (Abbott 2001a: 209-239; Haydu 1998; Ikenberry 1994; Mahoney 2000; Padgett 1981; Steinmo, Thelen and Longstreth 1992; Thelen 1999).

44

The final piece of this trilogy involves the nature of the conversation or the transaction itself. Remember that a relational approach on the assertion that social relations are the bedrock of social life, possessing an irreducible quality. As such, the transactions they channel, and which in turn modify their structure, possess an equal irreducibility. Transactions may begin and end as friendly banter: advice among equals, information about upcoming legislation or personnel movement between groups, such as F. J. Robertson's move from the Young Scots to become the founding chairman of the ISHRL and Roland Muirhead's move from the Young Scots to the SHRA. Or they may begin as collaboration, such as the post-War links between the Labour Party and the SHRA, which soon transformed into hostile transactions as the Labour Party's involvement in other conversations, mainly labour union activity, pulled it into new projects antithetical to the SHRA's goals. How the transaction proceeds depends largely on existing relations, past histories, developing ties and the available scripts. These transactions rely on relations and the meanings they embed. Bannockburn celebrations, a Home Rule rally and the open conflict between the crofters, land lords and the government all involve meaning making activity that calls upon the shared understandings of all parties involved.

All of these elements combine to produce flexible patterns of interaction, or *repertoires of contention*. These repertoires, Charles Tilly explains, "are learned cultural creations, but they do not descend from abstract philosophy or take shape as a result of political propaganda; they emerge from struggle" (Tilly 1995b: 42). Groups and organisations engaged in contentious politics develop a variety of ways of pressing claims through ongoing transactions between the claimants, the objects of claims, as well as learning from their own experiences and those of others (Levitt and March 1988; March, Sproull and Tamuz 1991; March 1991; Powell, Koput and Smith-Doerr 1996; Tilly 1995b). "At any particular point in history,

45

however," Tilly continues, those engaged in contentious activities "learn only a rather small number of alternative ways of acting collectively."

> The limits of that learning, plus the fact that potential collaborators and antagonists likewise have learned a relatively limited set of means, constrains the choices available for collective interaction. The means, furthermore, articulate with, and help shape a number of social arrangements that are not part of collective interaction itself, but channel it to some degree: police practices, laws of assembly, rules of association, routines for informal gatherings, ways of displaying symbols of affiliation, opposition, or protest, means of reporting news and so on (Tilly 1995b: 42).

Contentious repertoires are not possessions of individual actors, but relations between two or more actors, which provide scripts for interacting. They are ongoing processes of developing, raising, making and responding to claims. They rely on numerous relations, both direct ties between makers and objects of claims and indirect ties to peripheral projects. Furthermore, repertoires change as the relations storing them change. Far from being static, they are dynamic and flexible; however, their flexibility is conditioned by previous interactions and innovation tends to take shape through trial and error.

This brings me back to my original question: how and why did the way Scottish Home Rulers organised to press claims change from political lobbies to political parties? The development of an answer is advanced by reframing it in terms of repertoires. The substance of the questions remains, but the terms of its engagement are made processual. The reframed question, then, becomes: how did the repertoire of Scottish Home Rulers develop and change over the 50 years between 1880 and 1930? Recasting it in terms of repertoires exposes the relational foundations of the problem, highlights the networks, transactions and scripts employed by those advocating Home Rule, establishes change as constant and provides a means for examining the problem without recourse to mental states or teleological patterns.

It is true that elements of the Home Rule repertoire remand relatively constant throughout the 50 years reviewed. Home Rulers were publishing newspapers, organising rallies, seeking the support the prominent patrons, making public speeches and arranging speakers' series from the 1880s through the 1920s. The Liberal and Labour Parties were laying Home Rule planks in their platforms, introducing Home Rule bills, meeting with constituents, collaborating with lobbies and campaigning against one another throughout. Similarly, Unionists were publishing articles in newspapers, organising associations, denouncing legislation and developing anti-Home Rule party policies. What did change was the organisational core of the Home Rulers' repertoire, which transformed from political lobbies to political parties.

While Home Rule claim-making developed in association with and was pressed through existing political parties throughout the first 45 years of this period, these practices were exchanged for head-to-head party competition by the 1920s with the establishment of the NPS and John Maclean's Scottish Workers' Republican Party (SWRP). Accompanying this organisational transformation was a change in the type of claims being made. Demands for federalism, devolution and commonwealth status were replaced by calls for independence and separation. Simultaneously, changes were also taking place in the organisation of party politics, the Irish Home Rule movement and the post-war economy.

While this shift in repertoires was shaped by existing patterns of claim-making and response, this is not to say that it was an inevitable transition; the future does not determine the past. More importantly, the transformation from lobby to party does not presume some sort of improvement or advancement over existing methods. It would be wrongheaded to following the nationalists' argument and claim that the transformation from lobby to party was part of some teleological advance

from pre-modern forms of contention to modern ones. Such taxonomic

schemes obscure what actually happened and impose expectations of what

should happen: specifically, that Scottish Home Rulers, having finally

developed a "modern" form of nationalism, will now continue toward

independence, and any deviation from this path should be considered a

failure (Brand 1978; Hanham 1969; Harvie 1998; Nairn 1996 [1974]; Webb

1977).

Rather, the transformation from one form of organisation to another

represents a turning point (Abbott 2001a: 240-60); a transformation from

one dominant set of generative rules for action to another. Such a

conceptualisation bears strong resemblance to Weber's (1946: 280) famous

switchmen metaphor. The transformation from lobby to party was not

preordained or a teleological advancement from pre-modern to modern

nationalism, but rather a change in repertoires generated by a

transformation of the relations involved. To better situate how such

transformations occur requires a discussion of sequences of events.

Sequences

A processual understanding of social life not only recognises lumpy

webs of social interaction, but also accepts that these relations are

constantly in motion, changing, shifting and unfolding. Here we encounter

the second part of a truly processual ontology: sequences of events. In

Simmel's apt words, social life is not a "substance, nothing concrete, but an

event" (1950: 11); as such, social life is composed of "processes-in-

relations" (White 1997: 60). Developing an understanding of how the

organisational core of the Home Rule repertoire changed between 1880 and

1930 requires understanding how it changed over time; what events

reconfigured the relations; what sequences did these events take? As such,

relations and sequences are inseparable; to recognise ties and interaction is to recognise events.

Events: Most sociology divides social life into distinct causes and effects. The most readily apparent form of this practice is the variable model, which presumes that some single quality, place of birth, style of dress or accent, effects an outcome on another single quality, acceptance as being Scottish, for instance (Kiely et al. 2001).[9] Andrew Abbott explains that this approach, which he labels general linear reality, has six key elements:

1. The social world is made up of fixed entities with varying attributes (demographic assumption).

2. What happens to one case doesn't constrain what happens to others, temporally or spatially (casewise independent assumption).

3. Attributes have one and only one causal meaning within a given study (univocal meaning assumption).

4. Attributes determine each other principally as independent scales rather than as constellations of attributes; main effects are more important than interactions (which are complex types) (main effects assumption).

5. Things happen in discrete bits of uniform length and are not aggregated into overlapping "events" of varying length (continuity or uniform time-horizon assumption).

    5a. In cases where one must consider differential duration of attributes, determination flows from long-duration attributes to shorter-duration attributes, from context to individuals (monotonic causal flow assumption).

6. The order in which attributes change does not influence what changes occur (nonnarrative assumption).

    6a. All cases follow the same "causal narrative" or model (homogenous causality assumption) (Abbott 2001a: 187-88).

---

[9] This practice is ubiquitous in sociology. Even a qualitative work tends to presume that variable characteristics do all the work in structuring interactions (see for example the works of the Edinburgh sociologists discussed earlier). Most studies of Scotland in general and the Home Rule movement in particular have also replicated these assumptions. For example, McCrone (2001) adopts the basic tenets of the general linear model throughout his discussion of Scottish development. Brand (1978), who, while making some valid points about the development of Home Rule groups in the post-WWI era, frames his arguments in terms of variables, examining the role that politics, economic, literature, youth, church, army, football and press all played in the Home Rule revival of the mid to late twentieth century. Each of Brand's points is argued in isolation, as though they did not interact, implicate one another, or change one another.

The prior discussion of relations immediately casts aspersion on the factuality of points one and two. But what about points three through six? Moving from causes to events (ibid. 183-205) provides a way out of the morass of standard presumptions.

Such a move is necessary because social life does not resemble the world presumed by most sociology. Arguing that some isolated variable, individual level distrust of political parties as expressed in opinion polls, for instance, "causes" the rise of movements (e.g., Brand 1978) is a difficult case to make. How exactly does this occur? What mechanisms were implicated? Just as it is incongruous to assume that in a given transaction all that acts is my race, sex or class background which "causes" my educational attainment, it is an intellectual reach to presume that "causes" in the sense of distinct entities with a single, invariant meanings and no temporal depth lead to effects with the same characteristics. The contrast between this approach to social life and the one I advocate could not be starker.

As the preceding discussion of relations has illustrated, social life takes shape in webs of relations that are "cyclic, knotted, and characterised by a redundancy of ties" (Bearman, Faris and Moody 1999: 510). These lumpy networks in turn involve events in numerous relations simultaneously.[10] To move from "causes" to events is to recognise that

> the social world consists of complex subjects to which complex things—events—happen. Causality flows differently in different cases—perhaps in different rates, certainly in different patterns. Most cases work in complex bunches—the events—rather than alone. There is no necessity that these events be a certain temporal size or length and no restriction on relations between events of different sizes. Events can come in a variety of different temporal orderings- strict sequence, overlapping, and simultaneity (Abbott 2001a: 181).

---

[10] This does not assume that the impact of an event is equal in all networks. The dense web of relations in which all events are caught means that most structures are generally not susceptible to "butterfly effects", where small, random events rewire entire structures (Bearman, Faris and Moody 1999).

50

Therefore, to understand emergence, stability and transformation, requires understanding events.

Events are "bounded interactions" and sequential relations among these happenings constitute processes (Tilly 2002a: 173). They may be temporally brief such as a single newspaper article claiming that Scotland deserves devolution; or they may be more sustained such as the rise and transformation of the Scottish Home Rule movement. Distinguishing patterns and sequences requires examination of four primary characteristics of events: pace, duration, cycle and trajectory (Aminzade 1992). Pace and duration are quantitative features of events, representing the number of events occurring within a particular period and the amount of time elapsed for an event, respectively. Cycles and trajectories are more qualitative features. Cycles are regularly repeating events, such as elections, and trajectories are marked by "cumulative, rather than repetitive, sequences of linked events, suggesting a certain directionality to change" (ibid. 459), such as the development and transformation of the Scottish Home Rule movement between 1880-1930.

Recalling the classical tradition of the Chicago School, all events are conjunctural, implicating transactions between two or more actors. At any conjuncture, multiple sequences are involved; that is, all events are embedded into a multitude of relations, most of them moving at different speeds. The founding of the Young Scots Society in 1900 provides a clear case in point. The introduction to the 1911-12 edition of the *Young Scots Handbook* recounts the story of the organisation's establishment. "Immediately after the General Election of 1900", the article begins

> there appeared a number of letters in the *Edinburgh Evening News* on the need of political education of young men and of the training of Progressives in political work. The result was the was the summoning of a meeting in Edinburgh on 26th October, 1900, at which a resolution was adopted in favour of forming an association "for the purpose of educating young men in the fundamental

principles of Liberalism and of encouraging and stimulating them in the study of the of social science and economics."...

The Society was fortunate enough to achieve a national fame in its first session. Its syllabus included an address on South African affairs by the Hon. (now Rt. Hon.) John X. Merriman, and for this the Music Hall was taken. An outcry raised by the *Scotsman* led to the withdrawal of the Music Hall, but an application to the Town Council for the Waverly Market was granted by a majority, and the meeting was successfully carried through on 26th April, 1901. The chair was taken by Mr Thomas (now Lord) Shaw, and among those on the platform were Mr. Arthur (now Lord) Dewar, Mr. J. W. Gulland, Mr A. L. Brown, Mr Harry S. Murray, Mr C. E. Pierce, Mr Edwin Adam, Mr John Blair, Mr D. V. Pirie, the Rev. Profs. Orr, Hislop, and Paterson, and the indefatigable organiser of the meeting, Mr J. M. Hogge, now of York, the Liberal candidate for the Camlachie Division of Glasgow in December 1910 (YSH 1911-12: 5).

The story continues: "its first great opportunity came in 1903, when

Mr Chamberlain started his Protectionist Campaign." The organisation's

platform expanded

at the Glasgow Conference of 1907. Scottish Home Rule and the House of Lords question were put in the forefront of the Society's propaganda work, and a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to administer a fund raised for this work. Under the energetic leadership of Mr (now Councillor) F. J. Robertson a most extensive and successful campaign was carried out over the next three years (ibid. 6).

In this brief review of the founding and early achievements of the

Young Scots Society, numerous conjunctures are evident. Four of the most

prominent conjunctures are those involving newspapers, careers, national

and international politics and the founding of the Young Scots themselves.

What were seemingly individual events, isolated from one another were in

reality intersections of multiple events. The series of articles in the

Edinburgh Evening News, which highlighted the initial problems around

which the Young Scots organised, intersected with Liberal Party politics and

its burgeoning youth movement (the YSS was an outgrowth of the Liberal

Party). The *Scotsman*'s protest over the Edinburgh Town Council's

permission to use the music hall crossed Liberal Party activity, Young Scots'

efforts to mobilise and the activities of the Edinburgh Town Council which

withdrew one offer and accepted another in response to a newly generated application.

The Young Scots establishment narrative begins with the 1900 general election, and as an event, the election intersected with, amongst other things, the youth wing of the Liberal Party, the series of articles published by the daily newspapers and subsequent requests for meeting places involving the Edinburgh Town Council and the *Scotsman*. The election itself was conjunctural, emerging from the intersection of a regularly occurring political event, the election, which involved party mobilisation, a shifting array of current issues (e.g., the Boer War, local government, drinking laws, Irish nationalism), the organisation of the electorate, election organisers and other representatives of the state. Prime Minister Chamberlain's protectionist campaign, which provided the YSS with its first major opportunity for political countermobilisation, emerged from the intersection of domestic politics, Imperial economic concerns and international trade activities.

These political events were also emplotted in the individual careers of assorted dignitaries and organisers including by John X. Merriman, Thomas Shaw, Arthur Dewar and J. M. Hogge. Their attendance at the founding was an event forming part of their individual biographies, their political careers within Liberal, left of centre and Scottish politics, as well intersecting with South African political careers in the form of Merriman, who was the last governor of the Cape Colony.

The establishment of the Young Scots Society was itself a conjunctural event: the linking together of multiple sequences and relations generating a new sequence, the "life course" of the YSS. Newspaper articles intersected with Liberal Party politics, international politics (the YSS openly campaigned against the Boer War), the careers of the founders, speakers and other participants, as well as the city Edinburgh. Less

53

apparent are the events which intersected to make Home Rule an issue and popular political responses to it possible in the first place. The Reform Acts of 1832, 1868 and especially 1884 had dramatically expanded the electorate, introduced national political parties and in many ways facilitated the development of democracy in Scotland (Hutchison 1986; Dyer 1996).[11] These events intersected with the Boer war, debates about land reform, drinking, local government, Irish nationalist agitation and Parliamentary representation for Scottish issues providing the opportunity for the formation and airing of grievances through existing political parties.

As result of the conjunction of these sequences, political lobbies advocating Home Rule such as the Young Scots Society had become since the mid-1880s conceivable for the first time. They represented ways of organising that were simply impossible during the last large-scale episode of Home Rule contention during the 1850s (Morton 1996). The establishment of the Young Scots joined another event—the Home Rule movement in Scotland—involving their predecessors such as the SHRA and their contemporaries such as the ISHRL, further illustrating the specifics of the historical juncture in which they developed.

The founding of the Young Scots, its continued existence and ongoing proselytising activities arose out of the ongoing interaction of multiple events sequences: making a claim; petitioning for use of Waverly field; and the inviting of speakers and other interested parties. Each involves a relation between several distinct sequences. These sequences, all moving at different speeds were harnessed together into this founding event producing a new time, a sequence called the Young Scots Society, which joined another set of events labelled the Home Rule movement.

---

[11] If democracy is considered to rely on "1) a broad and relatively equal definition of citizenship; 2) obligatory, definitive consultation of citizens on state policy and personnel; 3) protection of citizens, including members, against arbitrary action by agents of the state" (Tilly 1995b: 15) then the argument can be made that democracy was emerging in Scotland by this period.

From this brief example comes a critical point: all events are simultaneously involved in multiple narratives (Abbott 1988: 319-323; 2001a; Aminzade 1992; Griffin 1992; Tilly 2002a: 171-87). History is a web of activities; indeed the same event may form different parts of several processes. This tangled skein overlaps at some points and disconnects at others; and it is this process of coupling and decoupling, working like a shuttle across a loom, weaving together the tapestry of historical structure. The establishment of the Young Scots Society is precisely such a web, involving a myriad of events, four of which have been outlined. However, events are not singular occurrences, but ongoing flows of activity and in order to understand the issue of trajectories, requires an understanding of how sequences of events enchain into processes.

Sequences: A sequence of events involves a series of transactions. Connecting these sequences into coherent and relatively durable patterns generates actors. For ease of reference, the actors emerging from these collections of processes are *lineages* (Hull 1976). As such, the establishment of the YSS provides evidence of two additional points: 1) the varied speed of the lineages involved; and 2) the codetermination of relations and sequences.

Continuing with the four sequences examined, the establishment of the Young Scots was implicated in several times lines, all of them moving at different speeds. The *Edinburgh Evening News* and the *Scotsman* were both daily papers involving them in a cyclical sequence of regularly producing and distributing papers. Their daily cycles of newspaper production intersected with, amongst other things, political events. The general election of 1900 was part of sequence of events which, if analysed as part of the development of the Home Rule movement in Scotland, extended back to 1885, the first election held after the Third Reform Act (1884), but also had roots much deeper in time as part of the lineage we call British politics. This

55

sequence's pace and duration rested largely on the speed of personnel turnover in political parties and domestic and international events, which facilitated the calling of general elections.

Joining these political and journalistic sequences were several political careers and promotions in political hierarchies. John X. Merriman's career in South African politics, (his promotion through election from MP to PM), was joined by transformation in the careers of Thomas Shaw and Arthur Dewar both becoming peers, and F. J. Robertson's election as member of Edinburgh Town Council, all unfolding in the period intervening between the 1901 meeting and the 1911-12 recounting of events. The speed of these career transitions was conditioned by their embeddedness in specific sets of relationships: party politics; domestic politics; Imperial politics; and the opening and closing of employment vacancies.

What was a significant event in the lineage of the Young Scots Society—its inception—was simply part of every day business for the newspapers. It was a link in the career biographies of Lords Dewar and Shaw, the Rt. Hon. John Merriman, and the others present. For the Liberal Party, it provided a redirection of policy and a reinvigoration of its youth wing. It was a crucial event in the political biography of Councillor Robertson, helping to direct his lineage more intensely into Home Rule politics, leading to his establishment of the ISHRL. While the establishment of the YSS may be emplotted in a number of sequences, its impact as an event depended largely on the structure of the conjuncture (Sahlins 1985; 1991). While events are multifaceted, involved in several networks simultaneously, the significance of their impact on specific lineages depends largely on the structure of the relations involved.

"Metaphorically speaking, how a crystal responds to the blow of a hammer depends not only on the direction and force of the blow but also the fault lines within the crystal itself" (Padgett 2001: 239). Here the

codetermination of sequences and relations comes into focus. Network structures—hierarchical, cyclical, knotty and redundant—are perpetually in motion, generated by the events they channel, the transactions they link.

Since all structures are continually reenacted, it will happen from time to time that several local structures under a larger one might be simultaneously disconnected and their own reproduction prevented. This leaves an opening for action, a new juncture that might assemble their constituent parts in new ways (Abbott 2001a: 257).

Events, small ones such as the publication of a newspaper article or large ones such as general elections, are implicated in numerous processes-in-relations simultaneously. And "[b]y doing many things, each action reconnects some existing structures, disconnects others and indeed creates some structures unseen before" (ibid. 255). Transformation is therefore constant. It becomes significant at "peculiarly essential junctures...where action [makes] particularly consequential bridges by making or breaking links between many networks, with the consequence of rearranging the overall pattern of networked structures" (ibid. 256; see also Sahlins 1991; and Sewell 1996 for alternative culturally driven explanations).

Several processes-in-relations formed such a juncture on the 26th of October 1900. Their intersection (brought about partially through deliberative effort of the Young Scots' organisers as well as unintentional events such as the publication of these specific articles at this specific time) gave way to a significant transformation in the linkage of these various relations yielding the emergence of the Young Scots. Conjunctures such as these are "like arrangements of tumblers in a lock: if an action sits just right under the tumblers, it becomes the key that opens, the agent of sudden advantage or disadvantage" (ibid.). Furthermore, it is important to point out that the size of the event does not necessarily determine how it affects structures. Seemingly small events such as an assassination, of Archduke

57

Franz Ferdinand for instance, may have generate a cascade with huge impacts in numerous relations—World War I, the reorganisation of party politics in Britain, the reorganisation of labour power and so on—because of its position in those processes (Abbott 1983).

It is worth repeating, though, that such conjunctures do not have identical impacts in all the relations they involve. Sequences and relations are many, overlapping and lumpy, generating "multiple independent pathways through which causal effects flow" (Bearman, Faris and Moody 1999: 510). However, recognising that multiple sequences and relations are involved in every aspect of social life highlights a critical methodological and theoretical issue: the impossibility of studying the Scottish Home Rule movement in isolation. While the examples employed so far have relied on specific cases, making sense of the larger problem requires producing a colligation of multiple events and relations. The founding of the Young Scots and the Home Rule rally of 8 November 1913 were only instances in a larger process. Reconstructing the Scottish Home Rule movement between 1880 and 1930, mapping how it emerged and transformed over time requires reconstruction of its ecology.

Ecologies of Contention

An ecological understanding of the Scottish Home Rule movement provides a framework for examining *multiple* networks, sequences and their concatenation. As the encapsulated history that opened the last chapter and the detailed examples that have filled the pages of this one have shown, the Home Rule movement was a product of and involved in numerous activities. What requires further investigation is the way that multiple networks are put together and how they change over time. This is what evolutionary biologists refer to as coevolution.

To solve this problem I introduce the concept of *ecologies of contention*. An ecological approach to Scottish contention brings four main

58

benefits. 1) It provides a framework for studying the multiple actors involved by connecting them through their involvement in common problems. 2) It expands the frame of reference to include interactions between multiple "unlike species". 3) It provides a way of understanding change without recourse to teleology. 4) It recognises that everything has a past, providing a model of social change based on refunctionality: the use of exiting organisational materials for new purposes.

Constructing Ecologies

Delimiting ecologies requires answering two questions: 1) how exactly were the various processes involved yoked together; 2) why did they become intertwined in such a way. Answering these questions requires the identification of a central subject (Hull 1975), which serves as the core of my narrative. As philosopher David Hull clarifies, a central subject is

> a coherent, unitary entity that either persists unchanged or develops continuously through time. At any one moment the parts of an historical entity are interrelated by a variety of relations, among which must be spatial proximity and at least intermittent contiguity. The parts of an historical entity must also be interrelated in such a way that the entity exists continuously through time. But in any case, *for a historical entity to remain the same entity no degree of similarity between earlier and later stages is required, as long as this development is spatio-temporally continuous* (1975: 256; emphasis added).

As the heart of the historical narrative, the central subject is a cluster concept, emerging through its relations and developing through time. Central subjects are historical particulars, which emerge and change as their constituent relations change. Such an existence requires the reconstruction of the subject's relations in order to understand the subject (Abbott 2001a; Cedarman 2005; Emirbayer 1997; Franzosi 2004; Hull 1975; Simmel 1950). These lineages are assigned proper names such as Scotland, Liberal Party and Home Rule movement; but we should not be fooled into believing that the unity of marker reflects unity of the marked: these lineages are always open to change, transforming with their constituent relations. Classifying

and colligating (McCullagh 1978) the various processes involved in the lineage labelled as the problem of Home Rule brings us back to ecologies. For my purposes, the problem of Home Rule for Scotland serves as the central subject.

With the problem of Home Rule as the central subject, its ecology consists of the various groups who work with it, both directly and indirectly. This embeds the problem in numerous networks, with shifts in these ties generating changes in the problem and the way it is approached. This link between actors and their work forms jurisdiction (Abbott 1988).[12] Examining how jurisdictions are created, managed and destroyed provides a framework for understanding how and why problems become contentious in particular ecologies. In this framework, the problem is efficacious: it precedes groups to work with it and can force reorganisation to confront its changes.

In the case of the Scottish movement, the problem of Home Rule involved the national government, Scottish local government, trade unions, Co-operative societies, political parties, socialists, land reformers, communists, Unionists and Home Rule lobbies. For some, the problem provided their sole jurisdiction—Home Rule lobbies, for example—for others, their connection to this particular jurisdiction was weaker because they made their living in other areas of work—for example, land reformers. In the problem-driven ecology of Home Rule, various groups came to work on this particular problem either because it impacted on existing areas of work, as it did for political parties, or it provided new areas of activity which affected existing practices, as it did for labour unions. Cooperation and competition between groups over how the problem was approached formed the basis of contention.

---

[12] In Abbott's discussion of professional development, jurisdictions were more or less exclusive. This was not the case with Scottish Home Rule.

60

Making the problem of Home Rule the central subject brings the larger ecology into view. And in this ecology the primary empirical problems concern how the problem emerged and changed, who worked with it, and how they were organised to perform this work. Shedding light on these issues requires understanding the structure of those interactions.

Interaction of Unlike Species

I have already detailed the variety of lineages involved in the ecology of Scottish Home Rule. Recognising such a broad array of actors has the benefit of connecting the Home Rule movement with other types of contention, as well as highlighting the inseparability of institutional and contentious politics (Goldstone 2003; McAdam et al., 2001; Tilly 2004). The problems of political reorganisation, land reform, labour representation, state/Church relations and economic redistribution were inextricable elements of the problem of Home Rule and partitioning them and their various contenders obscures the subject. Furthermore, separating contentious from institutional politics overlooks the ongoing interactional feedback between the two. However, recognising the interactions of multiple, unlike actors is only half of the issue. The structure of these species interactions provides the other half.

Understanding the structure of these interactions—both relationally and temporally—is crucial to understanding the issues of jurisdictional creation and management. Broadly, these relations constituted coevolutionary dynamics: their interactions—both cooperative and competitive—altered one another as well as their environment.[13] Contentious political activity both influenced institutional politics—e.g., the introduction of Home Rule bills and land reform legislation—and was

---

[13] For an excellent discussion of coevolutionary dynamics of species interaction see Thompson (1999). For useful applications to human organisational systems, see Padgett (2001), Pagie and Mitchell (2002) and Lewin, Long and Carroll (1999). I more fully discuss coevolutionary dynamics below.

influenced by it—e.g., Reform Bills expand the electorate and change party activities.[14]

However, with so many organisations participating in the problem, these interactions took shape in an environment of inter-organisational ambiguity. The Home Rule ecology was a variably coupled system (some elements were tightly coupled, some loosely, all were temporally variable), more strongly resembling a "garbage can" (Beamish 2002; Clarke 1989; Cohen, March and Olsen 1972; March and Olsen 1976) than the highly ordered system of clear preferences and straight-forward plans for problem-solving and goal achievement presumed by many theories of collective action and political practice (Mische and Pattison 2000: 166-67).

Garbage can models of organisational activity examine decision making under conditions of uncertainly. Beginning from the premise of "organized anarchies", it incorporates three basic premises: 1) unclear preferences; 2) unclear technology[15]; and 3) open and temporally fluid participation (Cohen, March and Olsen 1972: 1). Problems and solutions may vary almost independently of each other and applying rationally calculated solutions to clearly defined problems is nearly impossible. As Cohen, March and Olsen explain:

> The organization operates on the basis of a variety of inconsistent and ill-defined preferences. It can be described better as a loose collection of ideas than as a coherent structure; it discovers preferences through action more than it acts on the basis of preferences (ibid.; see also Mische and Pattison 2000 for a similar argument applied specifically to contentious politics).

Means-ends calculations are chimerical: as organisations are involved in a myriad of activities—often working at cross-purposes—it is impossible to

---

[14] This system of coevolutionary feedback undermines the search for distinct causes and effects. The continual interplay between contentious and institutional politics means that any action that might be considered a "cause" can just as easily be feedback "effects". In essence, all events are multivocal, simultaneously in play in multiple relations and cannot be separated into discrete "causes" and "effects". (For an excellent discussion see Abbott 1999b: 34-59; Abbott 2001a: 183-205).

[15] By technology Cohen, March and Olsen are referring to methods for getting work done: hardware, standard operating procedures, organisational histories and learning; repertoires of action; all of which serve this role in contentious politics.

strategically plan to achieve clearly defined goals. A general lack of understanding exacerbates these problems.

Conjoined to these unclear preferences and varied knowledge is fluid participation. "Participants vary in the amount of time and effort they devote to different domains; involvement varies from one time to another" (ibid.). This results in an ever-changing collection of decision makers and audiences. Who participates in problem-solving activities changes at each iteration. Attention spans are limited, and goals change as attention is diverted into new issues. As a result, information about problems and solutions is limited, shifting and sometimes contradictory; priorities change; goals transform.

There is significant debate about how accurately a garbage can model represents organisational behaviour (e.g., Beamish 2002; Clark 1989; for an openly hostile review see Bendor, Moe and Shotts 2001). And Cohen, March and Olsen clearly state its limitations: "A theory of organized anarchy will describe a portion of almost any organization's activities, but will not describe all of them" (Cohen, March and Olsen 1972: 1). Additionally, they note that such a conceptualisation does not hold all of the time. However, expanding the garbage can model to the organisational field is a more accurate representation and provides a frame of reference for understanding the structure of species interactions in the Home Rule ecology. The issues that became the evolving problem of Home Rule produced ambiguities between, as well as within the organisations that came to work with them. Groups regularly entered and left the ecology. Problems and goals were continually changing.

That the problem of Home Rule included so many different actors, affected such a variety of jurisdictions and was embedded in so many networks, meant that the interactions of those working with it took shape in an ambiguous environment, an environment marked by no single leader,

63

shifting definitions of the problem, few mechanisms for regulating who worked with the problem, and a shifting flow of actors. This resulted in overlapping responses or contradictory plans of action, often generating open conflict. Because no single actor or group of actors had a clear mandate to work with the problem, it was easy for groups to become involved with it and just as simple for them to exit the arena. The resulting ecology was large and unwieldy, marked by ambiguity of interactions and goals.

Actors such as the state were multiply embedded in different aspects of the problem, exacerbating certain aspects, while remedying others. As a collection of sub-units, some were powerfully positioned to intervene in the problem, while others often ignored it completely or only intervened in an indirect or tangential manner. This is clearly illustrated by Prime Minister Gladstone's 1886 pronouncement concerning Home Rule. In an effort to settle the ongoing problem of Ireland, concessions were made to Scotland, concessions which were half-heartedly pledged and not readily followed through. The state's involvement over time was further complicated by changes of the party in power and administrative reorganisations. As a result, the state's attention span was limited and often diverted to other projects deemed more pressing.

On the other hand, organisations such as Co-operative groups, with limited direct interest in the issue, were often closely involved due to their ties to Home Rule organisations. William Gallacher, President of the post-War SHRA was simultaneously leader of the Scottish Co-operative movement. One result of this connection was that of the 493 public meetings organised by the SHRA between June 1920 and February 1928,

265 of them, or 54%, were held under the auspices of a Co-operative group.[16]

With no clear boundaries or limits on who could participate and what role they could take, the interorganisational ecology was a truly a garbage can. A myriad of organisations entered and dumped their problems. Some of these problems were taken up by other groups, in essence becoming shared garbage: such as the Young Scots Society's concern with labour conditions (YSH 1911-12: 109) and the labour movement's advocacy of Highland land reform, temperance and Church reform (Keating and Bleiman 1979: Chapter 2). Other problems such as Irish Home Rule fluctuated in importance depending on who was in the field and what other projects were pressing.

The relational foundations of how problems came to be understood as worthy of attention depended on two related points: the number of cans available and how connections to those cans were structured. The number of cans was determined by the number of organisations involved. During the first phase, between 1880 and 1918, for example, the problems of Home Rule were handled by groups such as the SHRA, ISHRL, YSS, the Liberal and Labour parties, several unions and land reform organisations. Each of these groups produced both garbage and cans into which it was stored.

Attention to problems raised was largely a factor of connections between those raising the claim and the organisational channels to which they had access that might connect to solutions. As the YSS was a direct outgrowth of the Liberals, it was capable of maintaining Party attention on the problems it identified. While organisations such as the SHRA, with fewer direct ties to political parties and a more varied, less ideologically uniform membership was less capable of focusing attention on the issues they

---

[16] These data are taken from the SHRA News-Sheet/Scottish Home Rule between August 1920 and February 1928.

raised. Careers buttressed these links. Leaders who were active in multiple organisations simultaneously were more capable of assuring particular issues stayed on the agenda. For organisations that lacked or possessed weaker patron-client, career and leadership ties, connecting problems with solutions—garbage with suitable cans—was often difficult.

Sometimes, though, tightly coupled relations were of little direct help as the type of connection was crucial for directing claims. The ISHRL, under the leadership of F. J. Robertson, a member of Edinburgh Town Council, connected the organisation mainly with local elected officials. Within six months of its establishment in May 1913, 35 of the 61 Honorary Presidents were current or former local office holders (TSN November 1913: 15). The ISHRL was working with the understanding that local support for Home Rule, especially in light of Scotland's long history of administrative autonomy, would help to generate national legislative activity (see Morton 1999). However, close ties with elected officials channelled demands into an ineffectual can. Local government's power was being eroded under the increasingly administratively centralised British state.

It is worth briefly returning to the state. Considering its position as the central target of claims and its deeply influential role in many of the processes comprising the ecology, it is desirable to understand its behaviour. Most organisations demanding Home Rule wielded considerable access to MPs. From the first bill introduced in 1889, Scottish Home Rule bills were regularly introduced until the First World War. The obvious answer is that Scottish Home Rule was a minority issue, advocated by a small number of people through an even (proportionally) smaller number of MPs. However, given the support of the Liberal Party and the laissez faire approach to governing which marked politics of the period before World War I, it is not enough to simply put the response down to indifference; such unresponsiveness requires explanation.

As a large, multi-unit organisation, the state was itself a garbage can and its indifference was an outgrowth of its own processes of problem/solution matching. Gladstone's public support of Home Rule for Scotland in 1886 was responsible for the emergence of a political can for the host of issues which become the problem of Home Rule. But it was not Scotland which was the main problem being solved. Rather Scotland (and Wales) had been included in order to make Irish Home Rule more palatable.

Two key points developed as a result of this which were to influence the state's response to Scotland for the next 50 years. First, Scotland was largely considered an afterthought, with Home Rule only to be considered upon resolution of the Irish problems, in essence, Scotland was a second order problem, shelved until the more pressing problem of Ireland could be resolved. Second, in responding to the increasingly violent Irish situation, the state developed a set of routines and responses which classified a) how to identify a Home Rule movement; b) what the problem of Home Rule entailed; and c) how to respond to claims made. As the Scottish movement never met the criteria (violence, unwillingness to recognise Parliament, etc.) developed by the state's work with Ireland it was never a problem worthy of attention.

The structure of state/Home Rule interactions—which had proceeded through a process of non-violent, "muddling through" (Lindblom 1959; 1979)—meant the state was unable to connect the claims made to its existing understanding of what Home Rule claims meant. However, for Home Rule organisations, the response garnered by Irish activities was assumed to extend Scottish possibilities. The state's responses were understood to pave the way for a Scottish route to Home Rule. While the problems of Ireland and Scotland were tightly coupled for the Home Rulers, they remained loosely coupled for the state. Given the garbage can nature

of the ecology, different actors acted on different interpretations of the problem.

Shifting temporal parameters added to the ambiguity of these variably coupled relations. Time was implicated in species interactions in three ways: encoded histories; the timing of entry, exit and mutation of actors and projects; and organisational attention spans. The past was encoded across three, Chinese-box-like (Simon 1973) levels: macro-social organisation, organisational lineages and careers. By social organisation, I am referring to the historically accumulated macro-conditions in which the problems and organisational solutions took shape, such as governing relations, the economic system, state/society relations. These conditions emerged from long-run historical development, residues of past struggles and developmental paths laid down by settlements at critical junctures. While the structures of history did not have direct control over the present, they shaped the structure of ecologies in powerful, often deterministic ways, providing lenses through which problems were comprehended and the materials from which solutions were cobbled together. The weight of the past—the historical residues of past battles, compromises and alliances— provided a kind of "ecological control" (Padgett 1981).

At the mezzo level, the past was imprinted in organisational lineages, most readily evident in contentious repertoires. Historically accumulated patterns of forming and airing grievances provide the building blocks for understanding and responding to newly emergent, as well as long standing problems. Home Rulers' historically developed methods of confronting problems—from recruitment through local networks to the solicitation of assistance from power patrons—provided the materials for confronting new problems. Historically accumulated patterns of claim-making and response included filters that linked particular actors with particular problems.

68

Careers, particularly of organisational founders and leaders, worked like historical needles and thread, stitching together repertoires as well as organisations. Simply put, the shape of a new organisation was partially determined by the historical background of the leadership, their networks and experiences, what John Padgett (2001) calls the "logic-of-identity". As "the product of the 'mating system' of the population, concatenated to generate historically intertwined lineages of practices and persons" (ibid. 214), the logic-of-identity brings the history of past experiences into new organisational settings. Alternatively, how interorganisational interactions take shape depends on from where the founders and leaders are coming, unfolding through organisational careers, which themselves constitute flows through the larger macro-organisational structure.

More presentist temporal concerns involve the timing of entry, exit and mutation of actors and projects. In this garbage can, the entry and exit of actors into and out of the ecology was not regulated and actors regularly flowed in and out. However, the timing of entry and exits proved crucial. Recalling the co-determination of relations and sequences, when a particular actor entered, exited or mutated often had far reaching effects on the shape of the ecology and the types of interactions possible within it. Consider three brief examples. The rapid decline of the Liberal Party after the First World War and their resulting exit from the ecology redirected lobbying activities towards the Labour Party—species exit. The radicalisation of the Irish Home Rule movement—a project mutation—alienated many Scottish Home Rulers (e.g., SHRA) and energised others (e.g., SNL). The creation of the NPS (the entry of a new actor) alienated many of the SHRA's affiliates such as the STUC (SHR May 1928: 240).

These entries, exists and mutations provide an insight into an ecology in consistent flux. Shifting rates of participation were exacerbated by limited organisational attention spans. As the ecology of Scottish Home

69

Rule was one of several ecologies in which many of the actors participated, actors were involved with a variety of projects, each vying for attention. As attention span is limited, organisations were unable to give equal attention to all projects resulting in a loose ordinal ranking of issues. Similar to relational coupling to problems, attention spans fell into three categories: tightly focused (e.g., Home Rule organisations); moderately focused (e.g., land reform groups, trade unions); and loosely focused (e.g., the state). Changes in personnel, projects and sudden events such as wars all worked to delimit attention spans.

The overlap between attention spans and porous boundaries interacted to bedevil the problem-solving activities of Home Rulers. Temporally variable participation and attention spans conjoined with a variably coupled system of interaction resulted in an ecological garbage can. I want to stress that this ambiguity should not be construed as failure; it is simply an explanatory device. Home Ruler's ties to Co-operative groups, trade unions, socialist organisations and land reforms provided stability. This stability allowed the movement to survive, successfully reproducing itself in the face of rapid turnover of parts (Padgett 1997) because it was capable of drawing upon such a variety of networks. However, by building stability through bricolage, Home Rule organisations operated in an unclear environment. As such, a garbage can model provides the best way of understanding the interaction of these unlike species in the Home Rule ecology.

Change without Teleology

The transformation from lobbies to parties has generally been framed as a march of progress (see e.g., Brand 1978; Harvie 1998; Nairn 1996 [1974]; Webb 1977). Scottish Home Rulers had become, so the story goes, more politically focused, their activities finally becoming modern. This simplistic narrative of "modernisation" is clearly rebutted by the preceding

discussion. In place of an encapsulated entity called "Scottish Nationalism", we find a complex, fluctuating ecology with actors entering, leaving and mutating, goals shifting, interests redefining and strategies changing. Even if particular actors within the ecology possessed a clear telos, it is simply impossible for the ecology as a whole to exhibit similar characteristics.

Following the biological metaphor of ecologies, a model of coevolution, relying on reciprocal changes between interacting agents, more accurately defines how changes occurred in the ecology. Jurisdictions were opened by the emergence of new problems, new actors or the transformation of existing actors and problems. In turn actors changed as their work changed. However, these changes do not imply any sort of linear progression or improvement. Solutions developed are limited by available materials. A coevolutionary framework provides a way of conceptualising change as a process of problem-solving (Haydu 1998). As the problem of situating Scotland within the United Kingdom changed over time, the ways of working with them also changed. More importantly, the solutions enacted at one point—political lobbies for instance—may trigger problems in the future as the original problems change—as parties turned their back on Home Rule, lobbies became ineffective. The transformation of jurisdictions in turn forced the transformation of solutions—lobbies into parties.

Adopting an ecological approach provides a framework that answers questions about organisational development and change without recourse to teleology. The rise of the NPS was not preordained: within the Home Rule ecology the problem was efficacious—as areas of work changed, so did the organisation of those who tried to control it (Abbott 1988). What form these changes took was path dependent, a bush-like structure of coevolution, dead-ends and divergence, not a progressive march towards becoming "modern" (Padgett 2001: 243; Gould 1989). Replacing the advancement narrative with a fluctuating ecology overcomes several problems, but raises

71

another significant one: where do these actors come from? The

coevolutionary framework is a key element to answering this question: as

nothing is fixed, actors are open to redefinition as their relations change. In

the next section, I explore the problems of genesis and transformation more

explicitly.

Organisational Genesis

Thus far, I have focused exclusively on the interactions of existing

actors, taking their existence for granted. Now I want to turn attention to

the challenging problem of genesis. Continuing in the strongly interactionist

stance I have thus far developed, I explore the genesis of new actors

through refunctionality. The groundwork for my solution has been laid in

the proceeding discussion of relations, sequences and ecology, what is left

to explain is how they concatenate into actors.

Let me begin by briefly clarifying what I mean by actors.[17] In the

processual approach I have thus far developed, actors are bundles of

relations, functionalities that are capable of reproducing themselves through

time and affecting their surrounding environment. Actors as processes are

best described as lineages, forever open to change and redirection

depending on the contexts in which they are brought into being.

Transactions provide the bedrock out of which actors emerge.

> But interaction is not merely actors' way of reproducing themselves….
> If we explain change at all, we must begin with it, and hope to
> explain stasis—even the stable entity that is the human personality—
> as a by-product. Previously constituted actors enter interaction, but
> have no ability to traverse inviolable. They ford it with difficulty and
> in it many disappear. What comes out are new actors, new entities,
> new relations among old parts (Abbott 2001a: 266).

John Padgett provides the point of departure for thinking about the

process of actor emergence, explaining: "It is the absence of a theory of

---

[17] For my purpose, actors are organisations; but they may include states, professions, people, social movements, schools of thought. As Andrew Abbott argues: "Rather than taking the individual actor human being as metaphor for the social actor, let us take the social actor as metaphor for the individual human being" (2001a: 264). For an excellent discussion of the network construction of people (specifically Cosimo de' Medici), see Padgett and Ansell (1993).

recombination that inhibits social-science understanding of genesis: we need to take more seriously than we do the fact that nothing exists without a history" (Padgett 2001: 213). What became the Scottish Home Rule movement emerged from a set of coevolving networks; four were central: Irish contention; land reform; labour organisations; and political parties. What was unique about these networks was that while they shared a number of nodes, they were connected by a variety of different logics of operation.

These networks have generally been studied in isolation, their interactions suppressed or ignored. In reality, though, they formed an ecology, where activities in one network were regulated by the happenings in others. This process of ecological feedback provides a framework for understanding how actors development through recombination. Within this ecology, new actors are forged from existing sets of relations, which are themselves constituted by pre-existing systems of meaning and historically embedded practices. "Descriptively, this refunctionality: the use of one social or biological organizational form for a completely different purpose" (Padgett 2001: 215; see also Ertman 1997; Stark 1996; Stark and Burszt 1998; Volkov 2002).

To make better sense of the dynamics of refunctionality, I need to further unpack the notions of embeddedness (Granovetter 1985; McLean 2002; Padgett 2001) and ecological control (Padgett 1981). Embeddedness refers to network co-constitution: what happens in one network is conditioned by its interactions with neighbouring networks. This network co-constitution (Padgett and McLean 2004) explains environmental feedback (Stinchcombe 1965): how changes in one domain—organised labour for instance—may rebound into others—Home Rule politics, for example. Ecological control refers to the way in which this densely woven mat of networks shapes the realm of the possible. The possible forms these

73

networks may take, the ways in which they may be reconfigured and intercalated and the paths down which they may travel are finite. Innovation is constrained by the materials being combined, the space within which combinations are shaped and rules that define interaction. While subsequent chapters paint a fuller picture of these processes, I can at this point at least sketch the basics mechanisms of refunctionality.

Organisational genesis is triggered by the realignment of existing relations. These realignments become stable when they are capable of reproducing themselves through time. Gladstone's active support for Irish Home Rule, connected other problems such as organised labour, land reform and temperance, into a new area of activity called Scottish Home Rule. With the development of a new area of work, new ways of making a living within it developed. A stable configuration emerged through the layering of three flows of activity: careers; organisations; and ecologies. [18]

Careers of ideas and people wove organisations and the ecology together like a basket lattice. For Home Rule organisations, my focus is on flows of leadership through organisations—labour leaders through Co-operative groups and into Home Rule organisations, for example—and the ways they produced individual biographies, and shaped organisational histories. Careers carried repertoires, weaving together different logics of operation; the paths taken by individuals through a variety of organisations shaped different conceptions of control and how activity should be undertaken (Fligstein 1990). That the Scottish ecology was organised like a garbage can meant that careers followed often seemingly random paths (March and March 1977), adding to the ambiguity of mobilisation.

---

[18] My discussion focuses almost exclusive attention on the relational materials being recombined. This is not to discount the cultural or social psychological elements of this process. Rather it is a function of the division of labour that operates between network and institutionalist perspectives on organisational change. For a review which focuses on the cultural/cognitive aspects of organisational genesis in contentious politics, see Clemens (1993; 1997). For a specific discussion of this process in social movements from a strongly social psychological perspective see Melucci (1996).

Careers of people and ideas were themselves embedded in larger organisational contexts. Careers and the histories they carry may be conceived of as organisational DNA, but their unfolding into new organisations was "hardly a matter of automatic template and design. Actual living organizations...are the developmental products of these founder logics, interacting with the inherent properties of the...raw materials being assembled" (Padgett 2001: 214). These raw materials include ties between organisations with an interest in Home Rule and their links to particular areas of work. Home Rule organisations had to nest into particular sets of relations, continually negotiating amongst ambiguous goals and changing rates of participation. The ecology emerged from the layering of careers, the activities of organisations and shifting ties to the Home Rule jurisdiction.

The big question yet to be answered is how is refunctionality triggered and this requires an ecological viewpoint. During the first phase of the movement (1886-1914), refunctionality was triggered by political realignment, which cascaded across a set of related networks. Gladstone's proclamation of support for Home Rule was simply the most obvious example, but an entire wave of political reorganisation was taking shape in Scotland: the state was centralising and localism was declining (Dyer 1996). The second phase (1914-1930)—the transformation from lobbies to parties—was triggered by war. The First World War realigned a number of key networks (mainly political and economic ones) that forced reorganisation in Home Rule organisations. The pre-War alignment was disrupted: existing avenues for airing grievances were disrupted, new problems emerged and existing conceptions of the problem and its solution changed. During both periods, the way in which jurisdictions and ways of working with them were significantly rewired. The problems and ways of working with them were remade. The details of how this took place are explored in Chapters 3 through 7.

The Trip So Far...

Before continuing, I want to pause briefly and reflect on what I have accomplished so far. These first two chapters have had two main goals: 1) to reclassify the Scottish Home Rule movement as contentious politics; 2) to provide a framework capable of fruitfully analysing the shifting organisational means by which it was practised over a 50 year period. Let me briefly review the strategies I have employed for each.

My review of the literature on nationalism identified a raft of problems. It has long been understood as a discourse, state of mind (either individual or collective) or ideology. Defining it as such, commentators have used an inflexible set of tools to discern its existence, trajectory and outcomes. The application of these invariant models of nationalism has served to obscure what actually happened in Scotland with demands for what should have happened. Examinations of the Home Rule movement as nationalism have proceeded by making Scotland a negative case, generally searching for what failures of nerve, political timing, elite organisation or cultural resilience might be labelled as the source of its failure.

As a result, what we know about the Scottish Home Rule movement is obscured by the invariant models used to study it. By beginning with the notion that nationalism possesses a stock of standard traits, which taken in proper proportions of necessary and sufficient condition resulting in extremely similar outcomes, scholars of Scotland and nationalism have done more harm than help in their discussions. Applying law-like generalisations, they have obscured what happened with laments about what should have happened.

In place of invariant models of nationalism, I have argued for contentious politics. With its focus on mutual claim-making, it provides a clearer way of understanding what occurred. Gone are the demands that independence is the goal of all movements and those that do not achieve it

are failures; gone are the questions as to why Scotland refused to demand independence until the 1920s; gone are the searches for discourses of nation. Further, because the focus is on claim-making, the contentious politics programme is capable of including a variety of different actors, which have generally been left out of nationalism's programme. Opening the field of examination to include all those activities which were involved in raising claims changes the terms of investigation. Rather than searching for reasons why this well-developed nation did not become a state, I reframe the problem as an organisational problem, asking why did the organisational means by which contentious politics was practiced change?

This redefinition of the problem includes a set of further changes. My demand for a relational approach to contention is certain not new. Several scholars in the field have advocated it. My focus on time is again not new, although it is not nearly as widespread. Taken together my processual understanding of social life and contentious politics is nothing revolutionary, even if it is in the minority. The terms of this processual approach, though, are more contentious.

Rather than studying actors with interests, I have adopted a model from the study of professions and focused on work: who does it, how and why. Furthermore, I have argued that by making areas of work— jurisdiction—central to the investigation we can better understand how particular groups came to work with a problem, why they approach it particular ways and what impels them to stop working with it. This has required the introduction of the concept of ecologies of contention. Where a variety of unlike actors work with a set of problems collectively known as Home Rule, their interactions alter one another as well as the operating environment—a process of coevolution. This has reframed the problem from one of discourse to an issue of contention stemming from problems and solution.

77

However, due to the nature of the problem, the variety of actors involved and the shifting temporal and relational parameters of the problem, the ecology was more a garbage can than a neatly ordered arena. As a result, Home Rule was a can into which several problems were dumped, and with which numerous groups claimed a right to work. Contention resulted from claims over how the problems should be approached, who had a right to work with them and what constituted a viable solution. It is helpful to think of a field of groups and tasks. Groups were mapped over tasks, but not in a one-to-one manner. Some groups overlap with multiple tasks—the state, labour unions, land reformers, socialists—while some groups work in a single area—Home Rule lobbies.

Change in this ecological perspective stemmed from the entry, exit or mutation of actors, projects or ways of working. This notion of change provided a way of thinking about the emergence of new actors in evolutionary terms: new actors are built through the recombination of old ones—refunctionality. Refunctionality recognises that all activities and actors are multiply embedded and that any shift in one set of relations is likely to cause shifts in others. Andrew Abbott (1988: 319) nicely sums up this processual approach, explaining:

> History is first and foremost a tangled net of events. Each event lies in dozens of stories, determined and overdetermined by the causes following them, yet ever open to new directions and twists. Indeed given happenings may be seen as parts of different events within different stories. Because people and groups construct their future by interpreting their causal environment, the very knowledge of the past shapes the future, even though aggregate regularities and structural necessities oblige it.

Conceptualising a world of processes requires a radical departure from our existing understandings; however with it, we are provided with a much more powerful way of studying social life.

Chapter 3: The Structure of the Conjuncture

Before there were lobbies, there were unions and crofters, politicians and parties, Irish nationalists and land reformers, each working with a set of problems, some overlapping, others distinct. Explaining how lobbies emerged from this array of actors and activities requires an exploration of how these groups were organised, the problems they faced and the ways they worked to manage them. In effect, it requires an understanding of the operating environment. I focus on the operating environment because existing patterns of organisation chose and channelled activity. In effect, cognition—in terms of how problems were defined, approached and solved— was distributed, shaped and moulded by the multiple organisational contexts in which it unfolded (Hutchins 1995; March and Olsen 1984; Padgett 1981; 2001; Simon 1973: 7-8). While it would be tempting to assume that changing patterns of social organisation simply altered individual's cost-benefits perceptions (David 1994) or passively contributed to a teleological path of increasing modernisation, doing so blinds us from recognising the contingent, multi-stranded nature of social life.

Embracing this complexity, this chapter reconstructs the structure of the conjuncture, examining the forces that coalesced to shape the rise of lobbies. Employing the ecological garbage can approach to Scottish contention described in Chapter 2, I seek to answer four questions: 1) how did this particular set of problems become entwined; 2) why were they considered important; and 3) how were particular courses of action initiated? A fourth overarching question—"why now?"—bundles these three questions tightly together.

Too often in studies of the Scottish Home Rule movement, commentators have looked to essences to establish the roots of contention; searching for enduring cores, generally elements of a something akin to a national spirit. Often this search has focussed on national institutions and

cultural artefacts; for Scotland, the trinity of Kirk, Law and Education is the most prominent example. While it is undeniable that historical antecedents and deeply entrenched institutions shaped Scottish contention at the end of the nineteenth century, it would be incorrect to assume that the developing Home Rule movement was simply a continuation of earlier episodes or a teleological advance. The 1880s represented a specific historical conjuncture out of which a new set of actors and activities emerged. What became the Scottish Home Rule movement began as a series of activities taking shape in numerous institutional arenas, each with their own histories and established patterns of activity, which cascaded into one another.

Even with the recognition of Home Rule as a conjunctural event, it is imperative not to assume its inevitability.

> We know that the further we go down the genealogical tree, the wider the tree gets. This doesn't mean that the whole human race of twenty generations ago was directed towards producing some one individual, anymore than it means that one individual twenty generations ago produced all those progeny of today. Reproduction is a woven net, not a tree.

> As with people, so with events. To search for all the causal ancestors, or causal descendants, of a given event is merely a rhetorical convenience. Since history interweaves sequences of events, the combination of two stories with one result prevents their combination with other results. Openings created by one sequence of events may or may not be taken advantage of by another; structural necessities constrain, but sufficient actions determine the outcomes of situations. An analytic rhetoric of narration must preserve this adventitious but structured character. Such a rhetoric must leave events in their immediate temporal context. It must follow the blind alleys as well as the thoroughfares by which history produced the present (Abbott 1988: 280-81).

This point is particularly clear with the Scottish Home Rule movement and forms part of the larger problem of building an ecological narrative. Two central issues confront the assembler of such narratives. 1) Events did not arrive in an orderly fashion; they overlapped, with differing durations and intensities, their importance often not realised until long after their

initial appearance.[1] 2) The problems that were pulled together to form the Home Rule jurisdiction were idiosyncratically pieced together; this organisation channelled events leading to constrained, non-linear transformations, with shifts cascading through multiple networks. As a result, events were implicated in any number of lineages, producing a thickly woven mat of historical contingency.

Furthermore, as problems involved a myriad of different groups and relations, the Home Rule ecology was a fluctuating system. Groups entered and exited, varying in their attention spans and level of involvement; as problems developed, some were resolved, some mutated into new issues and some were trundled off into new lineages effectively leaving the Home Rule ecology. This shifting, fluctuating system of actors and activities means that some of those that are vital at the beginning of a process may no longer play a part at the end. In terms of our journey, this process of coupling and decoupling comprises the ever-changing landscape viewed from our particular seats on this train.

To build a comprehensible narrative, without eschewing the complexity of historical reality, I use a two-fold approach. In the first part, I outline the four main elements of the conjuncture, paying specific attention to the institutional changes out of which they developed. Following the problems both forward and backward in time, I examine how they intersected and interacted, were bundled together and broken apart, embedding them into their operating environment. By beginning with existing areas of activity, problems to be solved and solutions looking for work, I illustrate how and why they were harnessed together into a new entity called Scottish Home Rule. This process addresses three issues: problems generating work in the ecology, such as Irish contention and land

---

[1] As Arthur Danto (1985: Chapter 8) explains in his discussion of Francesco Petrarca's famous essay describing his climb of Mount Ventoux: Petaraca knew he was climbing and knew that he was writing, but was unaware that he was opening the Renaissance as his essay is often claimed to have done.

reform; forces outside of the ecology directly impacting how problems were understood and worked with, for example, political reform; and the forces such as organisational development which removed and introduced actors into and out of the ecology.[2]

Unpacking these three processes brings me to point two: evaluating the mechanisms that linked problems together; changed how they were understood; and transformed them. As there was no functional prerequisite for problems to become jurisdictional arenas, it is necessary to illustrate how changing relations between social sites intercalated existing lineages, connecting and reorganised some, creating new ones and disconnecting others. Crucially, what events activated particular ties and how were these crosscutting relations yoked together into new forms of organisation (e.g., Ansell 1997)?

Exploring these issues necessarily involves moving across multiple levels or scales of analysis, but rather than thinking of translations from micro to macro (or the reverse), it is more apt to recognise these mechanisms as fractal: exhibiting similar feature regardless of the scale at which they are viewed (Goldstone 1990: 278).[3] Mechanisms such as the political entrepreneurship of Charles Waddie, normally conceived as a micro-level phenomenon, are strikingly similar to middle range mechanisms such as coalition formation that are nearly identical to arguably macro mechanisms such as political realignment. In each instance, new connections were made, existing ties were confirmed, broken or changed and new actors and ways of acting emerged. The combination of these two strategies provides a framework for a more realistic, albeit non-traditional,

---

[2] As Cohen, March and Olsen (1972: 3) remind us: "every entrance is an exit somewhere else...."
[3] In addition to this fractal approach to social mechanisms it is important to recall that a processual understanding of social life disregards traditional sociological obsessions with micro and macro in favour of actions concatenating into actors and activities, developing both contexts and those that act within them. From such a perspective, historically rich lineages of activity provide the materials out of which actors emerge; identities, dispositions and justifications for actions develop from relational positions, unfolding in particular times and places. Social organisation, therefore, provides the ultimate starting point.

narrative.

The Structure of the Conjuncture

Problems arising in a number of institutional sectors formed the Scottish Home Rule conjuncture. Irish contention intersected with demands for Highland land reform, which crossed with British trade union reorganisation, which linked with changing party politics, which traversed the reorganisation of national political parties in Scotland, interacting with demands for local political management, all of which was ensconced in a framework of expanding representative politics. Viewed from the perspective of any one activity, it is not apparent how Scottish Home Rule emerged. But taken together these pieces form a vibrant mosaic. Irish contention provides a point of entry into this maze of problems, solutions and institutional transformations.

The Contentious Irish

Shortly after their revolt of March 5th, 1867, the Fenians published what was to become their manifesto, *Proclamation of an Irish Republic*. In it, they passionately set forth their grievances.

> The soil of Ireland, at present in the possession of an oligarchy, belongs to us, the Irish people, and to us it must be restored....
>
> We appeal to the Highest Tribunal for evidence of the justness of our cause. History bears testimony to the integrity of our sufferings, and we declare, in the face of our brethren, that we intend no war against the people of England—our war is against the aristocratic locust, whether English or Irish, who have eaten the verdure of our fields— against the aristocratic leeches who drain alike our fields and theirs.
>
> Republicans of the entire world, our cause is your cause. Our enemy is your enemy. Let your hearts be with us. As for you, workmen of England, it is not only your hearts we wish, but your arms. Remember the starvation and degradation brought to your fireside by the opposition of labour. Remember the past, look well to the future, and avenge yourselves by giving liberty to your children in the coming struggle for human liberty (O'Day and Stevenson 1992: 77).

The proclamation gave shape to what was then a loosely defined array of Irish complaints, chief among them land and rule by a foreign power. It served as a rallying cry to link the local problems of land reform with the

83

national issues of Irish subjugation. Most importantly for this analysis, though, was that these demands were attracting significant parliamentary attention.

As historian Alan O'Day (1998: 24) writes, the Fenian proclamation had four immediate consequences:

> the formation of a clemency movement on behalf of the activists who had been imprisoned as a result of the rebellion; concern by middle-class leaders to form a platform to contain the Fenian threat; the reanimation of clerical involvement in politics; and [most importantly from a Scottish perspective] the renewed interest of British politicians in Irish reform.

Catholic mobilisation was typified by the Dean of Limerick, who by 1868 had gathered 16,000 clerical signatures calling for Repeal of the Union. Isaac Butt, a protestant barrister and former Tory MP gave a face to middle class mobilisation by founding the Amnesty Association in June 1869, which actively campaigned for the release of the imprisoned rebels. Taken together, Irish contention was becoming formally organised and politically active, and directing its claims towards parliament.

The election of 1868 was marked by this flurry of Irish activity. Liberal party leader William Gladstone established reform in Ireland as a central plank of the party's platform. With the Liberal victory and Gladstone's installation as Prime Minister, a series of reforms quickly followed. Gladstone authorised the release of 82 prisoners between 1869 and 1871, at least partially in response to Irish demands. Despite this reprieve, contentious activity continued apace with 411 public demonstrations between July and October of 1869. In October alone, the small borough of Ennis hosted a clemency meeting attended by an estimated 40,000, with some 200,000 attending demonstrations in Dublin (ibid.26-27).

Largely in response to continued popular contention, the Gladstone government's legislative agenda was dominated by Irish reforms. The single

biggest piece of legislative reform came with the Irish Church Bill of 1869.

Providing disestablishment from 1871, the Act offered something for both

Catholics and Protestants by reforming the establishment out of existence.

Gladstone's willingness to respond to popularly raised demands redefined

the relationship between Westminster and Ireland. Yet, while popular

contention had been crucial to improving political equality, the relationship

between Ireland and Britain remained far from democratic. However, these

legislative victories had significantly reorganised one aspect of Irish

contention—establishing the success of legislative means.

Although the Irish Church Bill provided for several of the issues

raised by popular protest, the significant problem of land reform remained

unanswered. While Gladstone did succeed in enacting the Irish Land Act in

1870, its provisions were limited and disappointing to tenants who remained

without security of tenure. Soon the issue of land reform was hitched to the

Home Rule wagon. And in 1870, the Home Government Association

spearheaded by Isaac Butt was established. In spite of Butt's insistence that

the organisation remain the domain of a small group of gentlemen, his

advocacy of a federal model of Home Rule did dominate the Home Rule

movement for the first half of the 1870s and provided an umbrella under

which land reformers, Fenians and Catholic leaders all took refuge, however

spotty the coverage.

By the end of 1876, though, tensions in the coalition erupted into

open hostility with Fenians regularly breaking-up Home Rule Association

meetings. By August, Fenians began acting under a decree passed by the

Supreme Council on 28 May, which stated:

> that the countenance which have hitherto shown to the Home Rule
> movement be from this date, and is hereby, withdrawn as three
> years' experience of the working of the movement has proved to us
> that the revolutionary principles which we profess can be better
> served by our organisation existing on our basis pure and simple;
> and we hereby request that all members of our organisation who may
> have any connection to the Home Rule movement will actively

> withdraw from their active co-operation within six months of this date
> (ibid. 45).

Whereas the organisation had been successful in achieving some goals, it was unable to revive the level of legislative attention garnered during the first three years of Gladstone's administration. Demands for federalism were met with declining parliamentary attention capped by the Queen's Speech of 1877 in which Ireland was made few legislative promises. In wake of this reversal of fortunes, the Irish Home Rule movement underwent a significant transformation driven by the conjuncture of environmental, economic and political changes.

Environmental and economic problems coincided in the late 1870s with poor harvests resulting from cool, wet summers. Compounding the fear of famine, agricultural prices dropped precipitously between 1877 and 1879. For example, the price of Irish butter fell from 137s to 100s per hundredweight and the Irish potato crop lost 40% of its value between 1876 and 1878. By 1879, Irish agricultural production was worth less than two-thirds of its 1876 value.[4] With withering crops and limited income, tenant farmers faced increasingly coercive demands from landowners.

Politically, the cause of land reform was given an organisational boost by three events. The first was expanding organisational influence of the Fenians. Initially drawing their support from city-based groups of merchants, shopkeepers and other members of an ascendant middle class, they were able to make inroads into rural areas through a process of organisational alliance. They worked as "an 'entryist' party which infiltrated legal nationalist movements of all sorts and attempted to use them for extremist purposes" (Garvin 1986: 478). The lasting impacts of this policy were multiple. By aligning themselves with a number of sympathetic organisations, the Fenians connected the more rurally salient issues of land

---

[4] All figures are taken from O'Day (1998: 59).

86

reform to Home Rule. Building these connections offered a broader base for

support by connecting the national issue Home Rule with more ostensibly

local problems such as land tenure.

> The increasing influence of Irish expatriates based in America
> provided the second major factor shaping Irish contention (Garvin
> 1986; O'Brien 1964;). Famine emigrants and their children provided
> a significant source of moral and monetary support. They were often
> more radical than domestic activists in both their hatred of
> landlordism and their intense desire to rid Ireland of the British. As
> both financial and ideological backers of the movement, they proved
> to be a decisive force.
> The leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell provided a point of

convergence for these two factors. Parnell had risen to prominence during

the 1877 parliamentary session for his role as an obstructionist. By

monopolising parliamentary debates with long-winded, marginally relevant

speeches and lengthy procedural motions (Parnell's forte), the

obstructionists pressed for attention to Irish problems by thwarting other

business. By the end of the 1870s, this tactic had served to exacerbate the

split in the Home Rule leadership, with two significant consequences: 1)

Parnell assumed leadership of a rapidly changing Home Rule movement; and

2) parliament became a central battleground for Irish Home Rule.

The Land War of 1880-82 marked a turning point for Home Rule-

Westminster relations. At the centre of Irish agitation was the Land League,

founded by the Fenian Michael Davitt and headed by Parnell. During this

period, Parnell was known as the uncrowned King of Ireland; however, his

power was far from absolute. His control over the Land League was limited

by its organisation along branch lines and often the central leadership was

powerless when it came to the activities of branch leaders. As a result, rural

violence escalated despite Parnell's calls for calm.

The government's response was a mixture of legislation and

repression. The legislative response centred on Protection of Persons and

Property Act (1881) which established tenants' rights to compensation for

improvements and investments. It also established land courts where

tenants could press their claims against landlords. In terms of repression, a number of prominent Irish MPs, including Parnell, were arrested as well as several Land League branch leaders. However, when this strategy failed to pacify rural contention, the Gladstone administration returned to their legislative efforts.

Gladstone's renewed legislative programme pressed on two fronts: 1) land reform, specifically the expansion of the 1881 Act; and 2) crime control, manifested in the Prevention of Crime Bill (1882), which allowed for trial without jury in cases of murder and treason as well as extending summary jurisdiction over a host of minor matters. Key to both measures was Gladstone's unwillingness to consult or work directly with Parnell or the Land League, which was eventually suppressed in 1882. By circumventing Parnell and his party, Gladstone worked to reposition Westminster from a position of response to action (O'Day 1998: 75-76). The Irish responded with the development of the Irish National League (INL, a diminished version of the Land League), which continued under Parnell's leadership. At this point Irish contention bifurcated. Local violence continued unabated, largely outside of the control of Parnell's centralising aspirations. Meanwhile, Parnell and his party worked to advance a reformist, although not explicitly Home Rule, agenda in parliament. As historian Conor Cruise O'Brien explains:

> The Parnellite movement differed from earlier and later Irish movements of importance, by reason of the primacy in it of the parliamentary principle. It convinced the Irish people that, through their representation at Westminster, they could secure the agrarian and political reforms which they desired. 'The party' under Parnell's leadership achieved an importance which no political party in Ireland had ever had before, and it came to exercise a decisive influence, for a time, on the politics of the United Kingdom (O'Brien 1964: 9).

With the quelling of the Land War in 1882, parliament was established as the main battleground for the Irish contention. This was largely a result of two complementary forces. First, Parnell had consolidated

his hold on parliamentary representation of Irish interests by purging radical elements from the INL, pressing a broad-ranging progressive programme and treading lightly around the issue of self-government. With a tighter organisational structure built around Parnell, the INL was capable of maintaining parliamentary interest in Irish problems. The second front arose from Liberal policy. Keen to see an end to Irish problems, Gladstone began formulating a plan for Irish Home Rule; a plan based largely on the Liberal platform of local administration and political decentralisation. This policy culminated in Gladstone's 1886 announcement of support for Home Rule All Round.

In the language of garbage can theory, Irish contention was a choice situation (Cohen, et al. 1972; March and Olsen 1979: 10-37). Choice situations offer opportunities for organisations to do a number of things: making decisions, changing policies, exercising organisational routines, airing grievances, reaffirming positions and solving problems. They are also invitations to other parties—directly or otherwise involved—to intervene in the decision under consideration or to introduce new matters (again, either related or not).[5]

With Irish contention increasingly occupying parliamentary time and governmental resources, generating significant specialised legislation, Scottish claimants increasingly complained of Irish usurpation of Scotland's parliamentary position. From within parliament, Lord Rosebery captured the Scottish position:

> But I confess I think Scotland is as usual treated abominably. Justice for Ireland means everything done for her even the payment of the native's debts. Justice to Scotland means insulting neglect. I leave for Scotland next week with the view of blowing up a prison or shooting a policeman....[6]

---

[5] The availability to participate is dependent on the rules of interaction, either formally defined or tacitly understood. For the Scots, the political rules of participation and the means by which it could be undertaken were both changing during this period. I will discuss these changes in detail below.

[6] Rosebery (1882) quoted in Ferguson (1990: 325).

SHRA leader Charles Waddie sarcastically added: "the Irish have taught us a lesson as we thank them for it. Nothing is conceded by England to reason and justice. Make yourself disagreeable enough, and you will get what you want" (LHR 14 January 1888: 13). As a choice situation, Irish-Westminster contention increasingly invited Scottish intervention, with the demands, targets and repertoires of the Irish reflected in Scottish activity.

Highland Land Reform

On 19 April 1882 a contingent of police from the Glasgow constabulary were met by a boisterous crowd of crofters on the Isle of Skye. The immediate cause of the crofter's mobilisation was anger over loss of pasture rights, refusal to pay rents and resistance to forced relocation. The ensuing clash, known as the Battle of Braes, marked the beginning of what became known as the "crofters' war", involving sustained clashes between 1882-1886, continuing intermittently until the beginning of the First World War. A group of ad hoc organisations were soon established to advocate political intervention in the crofters' claims. But it was with the establishment of the Highland Land Law Reform Association of London (HLLRA) on 31 March 1883, that these forces were brought to a national level. The HLLRA gave a national, political face to the crofter's cause; and taking advantage of the 1884 Reform Act, they returned crofter's MPs in both the 1885 and 1886 general elections. What began as a dispute over grazing rights became a national political movement, providing a significant strand in the developing Home Rule tapestry.

The Scottish crofting community, like their counterparts in Ireland, lived in perilous conditions, suffering famine during the middle part of the nineteenth century, with agriculture only slowly rebounding by the 1870s. Compounding the troubles brought on by the potato blight, landlords were increasingly moving their tenants to less productive property, diverting old crofters' claims to deer runs, sheep grazing and sport shooting. Land

owners, increasingly feeling the financial pinch generated by the declining agricultural value of their holdings, actively sought to move their financially draining tenants. This programme of converting crofters' plots to new uses dramatically increased the value of the property, in turn increasing rents on the new, less productive parcels on which crofters were forced to settle.

Faced with increasing rents for worse properties, no fixity of tenure, near starvation conditions and ever dwindling opportunities for property ownership, many crofters moved, generally into urban areas or abroad (often Canada, Australia or New Zealand). The scale of depopulation was stark, as evidenced by figures from the outer islands. Tiree's population fell from a peak in 1831 of 4,453 to 2,773 in 1881; Skye's population tumbled from 23,074 in 1841 to 17,680 in 1881; and by 1881, the county of Sunderland's population had fallen nearly 10% from a peak of 25,793 in 1851 and this despite a infamous earlier clearing (Smout 1986: 69). Their moves were sometimes willing, often with aid of relocation groups and landlord assistance, and sometimes by force under threat of the sheriff. But as historian T.C. Smout explains, from the mid-1850s estate policy in the Highlands was "not violent eviction, but the quiet encouragement to remove, the easing out, of people who could often pay little in rent and who might become a substantial liability if they stayed" (ibid.).

By the 1880s, soft suggestion and gentle persuasion were replaced with violence and political mobilisation. Paralleling Irish agitation, Highland land reformers began raising claims against landlords and parliament. This new period of Highland ferment was ushered in by the Battle of Braes. While grazing disputes provide the background, it was attempts to serve judicial notices which were instrumental in bringing the Glasgow constabulary to this northern outpost of the British Isles. Andrew Martin, working in his combined roles as sheriff's officer and clerk to the factor of the Macdonald estate (one of the largest landowners on Skye), was

91

assaulted by several crofters living on the estate while he attempting to serve summonses. The assembled crofters and their wives forced Martin "to burn the summonses he was about to deliver, and severely buffeted both him and a companion" (Hanham 1969b: 24). Fearing revolt, the sheriff, William Ivory, requested support from the Glasgow constabulary.

Recording the events of 19 April, Ivory recounted what befell his group comprised of "two Sheriffs, two Fiscals, a Captain of police, forty-seven members of the Glasgow police force, and a number of the county constabulary, as well as a couple of newspaper representatives from Dundee and Glasgow, and [bizarrely] a gentleman representing a well-known Glasgow drapery house" (ibid. 24-25) as they set out on the eight-mile march to Braes. A few miles into their journey, the silence was broken by "a collection of men, women, and children, numbering well on to 100. They cheered as we mounted the knoll and the women saluted the policemen with volleys of sarcasm about their voyage from Glasgow" (ibid. 26). A hail of stones soon followed this verbal assault. With several injuries on both sides, the police advance continued all the while facing stiff resistance from the crofters; the police in turn made free use of truncheons (ibid. 29). Ivory details a catalogue of cuts, gashes, collisions, swollen limbs and a hillside where "scores of bloody faces could be seen" (ibid.). "After the serious scrimmage at Gedintailler", Ivory concludes,

> no further demonstration of hostility were made, and the procession went on, without further adventure, to Portree [the small town near Braes]. Rain fell without intermission during the entire journey out and home, and all arrived at their destination completely exhausted. On arrival in town the police were loudly hooted and hissed as they passed through the square to the jail, and subsequently when they marched from the Court-house to the Royal Hotel (ibid. 29-30).

Continued disturbances on Skye led to the deployment of a marine-staffed gunboat to the island in 1883. Throughout 1884-85, contention spread throughout the Hebrides, evidenced by entire crofting communities refusing to pay rent and the forcible seizure of some large sheep farms. It

was not land alone, however, that generated crofters' claims. Their overwhelming allegiance to the Free Church, and a strict interpretation of Biblical rules provided both ties and rhetorics around which mobilisation took shape. This was exemplified by the events of Strome Ferry, where on Sunday 3 June 1883, where a group of approximately 150 men, many of them crofters, confronted workers who were breaking the Sabbath by unloading fishing boats. As H.J. Hanham explains: "the following weekend the authorities were so alarmed that they assembled several hundred policemen, with detachments of troops from Fort George and Edinburgh in reserve, in order to prevent further trouble" (1969b: 22).

The Battle of Braes and the continued upheaval that followed it represented a watershed in the political history of the Highlands. Whereas the "violent clash between crofters and the Lewis estate authorities, the so-called Bernera Riot" of 1874 had garnered little notice from those outside the Highlands, the Battle of Braes captured considerable attention—both supportive and repressive (Hunter 1974: 48). Like its counterpart in Ireland, the changing relations between popular contention and governmental intervention was generating shifts in the Scottish repertoire, which were eventually carried into claims for Home Rule.

Political Mobilisation of the Highlands

Like Irish contention, the crofters' war was a choice situation: a problem to be solved and an opportunity to act. The publicity these events received brought together a broad array of groups: Scotch Gaelic revivalists, Irish Home Rulers, MPs, political parties, supporters of the land reform policies of Henry George, Scottish trade councils and of course, the crofters' themselves, both local and expatriate (Crowley 1956; Hunter 1974; 1975; Newby 2003).

One of the first groups to enter the fray was the Irish Land League. Following the events in Skye, Donald H. MacFarlane, Parnellite member for

County Carlow, soon became the crofters' chief parliamentary advocate; while "at the same time, the Glasgow branches of the Irish Land League were showing an increasing interest in the crofting question" (Hunter 1974: 49). The level of this interest was evidenced by the 1881 appropriation by the Irish Land League of funds for the crofters, which were sent via their Glasgow branch (Newby 2003: 80). MacFarlane's parliamentary support was buttressed by the Highland tours of Edward McHugh.

As the Scottish organiser of the Land League of Great Britain (LLGB, an organisation dedicated to the land policies of Henry George), McHugh was a close associate of the Irish Land League and a friend of Michael Davitt. In 1882, he spent three months touring the Highlands as part of a LLGB-sponsored programme centring on land issues and Highland mobilisation (ibid. 81-82). This proselytising programme, while limited in realising its Georgite goals, did succeed in brokering critical ties between the Irish and Scottish land campaigns. Working together with Highland expatriates and land agitators, principally Alexander McKenzie and John Murdoch, McHugh's group were instrumental as brokers connecting the battle-hardened Irish campaigners with emerging Highland organisations. These ties had far reaching effects on the Highland mobilisation, offering templates for organising and bringing together Irish, socialist and Highland grievances (Hunter 1975; Newby 2003).

The government's response to events in the Highlands was shaped by its experiences in Ireland. In both cases they met demands along two seemingly contradictory fronts. As noted above, police were swiftly mobilized when events threatened to turn violent. However, the repertoire of government-crofter transactions was soon developing on another front: conciliation. When MacFarlane, the Parnellite MP who had originally championed the crofters' case petitioned the Gladstone administration in December 1882 for a commission to review their claims, his request

94

was flatly refused. Gladstone replied, "no such question [is] under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government" (ibid.). The following month, the same fate befell the demands of Scottish Liberal MPs, of whom 21 signed a motion calling for a royal commission to investigate crofters' claims. A complete reversal of policy took place on the 26th of February, when Gladstone announced the formation of a royal commission to evaluate the crofters' complaints under the leadership of Lord Napier. Patterned on earlier Irish land legislation, the Commission was specifically charged with discerning the nature of the crofters' grievances. Fulfilling this remit, the Napier Commission convened hearings throughout the Highland in order evaluate the crofters' claims.

In the period between the Battle of Braes and the announcement of the Napier Commission, local groups and ad hoc associations such as the Highland Land Law Reform Associations of Edinburgh and Inverness and the Skye Vigilante Committee were established and staffed by leading Gaelic enthusiasts such as John Stuart Blackie and Alexander MacKenzie (Crowley 1956: 112-113; Hunter 1974: 50). Their activities were buttressed by the Federation of Celtic Societies, which counted Blackie as one its central figures. The Federation, with the support of the radical North British Daily Mail organised a petition drive demanding a parliamentary investigation.[1]

However, the impact of these organisations was limited. The Federation of Celtic Societies was a relatively powerless umbrella organisation, and was effectively moribund by the early 1880s. The local HLLRAs were informally organised and provincial in remit. It was the establishment of the Highland Land Law Reform Association of London that brought the crofters' mobilisation to a finer point. Headed by a collection of

---

[1] Crowley (1956: 115) reports the petition as having been signed by as many as 45,000 people in Glasgow alone. However, the veracity of Crowley's sources, principally James Cameron's *The Old and New Highlands and Hebrides*, has been called into question (see esp. Hanham 1969b; Hunter 1975).

Gaelic revivalists, MPs (Liberal, Lib-Lab and Parnellite; D.H. MacFarland was the organisation's first president), land reformers and Irish sympathisers, the HLLRA built a platform similar to that of the Irish Land League. They augmented the three central planks of fair rents, fixity of tenure and compensation for improvement, with a specifically Scottish demand for "such an apportionment of land as will promote the welfare of the people throughout the Highlands and Islands" (Hunter 1974: 50).

The organisation immediate set to work preparing crofters for the Napier Commission. Working together with the LLGB, which was offered covert support by the Irish Land League (Newby 2003: 80), the HLLRA was hugely successful in shaping the Napier Report, relying largely on lessons learned in Ireland.[2] The uniformity of answers and the number of pre-prepared statements submitted by crofters' to the committee reveal the success of the mobilisation (ibid. 87). When the Commission published its 1884 report, it proposed replicating the Irish legislation of 1881 in Scotland, save the establishment of land courts.

In response, the HLLRA held it first annual meeting. Boasting a membership of nearly 5,000, the HLLRA welcomed the Report, but argued that it failed to go far enough (Hunter 1974: 52). At the Dingwall meeting, the assembled members pressed for a more radical response. Chief among its propositions being the establishment of land courts which would redistribute land in the crofters' favour and, perhaps most importantly, they "announced that at the next general election the HLLRA would only support parliamentary candidates for the northern constituencies who approve of this programme and promise to support a Bill to give it full legislative effect" (ibid. 53).

---

[2] The INL's support for the LLGB and for intervention in the Highlands should not be construed as wholesale Irish support for the crofters. Crofter support of the Irish cause, particularly as it related to Home Rule, was not regularly reciprocated by Irish, or their British supporters (see e.g., LHR 3 December 1887: 332; LHR 31 December 1887: 393, 397). Support was transient, as evidenced by the unsuccessful efforts by those on both sides to organise a pan-Celtic league to consolidate Irish and Scottish grievances (Hunter 1975: 192).

Taking these threats to their logical conclusion, the HLLRA exploited the 1884 Reform Act, successfully returning five crofters' candidates in 1885 and 1886 elections, vanquishing both official Liberal and Conservative candidates and breaking the landowners' hold on Highland constituencies.[3] The HLLRA had so successfully mobilised the Highlands that in parts of Skye "it was probable that every man of the crofter and cottar classes was an enrolled member" (ibid. 54). Their initial goal of legislative reforms was finally met with the 1886 Crofters Act, which replicated the provisions of the 1881 Irish Act in Scotland. Despite the success of parliamentary means, the HLLRA reorganised as the Highland Land League in 1886 and again called for the break-up of large tracts.

The fall of Gladstone's third administration in 1886 redefined the political landscape. When land raiding intensified after 1886, the Tory government resumed the use of military force to restore order. Government-sponsored coercion in the Highlands pushed the Highland Land League to adopt Home Rule as its official policy in 1887. By this time, however, the crofters' cause involved Irish Home Rulers, MPs, Gaelic revivalists, Scottish trade councils and socialist organisations, expanding their base of support into the Lowlands (Hunter 1974; 1975: 188; McHugh 2003; Keating and Bleiman 1979: 45-49). Out of the resulting coalition, a radical populist movement had been developed, framing the introduction of yet further groups into the Home Rule ecology.

Labour, Trade Organisations and Home Rule

Their support of the land reform movement offers a point of entry into the world of nineteenth century organised labour. Land reform was a lynchpin connecting socialist organisers, trade councils, labour unions and workers associations with Highland land reformers, Irish agitators and

---

[3] The constituencies won by the Crofters were in Caithness, Argyll, Ross, Cromarty and Inverness-shire. The strength of the crofters' party was such that the Gladstonian Liberal deferred to them in both the 1886 and 1892 campaigns.

political organisers. The Aberdeen Trades Council was typical of this support. In 1884, they advocated legal reforms to force landlords to cultivate available land and ease restrictions on crofter ownership; and by 1886, they were pressing for extension of Highland land laws to all of Scotland (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 48).

The strength of the land reform issue in socialist circles was made forcefully clear by Viennese expatriate and socialist organiser Andreas Scheu. When Scheu's Socialist League cleaved apart from the Social Democratic Federation in 1884, he justified the split explaining that the Federation had "failed in Scotland because it had neglected local sympathy for crofter agitation and the Irish Land League" (ibid. 1979: 47). The new Socialists League's Home Rule credentials were secured when the Scottish Land and Labour League (SLLL) seceded as well, becoming an affiliate of Scheu's organisation. The SLLL's contemporary, the Scottish Land Restoration League (SLRL) also had extensive ties with the crofters. From its 1884 establishment, coinciding with Henry George's tour of Britain, the SLRL, like the SLLL, shared the talents of several members of the crofters' leadership.[4] In conjunction with the HLLRA, the SLRL also fielded candidates in the 1885 campaign, albeit unsuccessfully.

From the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the forces of labour mobilisation and radicalism overlapped considerably in Scotland. The history of Scottish labour organisation since the middle of the nineteenth century moulded this lineage, with two features of proving crucial. First, in comparison to workers south of the Tweed, labour in Scotland was organised along regional lines, with trade councils representing the interests of several occupations. Rather than the single occupation unions commonly organised in England, Scottish trade councils provided umbrellas under which local

---

[4] Large portions of this catalogue of shared members is available in Hunter 1974; 1975; Keating and Bleiman (1979: chapter 2); Kellas (1965: 318-320); Newby (2003); Smout (1986: chapter 11).

representatives from several different occupations took shelter. Second, this local focus moulded the concerns of labour and radicals alike. Instead of pressing for the formation of national movements, the radical stream in Scottish labour rallied around distinctly local problems and advocated specifically local solutions. In large part, labour and radical support for Home Rule was a product of this organisational history; that is, the localism at the heart of their activities provided a clear segue into demands for local administration.

From their establishment in the middle part of the century, trade councils undertook three main activities: "organising, agitating and political campaigning." (Fraser 1978: 6). As labour historian W. Hamish Fraser explains:

> Trade councils provided a forum for the general demands of labour. Conditions of work could be discussed and improvements demanded in general terms, as they could not be at union branch meetings. They were a place where grievances could be aired and a means whereby demands could be brought before the general public. This was particularly important in Scotland where the councils often took the lead in agitation (ibid. 9-10).

While trade council petitioning extended beyond pressing for improved working conditions to involve any number of public issues, its focus was uniformly local. As Fraser continues:

> All trade councils engaged in multifarious pressure-group activities, particularly on local issues. A careful eye was kept on the salaries and prerequisites of local officials. The Glasgow Trades Council protested in 1881 against superannuation of Parochial Board officials from the rates. In 1885 they objected to the proposed increase in the salary of the Water Commissioner. Edinburgh protested at increases for the city superintendent in 1884 and for the city chamberlain the following year.
>
> The local courts were also closely supervised. In 1874, the Glasgow Trades Council protested at the allegedly excessive penalties being imposed by one of the bailies, and, a few years later, the Edinburgh Trades Council was complaining that sheriff court decisions in cases of dispute between employers and employed revealed 'very doubtful justice' (ibid. 12-13).

Throughout Scotland, trade councils excelled as lobbies, petitioning politicians about problems of membership interest. Issues such as working

hours, changes in criminal law, fair contracts and municipalisation of public

works were all championed by trade councils in Aberdeen, Edinburgh and

Glasgow at various points between 1860 and 1880. Importantly, all of these

campaigns were waged at the local level, with claims addressed to local

governing bodies. Repeated discussions were also held by trade councils in

all three regions concerning the possibilities of fielding independent

candidates or shifting support from the Liberals. However, through the

middle part of the 1880s, especially at national elections, the Liberals could

rely on trade council support.

Developing concurrently with the trade councils' activities was a

distinctly Scottish socialism. Labour leader Keir Hardie's exchange with a

French expatriate Marxist exemplifies its uniqueness.

> Leo Millet, a refugee from the Paris commune teaching French at
> Edinburgh University, who once urged shooting of the Principal of
> Glasgow University as a priority when the revolution came, on
> another occasion told a circle of sympathisers…that 'the only bulwark
> of liberty and justice is a sea of blood between the poor and the rich'.
> The young Hardie spontaneously leapt to his feet to exclaim, 'It is not
> socialism, it is brute madness' (Smout 1986: 257).

While nationalisation of the means of production was a fundamental tenet of

Scottish socialism—there was certainty that capitalism was the enemy—the

means by which it should be accomplished bore distinctly Scottish hallmarks.

In place of violence and class war, Scottish socialism was imbued with the

practices and symbols of Christianity and Covenanting.

Again, Keir Hardie's own words personify these traits, clearly

illustrating the basic facets of the developing "ethical socialism."

> Come now Men and Women, I plead with you for your own sake and
> that of your children, for the sake of the downtrodden poor, the
> weary, sorehearted mothers, the outcast, unemployed fathers—for
> their sakes and for the sake of our beloved Socialism, the hope of
> peace and humanity throughout the world—Men and Women, I
> appeal to you, come and join us and fight with us in the fight wherein
> none shall fail (ibid. 256).

These appeals to a common brotherhood of man were buttressed by the

organising of socialist Sunday schools (Reid 1966), demands for Church

disestablishment and the regulation of drink.[5]

Having built a platform from the issues of land reform, church disestablishment, labour rights, temperance, collective control of production, resolution of the Irish problems and local administration, organised labour was increasingly pressing the Liberal Party for improved representation of their interests. The Party had shown some willingness to sponsor labour causes, fielding Liberal-Labour (Lib-Lab) candidates in several boroughs. This policy, though, was limited by the Party's internal divisions between Whigs and Radicals, preventing the Liberals from providing wholesale support. Adding to labour's frustrations were the limited electoral successes of Lib-Lab candidates (see Dryer 1997: 47).

Like the crofters, labour was taking advantages of the opportunities provided by the 1884 Reform Act. "Everywhere 1885 was the key year", W.H. Fraser explains.

> With the redistribution of seats [afforded by the 1884 Act], trade unionists were, with increasing insistence, demanding the return of working men to local bodies and to parliament. … At a time when working-class aspirations were growing, the Liberal party and particularly local Liberal associations were unwilling and frequently unable to respond to them. As a result, snubbed by those whom they had regarded as their natural allies, trade unionists found that they were being pushed towards independent labour politics (1978: 18-19).

Labour's political mobilisation followed a zigzagging pattern, moving between lobbies, independent parties and support for established Liberal candidates. Socialist organisations such as the SLLL and SLRL fought individual seats, whereas trade councils, such as Aberdeen's, proffered support for radical candidates, all the while threatening to generate candidates of their own (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 49). The miners',

---

[5] The issue of disestablishment was given renewed vigour by the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1868. The roots of the problem extend to 1712 when election of ministers was replaced with patronage. The schism of 1843 gave birth to the Free Church, with its generally populist leanings. The Free Church was a crucial organisational factor in the crofters' mobilisation and influenced the development of socialism in Scotland.

101

whose socialist ties were secured through their leader William Small's connections with groups such as the SLLL, replicated this by shifting allegiances back and forth between the Liberals and independent labour candidates.

As with the crofters, police suppression provided the immediate stimulus for the formation of independent labour politics. Following limited newspaper or political comment on the 1887 Lanarkshire miner's strike, Keir Hardie announced that "working men should be taught to be members of a Labour Party first, and Whigs or Tories after. … We want a new Party, a Labour Party pure and simple, and trade unions have the power to create this…" (ibid. 50). Drawing support from prominent Irish and Scottish Home Rulers, land reformers, labour leaders and socialist agitators, Hardie organised the Scottish Labour Party in May 1888.

Given the diverse interests of its organisers, the Scottish Labour Party was more of a land, labour and Home Rule party, than one purely representative of organised labour (ibid. 49). Scottish labour's demands for independent political representation was give further support in 1895. Following the Trade Union Council's (TUC) refusal to recognise Scottish trade councils, the Scottish Trade Union Council was formed to provide a separate Scottish labour umbrella. Together the STUC and Scottish Labour Party were developing a defensible position from which they could ensure the protection of their distinctive organisation and unique brand of socialism. That Scottish labour would support Home Rule was almost a foregone conclusion given the lineage's historical components. Their support for Home Rule was also a direct outgrowth of the logic of labour's developing socialism; a natural progression, along with "extension of the franchise and curtailment of the House of Lords", to advancing democracy (ibid. 30).

The Organisation of Late Nineteenth Century Contention

Contention in late nineteenth century Scotland was characterised by

simultaneous activity in several networks. The discussion to this point has detailed three of them: Irish Home Rule mobilisation; the Highland land reform movement; and organised labour. Structurally these networks shared many of the same nodes. Common leadership and participation created circuits through which people and ideas flowed; these contentious careers connected labour with Home Rule, Irish agitation with Highland land reform. Even with these shared nodes, though, activities in each domain were regulated by unique logics of operation. That is, the rules of participation in each were a historically unique product of transactions outside the purview of this analysis. Taken together these three networks were arranged into feedback loops where activity in one was shaped by activities in the others. This is embeddedness in action (Granovetter 1985).

This career level approach to the development of Home Rule as a jurisdictional problem provides only part of the story. The circulation of leaders and ideas through these circuits was only part of larger flows which constituted the political and economic structures of the nineteenth century United Kingdom. Making sense of how these flows congealed into a set of activities constituting the Scottish Home Rule movement requires examining how these networks were embedded into another institutional domain— politics. Changes in the organisation of British politics cascaded through these other networks, transforming the way in which they operated. Specifically, the reorganisation of British politics reassembled these networks by changing what they were capable of doing. This in turn rewired how they interacted with one another and redefined the way in which careers (of both people and ideas) moved through them. While the dynamics of these remouldings are detailed in the next chapter, it is first essential to explicate what these changes were and how they forced reorganisation of these other domains.

Scotland's Place in British Politics

Three changes in the organisation of British politics disrupted these networks, realigned their activities and involved them in mobilising demands for Scottish Home Rule. The first was the expansion of the franchise. The second was the development of mass political parties in Scotland. The third was a "Westminsterisation" of Scottish politics. Each of these changes was moving at different speeds, often in contradictory directions; therefore, despite the temptation, it is incorrect to see them as part of some inexorable march towards democracy. Like the changes outlined above, shifts in the organisation of British politics were a conjunctural, contingent series of events.

Franchise expansion in the UK took place in three waves, marked by the Reform Acts of 1832, 1868 and 1884. The scale of change brought about with the passage of the 1832 Act was astounding. Before the Act, there were 4,500 eligible voters in Scotland, or a ratio of approximately one voter for every 125 adult males (the ratio for England and Wales was one to eight). This number was composed of self-appointing corporations of the Royal Burghs and roughly 3,000 landowners in the country.[6] Following the Act, 64,447 adult males were made eligible voters, an increase of nearly 1,400%. In comparison to England and Wales, where the electoral rolls expanded by a mere 80%, the growth of the Scottish electorate was explosive (Hutchison 1986: Chapter 1).

Despite the massive growth of the electorate as a result of the 1832 Act, 36 years later on the eve of the 1868 Act's passage, 97% of Scotland's population (outside of the Highlands) remained ineligible to vote. Even with the passage of time and the intervention of parliament, electoral expansion was slow. Following the reforms of 1868, the electorate only comprised

---

[6] All voting figures are taken from Dyer (1996: Chapter 1 and 2) unless otherwise noted.

seven percent of Scotland's male population and what expansion did take

place was skewed towards burgh residents. Property ownership

requirements benefited city dwellers, while excluding all but the great

landowners and large tenant farmers in the country (Dyer 1996: 7-8).

> Scottish politics under both the First and Second Acts was organised
> along a two tier system of Burghs and counties. The presumption
> undergirding the Second Act was the interests of urban and rural
> constituencies were so diverse as to require separate rules. With
> their mass enfranchisement following 1832, the urban middle-classes
> were actively involved in Scottish politics, leading Burgh councils and
> organising local activities. This contrasted sharply with the rural
> population.
>
> In the rural areas, the political rights of the parliamentary electorate
> as a whole remained highly circumscribed. Indeed, the political
> system established in the counties, 1832-1884, had been designed to
> minimise change. For most of the period, local parties were largely
> indistinguishable from the personal property of politically active
> landed proprietors, and county government, based on the direct
> representation of big land owners (the commissions of supply),
> remained unreformed until 1889 (ibid. 9).

This dual system was abolished with the Third Act.

Whereas both the 1832 and 1868 Acts were concluded amid

significant contention, both parliamentary and popular, the 1884 Act passed

with limited disruption. The relative quiet of the Third Reform Act's passage

was made all the more interesting because of the scale of its effect,

especially in comparison to the earlier Acts. The 1884 Reform Act

dramatically expanded the electorate increasing eligible burgh voters by a

fifth and expanding the county rolls by 250%, largely by removing many of

the qualifications enshrined in the First and Second Acts.[7]

The post-Act system introduced four new classes of voters into the

Scottish electorate. The household franchise created uniform rules of

residency in both burghs and counties by granting the vote to all male

householders who had been resident at the same address for the past 12

---

[7] The Third Act removed the stipulation that a householder should be rated for poor relief;
removed the bar to enfranchisement for those who obtained their house as part of their
employment (this particularly aided service workers in the counties); imposed a standard £10
rating across counties and burghs; and provided amendments which curtailed faggot voting
(helping to loosen the control over enfranchisement wielded by large landowners) (Dryer 1996:
11-12).

months. The service franchise provided votes for those working as servants, provided they were living in their own accommodation (in a separate office, flat or apartment). Those working in service but residing in the main house remained disenfranchised. The lodger franchise, previously only available to those living in burghs, granted the vote to joint lodgers, provided the unfurnished household was worth £10 per annum per lodger. Businessmen living within seven miles of a burgh were allowed to register from their office addresses (assuming they were rated at least £10 per year) under the occupation franchise.[8]

Reorganising National Parties

Votes require a minimum of three elements to bring them into existence: voters; governments; and parties.[9] That voters cannot exist without the institutional contexts provided by governments, communities, kinship, workplaces, friendship and any number of other relations has not prevented primacy from being traditionally accorded to voters, neglecting the organisational and historical contexts that make their votes possible.[10] I have detailed one aspect of the government's role—legal institutions—and in the process, I outlined how these legal changes fostered new relations between government and governed by developing new classes of actor: voters. Through a mixture of parliamentary and popular activity, the voter became an increasingly salient identity over the course of the nineteenth

---

[8] Only one vote per premises was allowed.

[9] I realise that within a comparative framework there are potentially several revisions that could be made to this triumvirate, but this framework provides the basics of the Scottish case.

[10] Too often voters and votes are viewed as historically shallow and relationally independent. They are presumed to represent immediate concerns emanating from isolated voters who have developed ideas independently of any context and express them through the ballot box. But this historically shallow, isolated voter cannot exist. Rather, the voter emerges from a soup of relations and histories. As Paul Lazarsfeld and colleagues explain: "the population votes in the same election, but not on it. For example, the tendencies operating in 1948 electoral decisions not only were built up in the New Deal and Fair Deal era but also dated back to parental and grandparental loyalties, to religious and ethnic cleavages of a past era, and to moribund sectional and community conflicts. Thus in a very real sense any particular election is a composite of various elections and various political and social events. People vote for a President on a given November day, but their choice is made not simply on the basis of what has happened in the preceding months or even four years; in 1948 some people were in effect voting on the internationalism issue of 1940, others on the depression issues of 1932 and some, indeed, on the slavery issues of 1860 (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee 1954: 315-316).

century.

The development of "voter" as a basis of political action did not simply happen with franchise expansion. Granting the right to vote does not ensure that votes will be cast. Rather, it took shape through ongoing transactions between voters, parties and the state. The role of political parties cannot be underestimated. From their perspective, votes are not something people cast so much as something parties mobilise for states to collect. With such vast expansion in the number of votes to be collected, parties reorganised to meet the challenge. Their changes involved two contradictory forces. On the one hand, national parties were working to consolidate their fragmented Scottish structures, more tightly harnessing Scottish branches to national programmes. On the other hand, local cleavages (east/west and burgh/county), which dominated politics in Scotland, shaped the way party organisations consolidation. These opposing forces worked to simultaneously increase the prominence of parties in organising votes while forcing specialisation, even fragmentation, in the parties themselves. This push and pull helped to create voters and give salience to issue-specific politics, aiding the development of lobbies.

After the First Reform Act, Scotland was solidly Liberal territory. Most seats in the burghs went uncontested and what contests did exist, took place in the counties between landowners. The strength of Liberal candidates in the burghs was such that in 1859 only 8,000 voters were cast in comparison to more than 40,000 in 1832—there was simply no need to mobilise voters to ensure success. Similar patterns held for the Conservatives. Solid commitment of lairds and lawyers to the Conservatives meant that little was needed in way of the formal organisation. The combination of small voter bases with clearly defined party attachments meant that centralised parties in a contemporary sense did not exist in Scotland before the 1880s.

The process of amalgamating and expanding the fragmented and ad hoc structures that existed to organised voters began between the Second and Third Reform Acts. Before the 1880s, both parties relied on local patronage systems in Scotland for organising votes. Writing about the Conservatives, Derek Unwin explained:

> In terms of social organisation, Scotland was still rather decentralised. Local issues were often of great importance in election campaigns. No single, continuous system had replaced that of the eighteenth-century political managers. What had emerged was a host of local potentates powerful only in their immediate areas (1965: 93-94).

Efforts were made in 1867 to construct a unified organisation for Scottish Conservatives with the creation of the Scottish National Constitutional Association. Consisting mainly of local subscribers and a scattering of local organisations, the Association provided a limited umbrella for Conservatives in Scotland.

The Party's organisation in Scotland was finally taken national in 1882 with the formation of the National Union of Scottish Conservative Associations, which survived until the Party's merger with the Scottish Liberal Unionists in 1912. It was organised along a loosely centralised hub and spoke system where branches elected a central body consisting of four secretaries who in turn provided limited leadership on a national level. Tensions between the central committee and local branches reflected other cleavages in Scotland, principally the burgh/county and east/west divides. With its decentralised structure, these long-standing local divisions further stymied attempts at building a centralised Conservative Party in Scotland.

For the Liberals, the foundations of contemporary party development are visible from the 1874 election. With the Conservatives increasing their seats in Scotland from eight to 20, Liberal electoral complicity was shaken. The apparently better organised Conservatives, with their improving ability to mobilise, led many in Glasgow and the west of Scotland to demand

reforms in the Liberal's organisation. The resulting reorganisation meant that by 1877 two virtually independent branches of the party, the West and South of Scotland Liberal Association and the East and North of Scotland Liberal Association, were representing the radical and Whig elements of the party, respectively (Kellas 1965).

After reconciliation of the two bodies in 1881, the passage of the 1884 Act reopened divisions. The eye of the storm was Church disestablishment. Radicals in the west were pressing a strongly disestablishment platform, and in response, eastern Whigs were fielding "Church Liberal" candidates (Hutchison 1986: 154-162; Kellas 1965). Radical activities resulted in another schism in 1884 and the formation of the National Liberal Federation of Scotland. The Federation operated as a quasi-independent entity along side the Scottish Liberal Association. In spite of their divisions, both groups remained in the Liberal camp largely because of their devotion to the Grand Old Man, Gladstone.

The National Liberal Federation rejoined the Scottish Liberal Association in 1886, but not before a near epidemic of double candidates in the 1885 election. The issues of land reform, Church disestablishment and Home Rule continued to plague Liberal unity. Repeated attempts by Liberal leaders, especially Gladstone and Lord Elgin, to paper over the cracks in the Party's façade were met with resistance by radical members. Gladstone's conversion to the cause of Irish Home Rule, with promises of a corresponding Scottish programme, in 1886 finally rendered the Party asunder. The 1886 election saw the return of 27 Unionist MPs.

Conflicts within the ranks of the Liberal Party were exacerbated by mobilisation taking place outside it. The legal changes provided by the Acts allowed the crofters to establish their own party. Labour leaders such as Keir Hardie began standing as independent candidates. By 1888, the Scottish Labour Party was rallying the demands of workers and providing an

independent base of operation for those who were recently enfranchised yet remained outside the view of existing parties. This political realignment was critical to the formation of the Home Rule jurisdiction. By loosening the Liberals' grip on Scotland, by allowing for new varieties of party mobilisation and by turning attention to the interest of the legion of newly developed Scottish voters, party realignment reshaped the networks embedded within it.

Westminsterisation

"For half a century after the Reform Act of 1832, the Scots were among the least-governed people in Europe" (Hanham 1965: 205). Following the abolition of the office of the Secretary of State for Scotland in 1746, Scottish political affairs were managed through a system of delegation. The Home Secretary, too busy with routine work, delegated much of the administration to the Lord Advocate, who in turn passed bureaucratic duties to the Solicitor-General for Scotland and the Advocates Depute. The chain of buck passing continued with further administrative duties allotted to the various Scottish boards. This pattern of patronage and delegation was only upset by the occasional reformer from Whitehall.

With no central administrative apparatus in place (and a proportionally minute number of Scottish MPs), Scottish legislation was slow and seldom adequate. Exacerbating these problems was the organisation of the administrative system itself which ensured that day-to-day management of Scottish affairs was a distinctly elite endeavour. Unlike England, Scotland was not included in the civil service reforms of 1870 and as a result, civil service roles were filled by patronage rather than merit. This created a situation where local elites exploited patron-client chains to provide what management did exist.

The Liberal policies of local administration, laissez faire management and political rationalisation provided the background for the development of

the Scottish Office. Demands for increased legislative attention to Scottish issues, largely in response to the continued attention provided Ireland, were led by Lord Rosebery. Following the failure of the Local Government Board (Scotland) Bill to clear the Lords in 1883, the Convention of Royal Burghs assembled a meeting in Edinburgh, representing all shades of the political spectrum to lobby for a new bill. Finally reintroduced in 1885 by Lord Rosebery just before the collapse of Gladstone's administration, the bill passed as a non-partisan measure. The Scottish Office was establishment in 1885 under Salisbury's Conservative administration.

The post immediately faced two problems; one was its location, Dover House. Governing Scottish affairs from Westminster was argued by many to limit the Office's effectiveness. Compounding this was the small contingent of civil servants in Edinburgh, too few to adequately manage affairs. The second challenge was bureaucratic. Most of the central regulatory infrastructure for Scotland that existed was under the jurisdiction of the Home Office, which was hesitant to relinquish control. After much political wrangling, the Scottish Office finally took over the management of a number of Scottish boards and most contentiously, education (Fry 1987: 103-104; Hanham 1965).

The establishment of the Scottish Office went some way in providing for devolved administration, but ironically also increased the direct involvement of London in the daily management of Scottish affairs. Moving the limited administrative apparatuses from the Home Office to a specifically Scottish office provided a mechanism for increased scrutiny. Scottish institutions continued to remain partially separate from the rest of the UK, but their administration and the rules of accountability under which they operated were becoming national. Hanham encapsulates these transformations, explaining: "within a generation after the passage of the Secretary for Scotland Act, men had ceased to think of the Lord Advocate as

111

primarily a political figure and had come to regard him as little more than the Government's principal legal advisor in Scotland" (1965: 244).

Taken together, the Reform Acts, franchise expansion, party development and centralising political management were "Westminsterising" Scottish politics. Simply put, this process of state expansion was realigning a myriad of networks pushing local politics to a national scale. By integrating, co-opting and overlaying the local structures of Scottish administration, the central government in London was helping to increasingly establish parliament as the target for grievances and the arena in which solutions might be found. This process of Westminsterisation has previously been noted in the discussion of Irish contention, with Parnell and his party the most obvious example. For Scotland, we can better recognise the extent of these transformations by examining an antecedent episode of Home Rule contention during the 1850s.

The National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights (or Scottish Rights Society as it was often known) was organised in 1852 and began formal operation in 1853. While short-lived, ceasing its activities in at the start of the Crimean War in 1856, it did achieve several of its goals, primarily rallying support for several monuments dedicated to national heroes such as Wallace (Morton 1999: Chapter 7). What makes a brief review of the NAVSR worthwhile is that while it made many of the same claims that lobbies were to press 30 years later, the targets of those claims and the repertoire used to organise them were distinctly different and provide insights into the extensive political reorganisation occurring by the 1880s.

Writing in 1854, "A Citizen of Edinburgh" addressed a list of 24 grievances demanding attention from both Houses of parliament. The Citizen's inventory of misdeeds began by bemoaning the "Abolition of the Scottish Board of Excise and Custom in 1843" and ended by citing the Union

112

Riots of 1706 "as evidence of the original unpopularity of the Union." The
intermediate 22 claims highlighted architectural neglect of the Glasgow and
Edinburgh post offices, Holyrood and Linlithgow palaces; made demands for
proper display of Scottish heraldic symbols; lamented the mismanagement
of the Post Office, Inland Review and the sale of Crown lands; and
demanded greater attention to Scottish problems and concerns. Recalling
the Great Famine of 1846, the Citizen stated matter-of-factly: "£8,000,000
donated to Ireland, nothing to Scotland."

Criticising Westminster directly, the Citizen stressed the distinct lack
of governmental attention to Scottish problems, particularly in comparison
to England and Ireland. Point two called for improved legislative action,
noting: "The Superiority of English and Irish poor Laws in comparison with
the Scotch." Point three demanded greater investment in Scottish
infrastructure, highlighting the investment discrepancy "of money spent on
harbours of refuge in Scotland in comparison with England." However, it is
point seven that captures the essence of the Citizen's argument: "Scotland
being at present, without a special Secretary of State; the Lord Advocate is
unfit to do all the duties expected of him" (ibid. 140).

The political management of Scotland within the confines of the
Union is the common thread linking both the NAVSR with the lobbies
forming by the end of the 1880s. But it was the repertoire employed by the
NAVSR that best illustrates how much had changed in the intervening 30
years. Under the chairmanship of the Earl of Eglinton and Winton and
managed by James Cohen and Charles Cowan, the association relied mainly
on its ties to local elites to press claims. Counted among it members were
the Lord Provosts of Edinburgh, Perth and Stirling and their campaign
materials and petitions claimed support from a plethora of other local
notables including magistrates, peers and college presidents (ibid. 136-37).

This focus on local elites was further reinforced by the voting patterns of the organisation's subscribers. Using the 1852/54 pollbook to reconstruct the voting pattern of the 1854 general election, Graeme Morton (ibid.) has shown that Rights Association membership did not correspond to electoral support for its leadership (principally Cowan and Duncan MacLaren). Rather than seek to press claims through elected officials, the NAVSR's repertoire focused its efforts to mobilise those whom it felt were most likely to be in a position to influence policy in Scotland—local elites. This policy was taken further with the repeated development of petitions. Organised on behalf of town councils, petitions pleading Scotland's ill treatment were forwarded by the Scottish Rights Association to both House of parliament, the Lord Commissioners of the Treasury and Queen Victoria.

The Rights Society's programme of developing and exploiting ties to Scottish elites presented their most realistic and viable option to influence policy. With Scottish political management in the hands of a small number of patronage chains, those who would seek to peaceably influence politics were forced to work within such a framework.   In essence, they had few options but to take advantage of what governmental mechanisms were available. [11]   This contrasts sharply to the 1880s where claimants mobilised to target parties and could even pursue the option of organising parties themselves, directly confronting the state. The developing political world of late nineteenth century Scotland was almost unrecognisable from the one that preceded it only a generation earlier. As a result, the repertoires employed to press claims were themselves transformed.

---

[11] The NAVSR was an adamant supporter of the Union and pressed for Home Rule, not independence. Furthermore, the repertoire they developed resulted largely from their leader's positions within and access to patron-client networks which managed much of Scottish political affairs.

Conclusion

The history of Scottish Home Rule lobbies shares striking parallels with the history of life on Earth. As earth scientist Andrew Knoll (2003) explains: the history of life is the history of its environment. Biological evolution was inextricably intertwined with geological shifts, atmospheric changes and geochemical transformations. Life, with all its diversity, is a process of feedback and interaction within multiple networks; it is, as John Padgett explains, "a tangled web of self-regulating loops of chemical reactions that reproduce themselves through time" (Padgett 2001: 243).

Human beings are similarly involved in a myriad of networks simultaneously. Changes in one network often spill into others, forcing reorganisation and transformation in capabilities. As a result, both development and future evolutionary trajectories of any one network is moulded by the other in which it is embedded. Of course, this does not suppose that evolution is a linear phenomenon. "Burgeoning pressures in one network, moreover, may urge other networks down one trajectory of possibility or another" (ibid. 244).

In this chapter, I have detailed the four most prominent networks out of which the Scottish Home Rule movement emerged. Describing how these networks were organised, what transformations they were facing and how they were connected, I have illustrated the structure of the conjuncture. Further, I have explained how despite the high number of shared nodes which knitted these networks together, each brought with it variable demands, patterns of operation, distinctive problems and solutions. The resulting picture is a vibrant ecology filled with a variety of different species, each making a living in a variety of different ways, but overlapping through their participation in the developing Home Rule jurisdiction. Simply put, I have sketched a picture of an ecological garbage can.

Mutations in the Irish repertoire, primarily the rise of Charles Parnell and the party organisation he headed, helped to wring concessions from parliament and create openings for Scots also seeking greater attention. The crofters' claims for more land and financial guarantees provided the second element of the conjuncture. Proselytising supporters of the Irish land campaign, Henry George's land nationalisation movement and local Scottish supporters were soon involved with the crofters. The demands of organised labour provide the third branch with a distinctly Scottish socialism developing, linking the demands for occupational stability with equality of opportunity. But it was political realignment that rewired these networks, expanded their capabilities and facilitated demands for Scottish Home Rule.

Despite the changes occurring in each arena, there was no guarantee that organisations demanding Home Rule would emerge. However, because of the way these particular networks were put together a new set of potential functions were developed with political realignment. In the next chapter, I discuss the way that these new functionalities became lobbies. Drawing on the insights developed in this chapter—principally the co-evolution of institutional domains—the next will detail the process of refunctionality.

Chapter 4: Organising Lobbies

Introduced in April 1886, Gladstone's Government of Ireland Bill had the immediate and extensive effects of ratcheting a variety of networks into a new configuration. This in turn laid the tracks down which Home Rule travelled until the First World War. It quickly exposed cleavages in British politics, which was polarising along Home Rule/Unionist lines, a process perhaps most clearly evidenced in Gladstone's own Liberal Party, which was rent asunder into the competing Liberal and Liberal Unionist camps following his announcement. Adding to these shifts, franchise expansion was forcing further party reorganisation, with the Liberals, Conservatives and emerging Labour parties developing new mobilisation strategies. Organised labour was increasingly pressing claims through national political channels. Crofters and Highland sympathisers, taking advantage of legal and organisational changes, were taking their claims national. And ongoing violence, political agitation and parliamentary obstinacy ensured that Irish affairs remained at the forefront of British politics.

Pulling these processes together and forming the Home Rule jurisdiction, the proposed offer of devolution for Ireland, and belatedly for Scotland and Wales offered a solution to a myriad of problems and extended an invitation to participate, an invitation quickly accepted by an alphabet soup of organisations. Land reform groups such as the HLL (Highland Land League), LLGB (Land League of Great Britain), HLLRA (Highland Land Law Reform Association of Edinburgh and Inverness), the Skye Vigilante Committee and the Federation of Celtic Societies collaborated with socialist groups such as the SLLL (Scottish Land and Labour League) and the SLRL (Scottish Land Restoration League). They were joined by labour organizations like the STUC that provided umbrella support for a number of trades councils. Labour's Home Rule political interests were represented by the SLP (Scottish Labour Party) and the SUTCLP (Scottish United Trade

117

Council's Labour Party), both of which affiliated to the ILP (Independent Labour Party) following its 1893 formation. The interests of existing political parties were represented by the Liberals, their recently separated cousins, the Liberal Unionists, and the Conservatives. From these established groups emerged a new "species" of organisation, the Home Rule lobby.

In the last chapter, I explored the constituent elements of the Home Rule ecology, developing three points. 1) I detailed the lineages out which Home Rule lobbies emerged, explaining how they were organised, what problems they faced and how they sought to manage them. 2) I described the establishment of the Home Rule jurisdiction—a set of problems over which several groups claimed an interest—developed by bundling together problems from a variety of arenas. 3) I illustrated the larger ecology, describing the operating environment in which these lineages were embedded. In this chapter, I clarify two further processes. First, I explain how these newly aligned lineages were braided together to yield this new variety of actor, the Home Rule lobby. Second, I explain how the ecology behaved and reproduced itself through time.

Structuring the Terms of Analysis

Before venturing into the forest of facts and thickets of detail, let me briefly review the terms of analysis. From our current perspective, it is easy enough to unpack events back through time. But life is not lived back to front; and lobbies did not unfold according to a preordained plan. Rather, genesis relied on the harnessing together of existing relations, a generally unpredictable process. Once pulled together, these strands of activity had to be connected into self-reinforcing structures and embedded into their surrounding environment to ensure their continued survival. Sometimes these processes were self-conscious; but often, as with the spillover from Gladstone's Home Rule support, they developed from unintended consequences. A focus on the combination of existing organisation,

118

accidental activity and active construction provides a demographic understanding of genesis and reproduction, focusing on birth, death and amalgamation.

To unpack this demographic argument, I want to extend the discussion of organisational genesis sketched in Chapter 2, in which I identified *refunctionality* as the central mechanism at work. Refunctionality is, simply, a process of using existing organisational materials for new purposes. What differentiates this approach from competing cultural and economic-inspired explanations, with their focus on ideational templates and cloning, is that it roots birth in recombination, recognising that everything has a history. Refunctionality is most similar to the "path-dependent biological metaphors of sedimentation and induction, according to which new organizing modes arise on the shoulders of older historical 'residues' in order to remobilize and recast them..." (Padgett 2001: 216). Understanding this process forces us into the sinews of social life.

To simplify the analysis, refunctionality can be disentangled into three nested processes: careers; organisational embedding; and ecological control. The *careers* perspective provides the founder's-eye view of genesis. From this vantage we witness collaboration with partners and the intercalating of personal networks, ideas and practices. This career-level perspective focuses on the structured channels out of which founders, collaborators and prominent members emerged and tracks their movement across domains, principally Home Rule, land reform, labour agitation and left-wing politics. Individuals' careers were regularly marked by simultaneous participation in multiple activities—land reform and trade unionism, party politics and lobbying, socialism and Home Rule—and while not all activities received equal attention, the push and pull of these positions provided mechanisms through which these different domains communicated (ibid. 244).

119

To paraphrase Padgett once more: who an individual was as a Home Ruler was deeply affected by the other roles attached to him as a person, which in turn is a product "of the 'mating system' of the population, concatenated to generate historically intertwined lineages of practices and persons" (ibid. 213-14).[12] Thus, individual careers consisted of a dense web of activities with commitment varying according to context and temporally variable demands.

This career level view highlights the multiple networks implicated in organisational genesis, exposing the layered flows of people, ideas and resources that connected a variety of activities. However, it provides an incomplete explanation by itself. Parallels can be drawn with biology (Goodwin 1994): while the enchainment of careers explicates the building blocks (DNA), to focus on this process alone ignores the dynamics of the surrounding organisation (the organism). Restoring the organisation and understanding its role in genesis brings us to *organisational embedding*.

In a weakly functional sense, organisations must accomplish certain things to ensure their stability and reproduction. In contrast to a strongly functional argument which attributes necessity to every structure, need to every activity and a goal to every actor, a weakly functional approach appreciates that the consequences of certain actions often help to sustain the relations that drive them.[13] Facing an ecology thickly populated with a variety of different actors and projects, lobbies had to find ways to confront this shifting terrain. As Arthur Stinchcombe (1965) noted forty years ago, one of the chief challenges developing organisations face is the liability of newness: unless they embed themselves into existing networks, ensure

---

[12] My use of the masculine pronoun "he" is only a reflection of the fact that women were largely absent from prominent positions in the Home Rule movement.

[13] Stinchcombe (1968: 80-101) is the classical account of functional explanation, especially its weak lines. In his later book, *Information and Organizations* (1990: 128), he clearly encapsulates the weakly functional approach to organisational embedding-as-problem-solving: "the organization will continue to throw up problems to individuals until they correctly identify the source of the functional inadequacy and build and structure that remedies it."

continual flows of personnel and resources, and maintain control over particular jurisdictions, they wither and die.

Organisational embedding aims to solve these problems. From this vantage, we gain insights into how repertoires worked, how organisations viewed problems and what efforts they made to respond to them. Problems appeared on multiple fronts: claim-making; proselytising; resource acquisition; co-operating; and competing. Solutions were drawn from a combination of contentious repertoires, existing organisational routines and learning-while-doing. Given the variety of different groups involved, this process of organisational embedding took a variety of forms: proposed legislation; pressure on MPs; recruitment of elite patrons; petitioning; rallies; pamphleteering; meetings; conferences and information sessions with allied organisations; membership drives; contests; and so on. In effect, organisational embedding is an umbrella term covering the work organisations undertake to get things done and the repertoires of solutions available.

Both careers and organisational embedding were shaped in powerful and often subtle ways by *ecological control*. Ecological control may be defined as indirect control of the underlying process: what appears important; why it appears important; how it might be worked with; and, crucially who is available and authorised to act (Padgett 1981: 82). Ecological control derives from the temporally variable structure of the ecology. Participants' simultaneous activity in multiple ecologies meant that they were embedded in numerous different exchange relationships, subject to different histories and rules that shaped their ability to act (Healy 1999). Ties to a variety of different groups and projects with variable, sometime contradictory temporal demands meant that the configuration at any given point in time shaped the realm of the possible.

A metaphor helps to clarify how ecological control worked. Each network of activity may be usefully conceived of as a lattice. Taken together the Home Rule ecology was a stack of these lattices. The degree to which these lattices corresponded controlled the flow of activity: close correspondence allowed for freer flow; the reverse constrained action. As participation in the ecology was not exclusive, external demands regularly diverted attention or rebounded into Home Rule. As outside obligations drew attention, opportunities to act were closed. Control, therefore, is a property of the ecology's structure, not its participants (Leifer 1988; Padgett 1981; Padgett and Ansell 1993).

Ecological control brings the garbage can nature of this particular ecology into focus. As Cohen, March and Olsen (1979: 26) explain:

> Suppose we view a choice opportunity [the offer of Home Rule, for instance] as a garbage can into which various problems and solutions are dumped by participants. The mix of garbage in a single can depends partly on the labels attached to the alternative cans; but it also depends on what garbage is being produced at the moment, on the mix of cans available, and on the speed with which garbage is collected and removed from the scene....In a garbage can situation... [any] outcome [is the result] of several relatively independent 'streams'.

These semi-autonomous streams include personnel flows (careers through organisations as well as who is available to act on any given problem); organisational activities (both those of lobbies and other groups involved in the ecology: e.g., unions; land reform groups; parties; contentious Irish organisations; and the state); and problems (claims directly related to Home Rule and demands emerging from other ecologies—the Boer War, for example—that shaped attention spans). Who is available to act, what solutions are available for problems and how the two are put together regularly varied independently of one another resulting in an intra-ecological garbage can.

That each of these flows moved at different speeds, provides insights into the temporal side of ecological control. While turnover of elements was

a continual feature—personnel moved into and out of the ecology, organisations emerged and disbanded, and problems varied in intensity— each stream turned over at different rates. Finally, all of these streams were shaped by longer-run historical residues in the forms of organisational inertia and settlements arising from previous episodes of contention. As a result, "[w]hat in one time frame appears as an ecological premise in another appears as a discretionary choice" (Padgett 1981: 83). When melded together, these elements form a complicated web of activity that gave birth to lobbies, shaped their jurisdiction and controlled how they worked with it. In the remainder of this chapter, I explore the genesis of lobbies from each of these three nested perspectives clarifying the importance of careers, organisational embedding and ecological control as the central mechanisms of success.[14]

Contentious Careers

Careers in Home Rule co-varied with activities in party politics, land reform and labour activism. This simultaneous participation in multiple organisations produced a duality: these careers sustained organisations and were in turn sustained by organisations (Breiger 1976). Leadership positions and membership roles across a range of activities linked organisations and the people who occupied positions within them. These links were important for the individuals because they built biographies. For organisations, their importance lay in the provision of raw materials and the ways they "affect[ed] the rate and pattern of diffusion into or from an organization; [the way they provided] a basis of organizational history and reputation" (March and March 1977: 377).

As careers help to encode in structures many long dead events— events such as earlier campaigns, ways of mobilising and repertoires of

---

[14] In line with the biological metaphors framing this analysis, success is defined as sustained reproduction, *not* goal-attainment.

action—they help to make sense of how organisations come to look and behave as they did. But unlike careers in stable hierarchies, these careers were not clear progressions through established roles. Like Katherine Giuffre's (1999) freelance artists, the careers of Home Rulers took shape in an ecology more like a sandpile than a pyramid. Given the consistently shifting nature of the ecology, these careers are best understood as

> a series of positions occupied within a structure that is itself in a state of flux….The [ecology] itself is continuously changing over time as actors make and break ties….Present-day status is based on a position within a web of ties and also had embedded within it the history of past positions (ibid. 818-19).

As a result, careers were strongly conditioned by the shifting relations in which they were embedded.

In this section, I map this duality by exploring how interfaces developed between different network domains and Home Rule, exploring the ways they channelled personnel into new organisations. But rather than treating party politics, organised labour, land reform and Irish contention as discrete networks and tracing the flows of people through them (a process made difficult by the fact that the same person often worked multiple fields simultaneously), I focus on the opportunities to act. That is, rather than tracing the careers of individual activists, I am following the openings that spurred movement across and collaboration between organisations and domains of activity. [15] To accomplish this goal, I divide the pre-War era into three periods which were marked by high levels of organisational founding and dissolution. The first period, 1886-1893, was marked by high

---

[15] I have taken inspiration from Harrison White's *Chains of Opportunity*. Rather that tracing the movement of people through jobs, White traced the movement of vacancies through employment systems. The central premise being that in many (generally tightly coupled) systems it is the vacancy that takes priority. While the Home Rule ecology shared little in common with White's Episcopalian ministers and parishes, it does make sense to give priority to the opening-creating event rather than the individuals moving through them. The practicality of this organisation-to-organisation exchange approach is reinforced by the fact that it was difficult to trace complete (or often coherent) careers of individual activist (something I hope to be able to supplement in future research). Individuals regularly disappeared from the record only to reappear at a later date in completely new settings. Finally, my focus on career making events allows for a way of giving coherence to the variable nature of collaboration. Exchanges between organisations (or domains of activity) provide traceable sequences even if the exchanges themselves involved different people.

mobilisation and regular flows of personnel between organisations as existing political alignments broke down and new political actors and identities were created. This period opened with Gladstone's conversion and ended with the 1893 Home Rule bill. The second period, 1900 to 1906, witnessed Liberal defeat and internal rejuvenation and critical events such as the Boer War both of which drove debates about imperialism and federalism, generating further opportunities to act. The third phase, 1910-1914, was driven by renewed attention to Ireland, which ultimately generated the tabled Irish Home Rule bill of 1914.

The Flow of Events: 1886-1893

Like the Cambrian explosion some 530 million years earlier (Gould 1998), the period following Gladstone's proclamation witnessed a sudden profusion of new organisations followed by almost equally rapid extinction. Most of the new career paths opened during this period emerged from interactions with the Liberal party. Internally, Gladstone's announcement led to an almost immediate, and ultimately permanent, split in the party between Gladstonian Liberals and Liberal Unionists. In the Gladstonian lineage there was a further bifurcation between those who advocated full support of Gladstone—Ireland first, with consideration for Scotland and Wales at a later point—and those who argued for Scotland to stand on equal footing with Ireland. The United Kingdom Home Rule League was representative of newly forming pro-Gladstonian career paths.

Founded at the National Liberal Club on 23 July 1886 and presided over by Professor J. E. Thorold Rogers, the founding membership also included three sitting and two former Liberal MPs representing both Scottish and English constituencies. "We are assured that the heart of soul of British Liberalism is with us and the case", they proclaimed in their founding declaration, "and that in setting up an acceptable form of Home Rule in Ireland, we are clearing the way to give England and Scotland Home Rule as

well" (LHR 31 July 1886: 29). The group's founding resolution commanded, amongst other things, that a "Committee consisting of the existing Gladstone Candidates Fund be appointed…" and "That in the opinion of this meeting it is expectant that a Public Meeting be held in October, and that Mr. Gladstone be invited to preside on the occasion" (ibid.). By December of the same year, the United Kingdom Home Rule League had merged with its regular collaborator, the British Home Rule League (LHR 4 December 1886: 242). Outside of these brief announcements and a limited number of reported events, though, little more was seen or heard of the newly expanded United Kingdom Home Rule League.[16]

The other side of the split was a more complex affair. Radical Liberals such as Charles Waddie and William Mitchell immediately resigned their memberships in the Party when it became apparent that Scotland was to be considered secondary to Ireland. They were critical in forming the Scottish Home Rule Association. An all-party lobby founded a month after the introduction of Gladstone's Irish Home Rule Bill, the group's public face was regularly maintained by Waddie, Mitchell and former NAVSR member John Romans. Its founding leadership also include key labour unionists such as Keir Hardy and Robert Smillie, Gaelic revivalists such as Theodore Napier and Stuart Marr (Erskine of Marr), and well as intermittent support from a host of Scottish Liberal MPs. The SHRA's London branch had a distinctly radical feel with Ramsay MacDonald, the crofter's MP Dr. G. B. Clark and the socialist laird R. B. Cunningham Graham all counted as active members. As will become apparent in subsequent discussion its activities reflected the push and pull of these groups.

---

[16] One of the strengths of the Home Rule newspapers reviewed was their extensive coverage of all aspects of the movement. Even papers that were hostile to particular positions and groups (moderates versus radical for example) provided coverage of their events and printed statements, letters and position pieces. Establishment and dissolution of organisations were regularly covered; and disappearance of discussion was nearly always a sign of dissolution.

The SHRA displayed its diverse lineages by simultaneously pressing two lines of activity, each drawing on different personnel. One path worked to build equivalence between Scotland and Ireland, at times pressing Scotland's superior suitability for Home Rule. The other path was marked by more radical demands for immediate action by political parties.

In a pair of articles published in 1887, the SHRA responded to both Irish Home Rule rulers and the Liberal party supporters who had claimed that Ireland was the more pressing case. SHRA leader John Romans assures Irish Home Rule supporters, "There does not exist in the British Isles a more sincere and practical body of men whose object is that Irishmen shall rule Ireland, than the Scottish Home Rule Association" (LHR 14 January 1887). But as Charles Waddie, the SHRA's Honorary Secretary, went on to explain:

> We have been long suffering and patient and that very virtue of ours is to be used as an argument against us…our people have been robbed to enable England to bribe renegade Irishmen to oppress their own countrymen. Is it an unreasonable thing for us to ask Ireland to help us? Have we not helped them? If it had not been for the noble Liberalism of Scotland Ireland would never have got her church disestablished. Nor has she any chance of getting Home Rule unless she takes us with her. Much as we desire justice to Ireland, we will not commit an act of national suicide to free Ireland (LHR 14 January 1887: 18).

The 1888 West Edinburgh by-election provided an opportunity for the SHRA to exercise its radical side with the formation of the short-lived Scottish Party. Formed in December 1887 under the leadership of Mitchell, who had risen to prominence in Home Rule circles as a strong proponent of the Wallace monument following the dissolution of the NASVR, the party was a conduit for acts considered too contentious for the SHRA. Having organised what became known as the "West Edinburgh 200"—a group of approximately 200 electors who supported Scottish Home Rule and who were willing to make it a test issue in the constituency—the Scottish Party went head-to-head with the Gladstonian Liberals.

Writing in the Liberal Home Ruler in January 1888, Mitchell outlined the party's aims in 12 points. Accompanying statements of worthiness, proclamations of wide-ranging support and claims of corrupt representation by "Liberal Hacks", were the party's most contentious assertions:

> Our course is clear. We must, unless Mr. [T. R.] Buchanan [Liberal candidate for West Edinburgh] sees his error in time, vote for Mr. Raleigh—Unionist though he be. By doing so in this and all similar elections until the claims of Scotland are recognised, we shall preserve the *status quo*, and that, in present circumstances, will best serve the true interests, not only of Scotland, but of Ireland, England, and the British Empire.

Anticipating the Liberal response, Mitchell concluded:

> We are not to be deceived by the plea sometimes put forward that once Home Rule is given to Ireland, Scotland is sure to get it. The Irish members, once sent to look after Irish business in Dublin, will have no *locus standi* in a quest of Home Rule as between England and Scotland, and the idea of Irish members being allowed to manage Irish affairs in Dublin to interfere at Westminster with those of Great Britain is too broad to discuss (LHR 28 January 1888: 45, emphasis original).

The Gladstonian Liberals counter-mobilised; with the West Edinburgh 200 threatening defection to the Liberal-Unionist Raleigh, the Gladstonian camp rallied behind their (ultimately successful) candidate, Buchannan. Writing in February 1888 following Buchanan's 46-vote win in West Edinburgh, the editor of *The Liberal Home Ruler* hit back against the Scottish Party and their tactics:

> It is gratifying...to learn that those of the Two Hundred Home Rulers forming the Scottish Party, who posses the franchise, voted for Mr. Buchanan, who never, since his last candidature was inaugurated, refused to accept the principle of Home Rule for Scotland. Accepting a principle is not the same thing as adopting a plan to carry the principle into legislative effect. If the Scottish Party is content to enforce the "principle" on Scottish candidates they will fairly propagate their opinions. But to insist that, being a member of the Gladstonian Party, the candidate who does not see his way to the acceptance of the programme of the Scottish Party shall be boycotted in favour of the Liberal Unionist, who does not believe in any form of National Home Rule, is neither straightforward policy nor plain common sense.

The editor continued:

> ...we think that the Scottish Home Rule Association should educate the constituencies as to the necessity of Scottish Home Rule. By this

means that organisation can only educate the candidates. It is very obvious by the recent elections that the "differences of the Liberal Party," which were fostered solely by the Liberal Unionists, are fast disappearing. They are dying out, are nearly dead, and do not want healing. You cannot heal a wound by re-introducing the poison. You cannot unite the Liberal Party by calling back the Liberal Disunionists (LHR 25 February 1888: 102).

In the wake of the West Edinburgh election, the Scottish Party soon shifted focus, advocating the formation of a Federal Union League "in which Home Rulers of every shade of politics and each nationality could combine, not only to advance their common principle, but to reduce it to some practicable shape, and so be ready for legislation when the opportunity shall present itself" (ibid). Despite their earlier ability to organise a large mobilisation, the Scottish Party was unable to transfer its successes into "pan-Celtic" endeavours.

A similar effort had been earlier attempted in the late summer of 1886. The Celtic League was formed at the September Conference of the Highland Land Law Reform Association at Bonar Bridge. By July 1887, the LHR's Gossip of the Week column was reporting that Irish leader Charles Parnell had "at length given his full adhesion to the scheme..." (LHR 30 July 1887: 39). Led by a coalition of Scottish, Welsh and Irish MPs, the Celtic League aimed to develop "co-operation between the Irish, Scotch, and Welsh, both in Parliament and in the country, for mutual support in their demands for Home Rule and on the other questions now agitating Ireland, Scotland, and Wales" (ibid).

Like its Scottish Party cousin, the League proclaimed two goals. Politically, the League sought to ensure mutual support amongst Scottish, Irish and Welsh MPs for increased legislative attention. As the LHR noted, the League would help to "make it clear to the country that the Irish, Scotch, and Welsh are in their present movements fighting the battle of the whole democracy..." and

> If successful, one immediate political result of the League will be the increase of the Irish vote in English constituencies by that of the Scotch and Welsh, which would mean a very large increase indeed in many of the constituencies of the North of England (ibid).

Culturally, the League affirmed that it would "further aim at the preservation of the Celtic languages, literature, and traditions, and the promotion of philological and historical Celtic researches" (ibid). Despite the acknowledge support of Parnell, the active involvement of MPs and the unifying focus of Home Rule, the Celtic League left few lasting imprints on the Home Rule jurisdiction.

The diverse careers that flowed through the SHRA helped to ensure it successful reproduction, even though it stymied its efforts at presenting a united front. However, shorter-lived and more ad hoc organisations, similar to the Scottish Party and Celtic League were more the rule rather than the exception in terms of political interfaces with Home Rule. Uniformly Liberal lobbies such as the United Kingdom Home Rule League and British Home Rule League were typical of this pattern.

The Flow of Events: 1900 to 1906

Many of the issues that had fostered collaboration and, in turn, new career paths between groups were receding in importance by the turn of the century. Land reform had been (partially) dealt with by the 1886 Land Act and both the HLL and their demands had largely been absorbed by the Liberals. Even though land reform remained a "live" issue, the arena in which it was fought had shifted from popular contention to institutional politics. Irish demands, while still visible, were not as important in shaping Scottish claims for Home Rule since Parnell's fall in 1890. Finally, the Scottish labour movement was dealing with internal issues which were redirecting its attention. Since the formation of the British Labour Party in 1893, Scottish organisers had been battling to establish representations of

their demands transferring focus from separation to internal political manoeuvring.

With these issues swept into the background, career structures within the Home Rule ecology were changing. Who was available to act, what problems were flowing through and what opportunities were arising to connect them were all changing. In this timeframe, it was once again the Liberal Party which spawned new careers into Home Rule. The elections of 1895 and 1900 resulted in significant inroads for the Scottish Tories. The 1895 election saw the Liberals' lead over the Tories narrow to eight seats (since 1886, the Liberals had maintained a 16 seat majority in Scotland), and in 1900 the Liberals returned a minority of Scottish MPs for the first time since 1832. These election losses took shape against a backdrop of further Party in-fighting. Issues such as temperance, Church disestablishment and imperialism were increasingly absorbing the Party's attention. Divisions were soon solidified between the so-called "faddists", supporters of temperance, disestablishment and crucially, Irish Home Rule, and the Imperialists.

The Liberals' failures at the election of 1900 spawned yet another Home Rule career path. The Young Scots Society began life as a ginger group within the Party and its ties remained close throughout its existence. Organised in the immediate aftermath of the 1900 election, the YSS began with an Edinburgh gathering of party members on 26 October 1900 and was "fully constituted at a meeting on 8th November" (YSH 1911-12: 5). Writing in 1903, Young Scot, Presbyterian progressive and future Liberal MP John W. Gulland explained:

> It seems to me that one line for us will be to infuse a spirit of nationality in our political life. Eight years of Toryism have killed our old Scottish spirit, and we have become mere dwellers on the north of the Tweed. Some patriot suggested as a motto for the Young Scots, "Rejuvenescat Scotia invitia!" "Let unconquered Scotland be young again!" I am not advocating the formation of a separate Scottish party. That is unnecessary and would be unwise. Let us

make the Scottish Liberal members our Scottish Party, impregnate
them with Scottish ideas, make them fight at Westminster for
Scotland as the Irish members do for Ireland and the Welsh members
for Wales (YS 2 November 1903: 16).

Drawing mainly from the "faddish" wing of the Party, the YSS sought to
strengthen the party, improve mobilisation structures, press for free trade,
protest against the Boer War and rally support for a progressive social
programme, largely shaped by the model of Presbyterian progressivism that
dominated Edwardian politics (Stewart 2001). At its Glasgow Conference of
1907, the YSS, celebrating "the splendid Progressive triumph at the General
Election of 1906" (in which it had played a significant role in mobilising the
Liberal vote), announced that "Scottish Home Rule and the House of Lords
question were put to the forefront of the Society's propaganda work, and a
Parliamentary Committee was appointed to administer a fund raised for this
work" (ibid. 6).

In terms of career structures, the YSS proved to be important not
only for the careers the organisation captured, but the ones it spawned.
Participation in the YSS was a stepping stone for a number of people who
would later go on to found other Home Rule organisations. F. J. Robertson
who went on to found the ISHRL and Ronald Muirhead who was to play a
central role in ILP, SHRA and NPS politics, both got their starts in the YSS.
Furthermore, many in the group were ultimately absorbed back into the
Liberals going on to serve as MPs weaving Home Rule into the fabric of
Edwardian Liberalism.

During the same period, John Wilson, leader of the Scottish Patriotic
Association and publisher of the *Scottish Patriot* newspaper, formed the
Scottish National League in 1904 immediately issuing a call for a distinctly
nationalist party. The debates concerning federalism which had marked
British politics since the Boer War were shaping Scottish claims. Covering
its inauguration, the Fiery Cross (FC October 1904: 2) reported the new

organisation had made it clear "it is not sufficient to talk of Scottish nationality, but we must make it matter of 'practical politics'." The organisation was founded with three objectives:

> The first objective of the League is: To secure proper attention to Scottish interests on the part of Scottish representatives to the British Parliament. This does not mean the neglect of British interests for the sake of Scotland, but the reverse. If the interests of Scotland are attended to satisfactorily by the Scottish Members British interests generally will be better looked after, but only by devolution, or Home Rule, which must be on the "all-round" principle.

> The second objective of the league is: When necessary to bring forward national candidates for Scottish constituencies. It is necessary that those chosen as candidates for Scottish seats should be, firstly, Scottish *Nationalists*. It would suicidal to elect any such who will not promise to advocate the objects of the League.

> The third objective of the League is: To agitate for, and demand the establishment of, a Scottish Parliament for the efficient conduct of Scottish affairs. The last object is the main one to be aimed at, for, without a Scottish National Parliament, Scotsmen can never be said to enjoy political liberty.

Wilson's new organisation, despite the fiery rhetoric and impassioned pleas, was short-lived. His push for a national party failed to garner much support as, structurally speaking, he was isolated.

The Flow of Events: 1910-1914

With the passage of the Parliament Act of 1911, which provided that bills passed in three successive legislative sessions would automatically receive royal assent, the Liberals had finally succeeded in implementing mechanisms for circumventing the Lords' veto. With an effective means of bypassing the Lords now in place, progressive elements of the Liberal Party aimed to use the opportunity to resolve the Irish question and press on with their reforms programme. The resulting constitutional crisis brought federalism to the fore as a solution to these problems. Federalism remained a vaguely defined solution (Jalland 1979), but it did serve to focus both governmental and party attention on Home Rule. What differentiates this period from the earlier two is the involvement of Unionists, as well as Liberals in demands for devolution, with the Round Table movement

involving Unionist support for some form of devolution as a solution to these issues (Kendle 1968).

Against the backdrop of constitutional crisis and broad cross party support, Home Rule was coupled with a new set of actors. The result was a new career structure that harnessed together devolution, imperialism, Liberalism and Unionism. In 1910 a group of Liberal MPs organised the Scottish National Committee to ensure continued focus on devolution for Scotland. External to parliament, the International Scots Home Rule League, founded by former Young Scot and current Edinburgh Town Councillor F. J. Robertson, was founded in May 1913. The group's aims were set forth in the first issue of The Scottish Nation, the ISHRL's official organ:

> In view of the rapid development of events, the time seems propitious for the establishment of an organisation devoted to the national cause. 'The Scottish Nation,' the first number of which appears to-day, is not a party organ, and will be conducted in no party spirit. The aim will be to foster national sentiment, to focus the various aspects of the national life; in a word, to give practical direction to the patriotism of Scotland—a patriotism which in no way conflicts with leal-hearted devotion to the highest interests of the Empire (TSN November 1913: 3).

The ISHRL's non-party stance meant it wove together a wide-variety of careers. Represented amongst its honorary presidents and elected administrators were radical reformists such as the Rev. James Barr, Liberals such as Hector Macpherson and a host of local government officials including the Lord Provosts of Glasgow, Dundee and Elgin. What made the ISHRL different from its predecessors was its focus on local government, international support and its willingness to collaborate across party lines. In terms of career structures, this organisation took advantage of its founder's ties as both a well-connected Liberal and local councillor. The result was an organisation that, for a time, bracketed together previously contradictory elements of the ecology.

Organisational Embedding

As the career-level view of organisational emergence has illustrated, events regularly provided opportunities to act and personnel were often channelled into them. Whether or not the "correct" personnel reach the event is debatable. As opportunities to act are often turning over at different rates than those governing the supply of actors to fill them, matching is often simply a case of availability and suitability based on ambiguous selection rules. In any event, establishment is often the easy part. Continuing survival requires embedding into the surrounding environment. As organisations such as the Celtic League, Scottish National League and United Kingdom Home Rule League show, this process is the more difficult next step.

In this section I change focus from organisational foundation to embedding. I focus centrally on how organisations sought to manage the Home Rule jurisdiction, nest into the surrounding environment and solve the problems they attached to the solution of Home Rule. Given the fluctuating nature of participation in the ecology, this process bears little resemblance to those theories of contention and organisational behaviour that presume clear goals, stable preferences and well-articulated means of engagement. In reality, organisational embedding was marked by fluid participation, ambiguous interests, and scarce attention, with the matching of people, problems and solutions outside of any single actors' control.

March and Olsen (1979: 21) set the terms of analysis when they explain:

> We remain in the tradition of viewing [inter-] organizational participants as problem-solvers and decision makers. However, we assume that [organisations] find themselves in a more complex, less stable, and less understood world than that described by standard theories of organizational choice; they are placed in a world over which they often have only modest control. Nevertheless, we assume organizational participants will try to understand what is going on, to activate themselves and their resources in order to solve their problems and move the world in desired directions. These

135

attempts will have a less heroic character than assumed in the perfect cycle theories, but they will be real.

Working out from this position, I operationalise the study of organisational embedding by examining how these newly formed lobbies did two things.

The first is an examination of how they differentiated their ties to both other actors in the ecology and the Home Rule jurisdiction. Home Rule organisations invested a huge amount of effort in defining appropriate relationships and acting on them. These efforts sought to ensure that claims would be appropriately channelled and in turn problems solved. But this process was stymied by the fact that attention was finite and easily diverted. This brings me to the second element of organisational embedding I will review, efforts to induce the attention of other actors. Making a claim is only one part of the transaction. Connecting it to a solution and ensuring the solution recognises the problem is the second and arguably more difficult part. It is important to recognise that both of these issues were embedded in broader temporal currents. Like career systems, each of these mechanisms relied on opportunities to act and the ability to harness actors together. Temporally, though, they are different from careers, as they highlight the problems of generating and sustaining organisational inertia. To illustrate this, I once again focus on the flow of events to illustrate how problems and actors to work with them moved through the ecology. Together these issues explain how the Scottish repertoire of contention worked in the pre-War period.

Clearing a Space for Scotland

One of the first problems confronting Home Rule lobbies was to establish themselves and their claims as distinct from the Irish. In the midst of the general upheaval following Gladstone's announcement, roles were unsettled, the meaning of Home Rule was vague, and how Scotland would fit into such a plan was being defined. This made tie differentiation and

136

attention induction in the period before 1893 a more chaotic affair as Home Rulers experimented with different approaches. The SHRA quickly went to work to establish Scottish Home Rule as a distinct problem, confirm the urgency of the case and clarify the broader political benefits of acting on it immediately.

Writing in the *Liberal Home Ruler*, Charles Waddie explained that Scottish Home Rule was an issue that transcended the divide between Gladstonian and Unionist Liberals. "As the association of which I have the honour to be secretary is composed of both Unionists and Home Rulers", Waddie explained "I am desirous of addressing the Unionists through the columns of the Liberal Home Ruler, and if I trespass a little more than usual on your space I must plead the importance of the question as my excuse" (LHR 5 November 1887: 261). Waddie continued to detail the egregious wrongs visited upon Scotland as a minority partner within the United Kingdom. He detailed the excessive taxation, the lack of appropriate legislation and the parliamentary gridlock that resulted from the demands of managing an empire.

He continued, explaining that should Ireland be allowed Home Rule before Scotland it would only result in continued oppression for the Scots, as they would lose the ability to call upon them—the Irish having now retired to a parliament in Dublin—to support Scotland's claims. Should Ireland be given Home Rule first result would continued oppression for the long suffering, and more deserving Scots. This remedy, he explained "has simply to be stated in its bare detail to show its utter preposterousness." Waddie continued:

> What, then, is the remedy? It is here that our Unionist friends have a better grip of the situation than the Gladstonians. It is to re-adjust the whole legislative machinery of government by setting up four distinct national Parliaments, and then clearly defining what is national and what is international...

137

Waddie concluded with a plea for engagement:

> If I have succeeded in convincing some of my Unionist friends that the only hope for our country is in giving the people of Scotland the full control of their own affairs, would it not become them to join the Scottish Home Rule Association and help on the good cause? Even Englishmen admit that Scotsmen can manage their own affairs, and that there would be no danger in giving them the power.

The response was unequivocal. The LHR's editor succinctly replied: "We do not agree with our contributor as to Mr. Gladstone's plan. A beginning must be made somewhere, and as the oldest claimant for Home Rule, Ireland is entitled to the first consideration" (ibid.).

The SHRA's efforts to differentiate themselves from Ireland continued, albeit with a slight change in tactics. In anticipation of the 1888 election, the SHRA organised a series of rallies calling upon their ties to allied organisations. The group sought to reinforce its image as a legitimate actor with a coherent programme and set of complaints while forcing the issue against political parties. Commenting on the Home Rule rally of 18 September 1888, The Leader reported: "Professor Hunter, M. P., who presided, said there was one advantage to changing the venue from Ireland to Scotland. No one could raise the bogey of separation." The report continued, explaining that "Whatever form Home Rule took, Parliament would remain sovereign and supreme." The meeting ended with William Mitchell proclaiming that "the Home Rule movement in Scotland was the important weapon that could be used for the success of Home Rule in Ireland." The meeting concluded as "The Rev. David Macrae moved, Dr. Clark, M. P., seconded, and it was unanimously resolved that the time had arrived to make Home Rule for Scotland a test question in every constituency" (LHR 22 September 1888: 163).

Actions such as these marked the early phase of the period. Home Rule was established as the solution to a distinct set of social ills in Scotland and differentiating Scotland's claims from Ireland's occupied much of the

energies of these early Home Rulers. Taking advantage of an invitation to chair a debate on Home Rule at the National Liberal Club in May 1888, the SHRA's William Mitchell captured the essence of the expanding Home Rule field, explaining "It need only to be remarked...that the Home Rule question has turned out a much larger one than Mr. Gladstone seems to have anticipated when he introduced his Irish Government Bill." Mitchell continued by reaffirming the SHRA's support for empire and distancing the organisation from Ireland. "Our apology for treating the Home Rule Question so much from an Imperial standpoint is, that the Scottish People are loyal not only to themselves but to the British Empire of which they form a part." Drawing contrasts with Ireland, Mitchell explained: "In a word, it may be said that the state of the matter is nearly this—Ireland receives all benefits and few burdens; Scotland, all burdens and few benefits; England, burdens and benefits alike."

Having distanced the SHRA from the radical Irish, confirmed the organisation's support for empire and established themselves as worthy political actors, Mitchell continued to detail the benefits of Home Rule for both Scotland and the United Kingdom as a whole. "Unfortunately, in these days, the Imperial Parliament seems too much overburdened with work to be able to attend to local grievances until they have been so neglected as to excite something like rebellion." Following a discussion of recent land seizures in the Highlands and Islands, Mitchell explained: "Such abuse connected with the land and many other Scottish grievances, which no Local Government Bill can cure, are long standing although of most of them the Imperial Parliament remains in utter ignorance." Mitchell concluded his discussion by quoting an earlier, unnamed reformer's comments following Gladstone's earlier flirtation with Home Rule, which had also taken shape against the backdrop of Irish contention.

> The people of Scotland are, to a large extent, left without the advantages of intelligent government, but they are quiet and orderly....They got on not because of, but in spite of the Government. They have been a patient people. But in so far as formal or reasonable government is concerned, we believe that Scotland has been, and is now, one of the worst governed and most neglected countries in the world.

The path was clear. The Liberals should elevate Scotland's demands to par with those of Ireland or they would discover "[i]n these circumstances and with a determination which if not respected will surprize [sic] the Liberal party at the next election..." (LHR 11 May 1888: 282). The Scottish Liberal responded and made Home Rule for Scotland an official plank in the Party's platform in 1888.

By the early 1890s Home Rule was firmly established on the Liberal agenda. The solution, as it would apply to Scotland, was reformist in nature. Home Rule was a solution to the problems of parliamentary overcrowding and needed social reform in Scotland. The Union would remain intact and Scotland's relationship to the broader UK would be one of "Federation *not* Incorporation" (FC May 1901: 3). After 1892, when Gladstone announced that Irish MPs would remain at Westminster under his revised Home Rule plans, the SHRA no longer sought the attention of Unionists and Gladstonian Liberalism came to define the Home Rule agenda. SHRA leader and Crofter's MP G. B. Clarke introduced the first Scottish Home Rule motion in the Commons in 1889. The first motion to be carried was 1894 and a second soon followed in 1895. Following this period, though, Home Rule lobbies receded into the political background.

Federalism

At the turn of the century, the Boer War and renewed contention in Ireland once again brought Home Rule back to the fore of Scottish politics. The Boer War renewed questions about imperial policy for which federalism was the increasingly discussed solution. Debates surrounding the cost of the war, administration of colonial dependencies and the relationship between

140

the UK and its colonies, both economically and politically, introduced

renewed vigour for long-standing Liberal policies such as free trade and

decentralisation. It was against this backdrop that the YSS began its life.

Despite having emerged from the Liberal Party, the YSS operated as

a largely independent lobby. Its ability to capture the larger Party's

attention was due to the depth and variety of its ties. And its willingness to

operate both for and against the larger party was made clear in its 1911-12

Handbook. Recalling the organisation's history, the YSS explained:

> The Society took a notable part in the brilliant Scottish Progressive
> victories at the two General Elections of 1910. The result of the
> December election having put the speedy enactment of the
> Parliament Bill beyond all doubt, the Society, at its Dunfermline
> Conference of 1911, adopted amid great enthusiasm the strong
> Resolution...by which it demanded Scottish Home Rule during the
> present Parliament and pledged itself to enforce this demand, if
> necessary, by running its own candidates (YSH 1911-12: 6).

It further focused the attention of the party by regularly—and successfully—

vetting candidates.

> The threatened adoption of Mr. Scaramanga-Ralli as Liberal candidate
> at the Ross and Cromarty bye-election in June, and the actual
> adoption of Mr Masterman by the Liberals at the Tradeston bye-
> election in July, almost led to Young Scots candidatures to enforce
> the spirit of the resolution....Mr Macpherson, however, just secured
> the nomination in the former case, and in the latter Mr Masterman,
> after accepting, promptly made way for Dr Dundas White. The choice
> of Mr W. G. C. Gladstone as Liberal candidate for Kilmarnock Burghs,
> in September, evoked strong protests from within the Society, but
> the National Council approved Mr Gladstone after he had declared
> himself in favour of the Society's policy on Scots Home Rule and the
> Land Bill.

The breadth of the YSS's organisational base was largely responsible

for its ability to focus Liberal attention. Before the First World War, the YSS

had established nearly 60 branches throughout Scotland and had a

membership of approximately 10,000.[17] The local branches organised

regular lecture series on a range of topics central to Liberal policy, such as

free trade and those more aligned to radical policy such as land reform and

housing. The YSS expanded this programme to both sides of the party,

---

[17] These figures were derived from the YSH and YS.

remaining open to both unionists and Gladstonians. For as the YSS

explained, "in present circumstances it will certainly be wise to conciliate

every available waverer, but no sensible Unionist Free Trader will object to

the affirmation of national rights" (YS 2 November 1903: 16).

This policy was expanded in new directions by the ISHRL. Following

the well-worn practice of Irish Home Rulers to exploit ties to North American

immigrants, the League undertook efforts to foster ties in the US and

Canada. Writing of their first year of operations, the ISHRL explained the

development of this policy.

> It was felt that the organisation of the Scots Home Rule movement
> was incomplete in respect (a) that no Society existed in the country
> for the sole purpose of promoting Home Rule for Scotland, with which
> its supporters could become connected; (b) that the geographical
> restrictions of the movement to Scotland was prejudicial to its
> success and should be removed by making the demand for a National
> Parliament one not from Scotland only, but from the Scottish race;
> and (c) that the absence of a journal devoted to the cause of Scots
> Home Rule, seriously retarded the progress of the movement (TSN
> March 1914: 75).

During 1913, ISHRL secretary F. J. Robertson toured North America where

branches were established in St. Louis, Chicago, Minneapolis, Seattle,

Vancouver, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Albany and Boston.

The ISHRL sought connections in Scotland as well. Exploiting his

position as an Edinburgh Town Councillor, Robertson recruited 73 Honorary

Presidents in the organisation's first year of operations, most of them

municipal officers. This practice resulted in a series of pledges from a

variety of local government organisations, chief among them a pledge of

support for Home Rule from the Convention of Royal Burghs. At their

meeting on 7 April 1914, the "Convention approved of the report of the

Annual Committee on Local Self-Government for Scotland" which stated:

> Your Committee are of [the] opinion that a federal system of local
> Government affords a possible means of relieving the Imperial
> Parliament from the weight of unnecessary local legislative detail. It
> should be applied to suitable divisions of the Kingdom, where the
> inhabitants have racial and national instincts and traditions in
> common....They are also of [the] opinion that such a system will

broaden the base of Imperial Government, and prepare the way to world-wide federation of the Empire—if not of the English-speaking race (TSN May 1914: 105).

By June of the same year, ISHRL, under Robertson's direction, had successfully championed a motion for Home Rule through the Edinburgh Town Council. The ISHRL's approach to Home Rule as a proposal for legislative and government efficiency, above party interest, continued. Federalism would improve the legislative life of Scotland. Robertson, in his speech supporting his motion, explained that Federalism would improve municipal legislation.

> The new arrangement was proposed because the present system was defective. Under the Private Legislation Act, Scottish Corporations and others were at the mercy of a few individuals in London. In the last Edinburgh Provisional Order, five Peers refused the unanimous desire that Council to equalise the local assessments. The recent application by the city of Glasgow to increase its water supply, was a notable example of the working of system. Five Peers, none of whom were connected with Scotland, were invested with all the authority of Parliament. In the exercise of their extraordinary powers, they rejected the Glasgow Order. It was not surprising, therefore, that those responsible for the administration of the country were disgusted with the whole system (TSN June 1914).

The motion passed by a vote of 28 to 12. Supporters included 15 Liberals, seven unionists and six Labour members. The ISHRL had succeeded in connecting the solution of Home Rule to problems of local administrative neglect, in turn embedding the organisation into the machinery of local government.

The Social Agenda

Thus far my discussion of organisational embedding has focused exclusively on embedding into political networks. But Home Rule was a solution to more than simply the political problems of legislative inefficiency. In this section I change focus and explore Home Rule lobbies' attempts to embed into radical, progressive and social-issue networks.

As noted earlier, the SHRA was forged in the crucible of radical politics. Recall that its founding membership included senior members of

143

the HLLRA, Crofter's Party, temperance organisations, labour unions and left-leaning Liberals. In comparison to later groups, the SHRA was initially developed almost exclusively as a channel of radical demands. The push and pull of these lineages were borne out in the SHRA's claim-making. Writing of "Scotland's Claim", the SHRA pressed the need for Home Rule to address the "many questions ripe for settlement in Scotland—such as Religious Equality, Land Laws, Liquor Traffic, Game Laws, Fishery Laws, Local Government Boards" (LHR 3 March 1888: 124). These claims were expanded the following week. Writing of the Highlands, the SHRA noted that only Home Rule would alleviate the "cry of wretchedness [that] comes yearly from our Highland population…." Only Home Rule would stop the wealthy "classes robbing the masses" through the "gradual closing up of the rural walks around our towns, and especially in many parts of the Highlands, by the encroachments of landlords and sportsmen." Only Home Rule could stop "the perpetration of strife amongst our Churches" and rectify the "grave defects in the Land Laws." The SHRA ended this listing of grievances with one its most populist pleas:

> It was the common people who in time past led the movement that preserved our National Independence. It was the common people who in time past led the movement which achieved our Religious Liberty. Again, it is the common people who fortunately posses now the power as well as the patriotism, that mainly support the present movement against the thraldom of having our National affairs mismanaged in England (LHR 10 March 1888: 134).

Once attached to the solution of Home Rule, social issues remained a part of the jurisdiction. However, facing developing competition for control of these elements from elements of burgeoning labour movement, Liberal lobbies fought to regain control of these elements of the jurisdiction.[18] The YSS Manifesto captures much of the same spirit of the SHRA's earlier claims and once again connects them to the solution of federal Home Rule.

---

[18] Amidst renewed strife in the Highlands, the HLL was reconstituted in 1909, with demands that it be completely free from the Liberals. Furthermore, the ILP, while still insignificant in comparison to the Liberal Party, was improving its mobilising capabilities.

> For years and years Scotland has been clamouring for legislation on
> Land, Temperance, House-letting, Education and Poor Law Reform,
> but to all these demands the Imperial Parliament turns a deaf ear—it
> has no time for Scottish affairs. Since 1886 there has been a
> demand for an extension of the Crofter's Act, and the securing of fair
> and just conditions for the agricultural portion of the community.
> The fate of the Small Landholders Bill still hangs in the balance. For
> more than thirty years there has been a demand for Local Veto, for
> popular control of the Liquor Traffic—but a demand still unsatisfied
> (YSH 1911-12: 39).

The manifesto continued to outline the egregious state of Scottish social

affairs from the poor state of housing to the decrepit educational

infrastructure and overwhelming necessity for reform of the poor laws. All

of these issues, they explained, were solvable only within the framework of

a Liberal government.

To ensure that attention was focused, the YSS continued to vet

candidates on these issues and hold public meetings to proselytize about

their importance. For example, a representative page from the "News of the

Movement", a regular report of national and branch activities, from 1

February 1904 (YS 1 February 1904: 54) carried reports of seminars on

disestablishment to be held at Bathgate. Peebles reported a forthcoming

debate on the temperance question. A seminar concerning the importance

of free trade on alleviating poverty was held in Edinburgh. And Selkirk

reported "an open meeting...on 22 December for the discussion of the

Temperance Question....the main points under discussion being—Prohibition,

Local Veto and Local Option, Municipalisation, Compensation to Publicans,

the Power of the Vested Interests, and the want of real interests in the

Church towards the question."

Similar demands for social reform were found amongst the pages of

The Scottish Nation.   Writing of the need for land reform, the ISHRL noted:

> There is an impression abroad that the Scottish Home Rule
> movement is of a purely sentimental nature. It is taken for granted
> that compared with Ireland, Scotland has no special legislative
> grievances which cannot be effectively dealt with by the Imperial
> Parliament. So far as the land question is concerned, this is quite
> erroneous. In the first place, the Scottish land system is so

145

complicated as to be beyond the grasp of the average English
Member of Parliament; and secondly, the Imperial Parliament is so
overweighted that time cannot be found for dealing with Scottish
affairs (TSN November 1913: 14).

The solution to this and a myriad of other social ills, the ISHRL explained,

was local administration, within a federal framework.

Ecological Control

These processes of emergence and lock-in bring me to the final piece

of the refunctionality puzzle, ecological control. At each point during the

timeframes reviewed, lobbies formed within the Home Rule ecology behaved

in very similar ways despite the turnover of participants, the change in

problems, the variation in activating issues and shifting flows of attention.

Explaining these similarities requires an examination of how the ecology was

organised. Ecological control is comprised of several elements, but in this

particular timeframe two pieces provided critical: the structure of previous

political settlements and the organisation of attention.

Political Settlements and the Shape of the Ecology

Short-run political contingencies interacted with long-run structural

settlements to define the shape of the ecology. Specifically, the political

dominance of the Liberal Party in Scotland was critical in shaping the way

that problems became attached to Home Rule. In the long-term, the Party's

dominance of Scottish affairs since 1832, willingness to champion the

expansion of the franchise, support for populist causes and efforts to

organise voters sloped the ecology in its favour. Short-run settlements are

clearly illustrated by the SHRA's early efforts.

As Home Rule organisations regularly explained, the issue was one,

they believed, that should have transcended political boundaries. Evidence

of this openness is provided by the early days of SHRA. Recall the group's

early invitations to Liberal Unionists, the Scottish Party's support for a

Unionist in 1888 and their willingness to shelter anyone who would support

the cause. This openness extended to its leadership as well with the organisation's first president, the Marquis of Breadalbane. However, the settlements reached early in the period defined the solution in terms of Liberalism, imperialism, federalism and socially progressive politics. The speed of this settlement is made clear by the rapid departure of the Marquis from the SHRA. The organization later explained that he had "became too nervous ever to occupy the chair..." (LHR 2 February 1889: 53).

The reality is that he did not fit the developing interactional rules. These early settlements produced matching rules that defined appropriate selection criteria for involvement, which in turn shaped the flow of people and the attachment of problems. While invitations were formally extended to anyone willing to champion Scotland's cause, the reality was that participation was limited to those working in left-wing politics.

This was further buttressed by the Liberal's ability to absorb challengers. The land reform movement is one very clear example. Despite the crofters' initial burst of activity in the middle 1880s, their claims and their central champions were quickly absorbed by the Liberal Party. Even when the HLL was re-established in 1909, it was unable to mobilise smallholders away from the Liberals. The Party's dominance over Scottish political affairs worked like a series of tributary river channels directing claims towards it. The result was that control over the meaning of Home Rule as well as what lobbies were capable of doing was largely conditioned by the relationship mediated by the Liberals.

The Organisation of Attention

For good or ill, the Liberals' role as ecological mediator meant that their attention tended to shape the ecology's attention. This is immediately evidenced by the founding and career structures of lobbies. Opportunities to act emerged from Liberal crises—Irish Home Rule, the Boer War, electoral decline. And when new events had begun to shift the Party's attention,

147

demands for Home Rule and the lobbies who channelled them tended to recede into the background. With the ecology slopping towards the Liberals, the resultant pooling of attention gave them significant, if inadvertent, control over activities within it.

Further complicating the organisation of attention was the multiple embeddedness of actors. This was evident from both the careers and organisational embeddedness perspectives. Founding a new organisation relied on the ability to organise existing ties into new configurations. Refunctionality from a career perspective, therefore, was the bracketing together of individual biographies into new arrangements. This however, was a function of availability. In some cases there was continuity of actors, such as the flow between the YSS and ISHRL, in others there were discontinuities such as the Scottish National League which existed as an evolutionary deadend. The central lesson to take from the careers perspective is the matching system generated by the ecology. It was temporally and relationally variable, shaped by the activities of other domains be they land reform, temperance or labour.

From the organisational embedding perspective, I made this problem of attention explicit. Nesting into the surrounding environment meant capturing the attention of surrounding actors. But again, unpredictability in the flow of events meant this process was often precarious. The ISHRL's later activities capture this problem of garnering the attention of a diverse body of organisations. Calling upon a variety of organisations to act, the ISHRL began rallying for a distinct Scottish Party in 1915. Unhappy that its demands had not been received by the Liberals or Unionist, it began to rally the attention of other groups. "Curiously enough" the ISRHL's proposal began

> considering our past, and our sentimental regard for our country, Scotland has not yet given the response to the movement one would have expected, though signs of awakening are not wanting. The

foundation of such a body as we desire are already laid, and we have only remove some partitions to disclose the complete edifice.
Simply as this may seem, however, the work is of a delicate nature, requiring at once the wisdom of Solon and the diplomacy of a Machiavelli....

Taking a rough estimate of the scope and aims of these bodies we find the An Comumn catering solely for the Gael; the Young Scots— aiming now at Scottish self-government and hoping to get same as the price of their loyalty to the Liberal party; the St. Andrews Society...[who] in conjunction with the Burns Federation and other societies [organised] the successful National Exhibition of 1911, and the appointment of Prof. Rait to the chair of Scottish History in Glasgow University....Now how much greater would their results have been if they had acted in unison....[the idea of a new Party] has been mooted...to some of the officials of these societies, and while they consider that there is a germ of reason in them, they have not taken them up seriously (TSN August/September 1915: 302).

Attachment to existing projects regularly meant that moving into new one was limited by the unavailability of attention to devote to it.

Ecological Control: Overview and Conclusion

Refunctionality from the perspective of ecological control illustrates two key issues. The first is that there was no enduring nationalist core that was intermittently awakened. Rather, there were problems flowing through various sets of relations, which were sometimes attached to the solution of Home Rule. Secondly, their ability to spawn new organisation was dependent on availability and authorisation to act, both of which were often functions of different structures. By melding short run historical contingency with long run structural stability, ecological control explains why what appears so chaotic in one timeframe appears stable in another. Furthermore, it explains why courses of action were initiated and maintained, even when more "useful" solutions presented themselves. Wilson's 1904 demand for a national party is just such an example. No one acted on his demands because refunctionality is "heavily influenced by the problematics of attention, by the ways in which [opportunities to act], problems, solutions, and their participants are associated in terms of their simultaneous availability" (March and Olsen 1983: 292).

149

Conclusion

In this chapter I have detailed the process of organisational emergence. Explaining genesis I have centred the mechanism of refunctionality and explored it from three nested perspectives: careers; organisational embedding; and ecological control. While Home Rule lobbies were indeed a new variety of actor, they were created from existing materials. This process of creation involved the braiding together of existing lineages into new configurations. From the careers perspective we witness the alignment of openings (opportunities to act) and available personnel. From the vantage of organisational embedding, I have reviewed efforts to lock-in to the surrounding environment, and ecological control has illustrated how the topology of the ecology shaped these two processes by controlling the flow of attention and directing claims towards the Liberals.

In retrospect, the processes of refunctionality and organisational emergence appear simple, even reassuringly familiar. But when viewed from the perspective of those involved we see drift, missed opportunities, shifting availability, frustrated demands, transient attention, glorious success and saddening failure. It is for this reason that the garbage can model is such a useful way of conceptualising organisational development. This model in no way disparages the activities of those being described. Rather it captures the contingent nature of multi-organisational processes. Matching opportunities with personnel with problem with solutions is seldom "the product of intentions, plans, and consistent decisions…." Rather it relies on "incremental adaptation to changing problems with available solutions within gradually evolving structures of meaning" (ibid.). As this chapter has shown, this is in no way to imply that organisational genesis is impossible, but rather that is "less a matter of engineering than of gardening; less a matter of hunting than of gathering" (ibid.).

And what can be done, can be undone. In the next chapter I return to the larger environment to detail the changes that started during the First World War that ultimately disentangled these newly braided lineages and reworked them into a new configuration.

Chapter 5: Environmental Redux

The period between 1914 and the mid-1920s witnessed a dramatic rewiring of the Home Rule ecology. Mobilisation for war, political transformation and economic change cascaded through the ecology radically altering how it was organised. Problems previously attached to the solution of Home Rule were finding new solutions. Established career systems were destabilised as organisational interactions changed. A number of actors left the ecology as a result of redirection or extinction and were replaced by new ones with differing levels of attention and interest in Home Rule. Existing outlets for channelling claims—chiefly the Liberals—were in rapid decline. And while the Labour Party initially retained support for Home Rule, its attention soon shifted to other issues. Taken together these changes reconfigured the Home Rule ecology and changed the way it worked, ultimately facilitating the emergence of a new species of actor—the Home Rule party.

In this chapter, I rise out of the intricacies of intra-ecological interactions and examine the contours of the broader environment that facilitated this process of speciation. As in Chapter 3, I explore the structure of the conjuncture by detailing the changing structure and flows of this ecological garbage can. I detail the events that diverted attention, shifted the flows of actors, problems and solutions, changed the rules of interaction, swept some problems out, returned others and introduced new ones. In the remainder of this chapter I explore these changes and how they transformed the Home Rule ecology.

Mobilisation for War

War-making, particularly on the scale witnessed during the First World makes huge demands on a state. Few activities are capable of focusing this complex organisation's attention like war making. Armies must be mobilised, weapons and munitions manufactured, monies raised and a

variety of activities coordinated. For the organisation of Scottish Home Rule, the war's effects were played out in a series of interwoven economic and political dramas. The co-evolutionary relationship between state and economy had been changing since the Third Reform Act. The partial enfranchisement of the working class combined with a Westminsterisation of Scottish politics was further reconfigured by the demands of wartime mobilisation. Three changes in particular proved critical to reorganising the Home Rule ecology: the rapid growth of manufacturing jobs; the attendant growth in union membership and power; and the centralised, state control of production and wages.

As Keating and Bleiman (1979: 63) explain:

> Wartime demands produced a tremendous boom in Scotland's traditional heavy industries. Shipyards were almost overwhelmed with orders and the textile industries were kept busy with orders of all kinds, from sandbags to uniforms, while Clydeside became the most important single munitions centre in Britain.

These increased demands took shape against the backdrop of significant wartime demographic changes. "Scotland lost the equivalent of 46.8% of the male workforce recorded in 1911, and 41.1% of those aged between 15 and 49 years, to military service in the course of the war" (Lee 1999: 21-22). The result was "one of the most contentious aspects of wartime employment…the 'dilution' of the labour force, as semi-skilled and unskilled workers, often women, replaced skilled men who were on military service" (ibid. 22). The process of dilution was particularly strong in the munitions industry which absorbed 500,000 extra workers during the war (ibid.), most of whom were unskilled, many of them women. As would be expected, the dilution programme was not popular with some in the trade unions who fretted over its long term impacts.

Dilution formed part of larger government plans to coordinate the war effort. The 1915 Munitions Act was partially in response to a number of small, unofficial strikes that had taken place on Clydeside. The Act radically

changed the working environment, centralised state power over production, and helped to radicalise elements of the labour movement. A core clause of the Act banned strikes in munitions plants. It controlled the movement of labour by making it a penal offence for munitions workers to withdraw their labour or move to another employer without the permission of their current employer. Further, employers were given the power to issue or refuse certificates of discharge in effect making it impossible for an employee to work for another plant without their previous employer's consent. It also made it a punishable offence for workers to refuse new roles regardless of pay rate or to refuse overtime, even if unpaid.

Against this backdrop, the Clyde Workers' Committee (CWC) was formed. An unofficial trade union faction, the CWC propounded an explicitly Marxist version of socialism (in contract to the ethical/Presbyterian socialism of earlier labour movements) and sought to organise the newly expanding, albeit diluted, workforce. The movement peaked in March 1916 with the Parkhead Work strike that soon spread to other plants ultimately delaying the deployment of a new Howitzer. The Government responded with a swift, two-pronged approach.   An official committee—the Clyde Dilutions Commission—was formed to negotiate over labour conditions. This afforded workers an element of control over the dilution process, improved their relationship with the state and helped to enshrine them as worthy political actors. This compromise was tempered with the arrest and imprisonment of three organisers and internal exile to other parts of Scotland for ten others.

Efforts to secure continuation of wartime stability and limit the impact of expected post-war unemployment involved the official and unofficial union movements in the 1919 General Strike. Demands for a 40 hour week combined the radicals of "Red" Clydeside and their officially sanctioned colleagues. These demands, though, were not supported nationally by the engineering and shipbuilding unions who had balloted

instead over a 47 hour week (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 64). This split between local and national demands served to reinforce local identities, further convincing radicals that Home Rule was the only answer. While the debate continues over just how "Red" Clydeside was, what is beyond debate is that this episode had significant effects for the Home Rule ecology. It radicalised a branch of the labour movement which, under the leadership of John Maclean founded the first Home Rule party, the Scottish Republican Party.

Radicalisation of parts of the labour movement was only one impact of the dilution policy. The massive expansion in the number of manufacturing jobs and the attendant reduction in the status differences between them swelled union rolls. In the UK as a whole, union membership increased from 4,145,000 in 1914 to 8,438,000 in 1920 (Hutchison 1986: 285). Furthermore, wage differentials between skilled and semi-skilled labourers were eroded during the war (ibid. 287). Additionally, the wartime concentration of industry around the Clyde and the resultant housing shortage meant that skilled artisans were soon experiencing similar living conditions as their unskilled compatriots. Rent strikes and housing protests, most notably the 1915 Rent Strike, further cemented working class allegiances. Commonality of experience was increasing amongst the Scottish working class facilitating more opportunities to act in coherent ways.

Adding to this commonality of experience was the strict regulation of working conditions. Even though the Munitions Act's severe regulation of labour proved unpopular with some, the government's policy of intervention in the economy laid the groundwork for future demands. The stabilisation of rates, the opening of previously closed shops and significant intervention in the economy proved popular with the Labour Party and the unions. As noted above, the 1919 General Strike was an effort to ensure continued

155

government intervention. And as will become clearer below, the experience of tight state control over the economy proved critical to changing the Labour Party's stance towards Home Rule.

Politics

Three changes provided critical in transforming the ecology of post-War Home Rule: the Fourth Reform Act of 1918 and its reorganisation of the electorate; the rapid decline of the Liberal Party; and the rapid ascent of the Labour Party. These three event streams, in a broadly similar fashion to the changes detailed in Chapter 3, altered the way parties operated, transformed the way affiliated groups interacted with one another, redirected attention, suppressed, solved or ignored a host of issues while according importance to a new set, produced new actors and identities and ultimately shaped the organisation of Home Rule.

The Fourth Reform Act

The 1918 Reform Act was in many ways distinct from its predecessors. Whereas the legislative processes of the previous Acts had involved a series of compromises between Whigs and Radicals in the face of a Tory controlled House of Lords, this Act took shape in a different context. Two differences were key. Previous rounds of redistricting had aimed to maintain rural seats as they provided a central pillar of Conservative support. With rural areas becoming increasingly radical and Unionist support moving to suburban areas, there was lessening opposition to redistribution. The second was the First World War. The Act's foundations were laid in 1916 against the backdrop of Liberal crisis and efforts to maximise consensus about the war effort both of which helped to limit partisan infighting.

Similar to the Third Act, it altered the demographics of the Scottish electorate. Once again a huge number of working class men were added to the rolls and, for the first time, women were granted the franchise. Between

1910 and 1921, the Scottish electorate nearly tripled in size from 760,000 to 2.2 million. Of these 2.2 million voters, men represented 1.3 million and women 911,000.[1] Of equal importance to the expansion was its distribution. During the same period, Glasgow's eligible male voters increased by 109%, Clydeside's by 72% and those of the Highlands by 84%. Even when compared to the far from inconsiderable 72% increase for male voters overall, these numbers were enormous. As Dyer (1996: 117-18) explains:

> It was a measure of the impact of the 1918 franchise, that even in the region of least change (Borders) there were two and half times as many voters (male and female) in 1921 than 1910. In Glasgow and Dundee where there were three and a half times as many, it is probable that only around 20 per cent of the 1922 electorate had been enrolled twelve years earlier.

> Similarly, in Aberdeen and Highland, where the electorate trebled, only one in four of these registered in 1922 could have cast a ballot in the last pre-war contest. Thus, the parties were faced with having to mobilise a large number of new voters if they were to succeed in the new political environment.

> Reinforcing the surge in the number of demographically similar voters

was the redrawing of constituency lines. Again, Dyer (ibid. 122) is enlightening.

> In parochial terms, the most distinctive feature of the Fourth Reform Act was its introduction of the first major reapportionment since 1707, because the accumulation of 25 extra seats, 1832-1885, had ameliorated injustice without removing anomalies. The acquisition of only one more seat in 1918 and the arithmetical imperatives of the redistribution scheme made substantial changes inevitable.... Tardily following the population movements of the previous century, Scottish parliamentary representation had become concentrated in a narrow strip of land between Glasgow and Edinburgh, which returned 48 of the 71 MPs, creating an overwhelmingly urban and industrial polity.

This state of affairs resulted from the Boundary Commissioners' remit to create constituencies of equal population size. In drawing boundaries based on populations of at least 50,000 (for liberation) and 70,000 (for creation) the old Scottish separations of burgh and county were no longer tenable. The result included a reduction in burgh seats from 13 to six reducing the power of rural landowners. Perhaps more importantly for the practice of

---

[1] All figures are taken from Dyer (1996: Chapters 6 and 7) unless otherwise noted.

Home Rule, it included the provision of eight extra seats to Glasgow. With

15 seats, Glasgow now held nearly a fifth of all Scottish MPs.

New registration provisions that removed the ratings and poor law

provisions and reduced the residency rules to six months coupled with

requirements that officials actively seek out potential voters in the creation

of twice-yearly registers led to the creation of a new variety of voter—

poorer, less educated and working class. This meant that

> in contrast to England, where the new electoral settlement left the
> political establishment undisturbed, the same facts which had
> sustained (if not enhanced) Unionist hegemony there revolutionised
> the party in Scotland by ending almost 90 years of Liberal suzerainty
> (ibid.).

It is to this decline that I now turn.

Wither the Liberals

There is a cottage industry surrounding the decline of the Liberals

after World War I. The Party which had successfully held Scotland since the

1832 Act was suddenly in free fall after 1914. Students of the Party's

decline have faced many of the same problems as those who study the

Home Rule movement. They expect change to be gradual, or if sudden, to

be precipitated by some catastrophic event. "Historians [of Liberal decline]

have tended to fall into two camps", Ian Parker (1996: 52) explains, "the

'accidentalists' and the 'inevitablists'." The accidentalists point to the First

World War and the Asquith/Lloyd George spilt as facilitating the decline. The

inevitablists on the other hand point to the slow rise of class consciousness

with its attendant focus on industrial conflict and social reform.

As will become apparent shortly, both approaches are correct. I do

not take this stand out of a sense of compromise, but rather out of

recognition that all actors are bundles of temporally variable lineages. That

is, any actor—the Liberal Party in this case—succeeds in reproducing itself

through time only by arranging a set of events into self-reinforcing

structures. For the Liberals these events included things like its branch

structure, recruitment networks, policy initiatives, relations to other

institutions such as the Church, newspapers and national government and

more indirect ties such as location and kinship networks that help to build

voters. Any structure, be it "micro" like personality or "macro" such as a

national political party, is enacted moment by moment and changes in the

configuration of the temporally variable networks that sustain it can result in

seemingly sudden and dramatic change. It is not that diversity of ties is bad

for actors; quite the opposite, diversity of ties sustains actors, producing

their "thingness" that makes them recognisable. Rather, problems of

survival and recognisability occur when local contingency exploits existing

structural configurations.

For the Liberals these contingencies developed on several fronts and

their impact was harsh. As historian Iain Hutchison (2001: 29) explains

> The extent of the transformation in Scottish politics can be starkly: in
> August 1914 there were 54 Liberal MPs, but ten years later only 8,
> while the number of Conservative MPs rose over the same period
> from 13 to 36 and Labour from 3 to 26…. The comprehensive defeat
> of Asquith in 1918 at East Fife, a seat he held for over thirty years,
> and the humiliation of a lost deposit at Glasgow St. Rollox inflicted on
> McKinnon Wood, Liberal Scottish Secretary between 1912 and 1916,
> epitomised the Liberal collapse.

Like the Home Rule movement, these changes resulted from a confluence of

events, some long running, others more immediate.

The Fourth Reform Act discussed above was one of these changes.

The extension of the franchise entailed by the Third Act was readily

absorbed into to the Liberal party. As I explained in Chapter 3, the party

was itself reorganising internally and, in Scotland at least, it was capable of

ensnaring these newly enfranchised working class voters. The context in

which the Fourth Act was enacted was significantly different. The newly

enfranchised working class encountered the Labour Party readymade for

their needs, serving their interests and organising their votes. Further,

redistricting implemented by the Act eradicated 13 Scottish seats, 11 of

which were historically Liberal strongholds and gave eight new seats to Glasgow, almost ensuring safe seats for Labour.

Internally, the Liberal Party had been pulling itself apart since the outbreak of hostilities in 1914. Deep divisions between those who supported the War and those who opposed it came to a head with the Maurice Debate of 1918. Scottish Liberal MPs disproportionately supported Asquith (22 for Asquith, 17 for Lloyd George) and were subsequently punished at the ballot box. By 1920 the schism was formalised with a quarter of Scottish Liberal Federation branches disaffiliating to follow Lloyd George. These internal squabbles rent the party asunder once more with more conservative members poached by the reinvigorated Tories and more liberal ones often defecting to the Independent Labour Party.

The Party's troubles were exacerbated by its inability to coordinate its branch structure. Even after the reconciliation of 1923, which attempted to smooth over the Asquith/Lloyd George split, central coordination of the Scottish Liberals proved elusive. "In 1928", for example, "a survey of constituencies activities for that year found that local parties had held 700 public and social meetings, and had raised £7,500" (ibid. 36), all of which came as a surprise the Scottish Liberal Federation. In line with the breakdown between centre and periphery was a significant loss in resources. With the grass roots withering, desperately needed funds were drying up as well. By the latter part of the 1920s, paying members numbered approximately 1000, half the pre-War number. This lack of adequate funds further constrained the Party. Once again, Iain Hutchison (ibid. 37) captures these impacts on the party's ability to get work done:

> The structure of the central machinery was highly deficient. It was chronically understaffed: at one point the party secretary was himself collecting subscriptions door-to-door when he should have been engaged in higher grade work. The party could barely afford cars for its organisers, so the constituencies were left to their own devices. No women's organiser was appointed until the late 1920s.

The atrophy of the Liberal's coordinating structures was reflected in their post-War policies. Free trade continued as a rallying cry throughout the 1920s as did temperance, but neither retained their pre-War constituents, business leaders and the Presbyterian dissenters. Against the backdrop of post-War recession, growing industrial populations, a general resolution of the rural land issue, mass enfranchisement of women, greater state intervention in local affairs and strict class polarisation of politics, the Liberals were a party without a cause.

The rapid decline of the Liberals provides a window on the changing Home Rule jurisdiction. In the years between 1886 and 1916, Home Rule was a solution to a number of problems, many of which were central planks in the Liberal platform. The changes brought about by the First World War either resolved these problems or shifted attention onto new ones. The Liberals were now excluded from a jurisdiction they had largely helped to create. The problems now being attached to this solution were bringing new groups into the jurisdiction and, in turn, transforming the way groups worked with it. Central to these changes was the rise of Labour.

Reorganising Labour[2]

The Labour Party's relationship to Home Rule was almost as old as the movement itself. Labour leaders played key roles in several Home Rule organisations notably the SHRA in both its pre- and post-War guises. However, the post-War environment soon diverted Labour's attention from Home Rule. This resulted from the concatenation of four event streams. Keating and Bleiman (1979: 84-85) identify three of these. Scottish industry was increasingly concentrating. The industrial boom of the War ended in deep recession, which hit Scotland particularly hard. As result, wages were declining in turn driving demands for national bargaining. This

---

[2] This section relies largely on Michael Keating and David Bleiman's superb *Labour and Scottish Nationalism*.

161

facilitated the amalgamation of several Scottish and English unions. To this triumvirate I add Labour's electoral breakthrough of 1922.

Wartime production had dislocated a number of industries. In addition to munitions, food production and distribution, iron and steel manufacturing, railways and transportation, textiles, coal mining all came under direct state control. This led to a boom in demand coupled with wage stabilisation and price controls (implemented 1917), which helped to reversed pre-War decline. Further this concentration of demand and the attendant shortage of labour coupled with the dilution policy swelled the ranks of trade unions. Finally, increasing government involvement brought with it wage equalisation and improvement of working conditions. National collective bargaining structures were created including joint industrial councils and, where unions were too weak to negotiate, wage boards. In many, albeit not all, cases this meant an improvement in both wages and working conditions.

The concentration of industry that the War brought slowed many pre-War declines, but failed to reverse them. Scottish industry was built on heavy manufacturing, increasingly reliant on a number of imported materials. Furthermore, several peculiarities of Scottish manufacturing noted below meant it was not competitive against foreign competitors who exploited their advantage of the latecomer. Taken together, the dislocation of wartime manufacturing allowed international competition significant gains. As economic historian Clive Lee (1999: 31) explains:

> The war certainly shifted the balance of international trade against Scottish shipbuilders by increasing world-wide capacity and against textile manufacturers by enabling competitors to establish themselves in Asian markets, especially in India. But the war also demonstrated the fragility of the Scottish heavy industry base, with the separation of iron and steel manufacturing and the growing need for imported raw materials. The war exacerbated a situation which was already a source of industrial weakness, accelerating the decline, rather than causing it.

This decline was soon manifested as a deep recession.

Unemployment skyrocketed. For example, unemployment in engineering stood at 27% in 1921 and by 1922 there were 80,000 unemployed workers in Glasgow alone. This was soon reflected in union membership with the STUC's affiliation dropping precipitously from 560,000 in 1921 to 227,000 in 1922 (Keating and Bleiman 1979: Chapter 3). The impact of the recession was broadly felt in Scottish industry. For example, Scottish farm workers who had earned more than their English counterparts before the war, so much so in fact that a special dispensation was required during the War to free them from national wage rates, were quickly losing ground. By the mid-1930s they were earning less than English workers in the same occupations (ibid.).

Experience of national pay scales and the rapidly diffusing argument that national negotiation was the only way to ensure occupational stability led to demands for centralised labour structures. A wave of amalgamations of Scottish and English unions soon followed. This contrasts sharply with practices of organised labour in the 1890s. Recall that the STUC was established in opposition to the TUC precisely because of Scottish workers' desire to maintain the uniqueness of their working patterns. Home Rule, for many labour organisers, was another way to solve what were conceived of as specifically Scottish problems. STUC support for Home Rule was maintained to protect Scottish interests that were necessarily separate from English ones. However, following the War, the STUC began a push for amalgamation. This point was made explicit at the 1919 TUC annual meeting where the vice-chairman of the STUC explained:

> It would be foolish for us to aspire to be rivals to the British Trade
> Union Congress; but, if I may use the illustration, I would say that
> the Scottish Trade Union movement generally exercises the function
> of a Home Rule body. In political matters, we believe that the time
> has come when Home Rule for Scotland, Wales, Ireland, and England
> is necessary, in order to relieve the pressure upon the Imperial
> Parliament; but that does not imply that there is any desire for

separation or to weaken the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. As a matter of fact, the Imperial Parliament would be enormously strengthened by the establishment of Home Rule in the different countries of the United Kingdom. I would apply that illustration to the Scottish Congress in relation to the parent body. You represent 5,250,000 people this week, at this Congress, and that is an unwieldy membership for one body to control. We believe that the time is not far distant when the question of devolution, industrially as well as politically, will have to be taken up....we sincerely hope that those of you who are entitled to give us your Scottish membership will seriously consider the question... (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 95).

This announcement was followed in 1920 by increased discussions between the two bodies under the broad assumption that Home Rule was inevitable and a corresponding relationship was needed. By 1922, this policy had irrevocably changed.

After the War the TUC had become increasingly involved with post-War planning, serving as a mediator between the government and specific unions. In 1922, the STUC undertook a similar programme which led to negotiations to collaborate more closely with the TUC. By 1923, internal rules changes had transformed the STUC. While maintaining its unique structure, including representation of trades councils and the absence of the card vote, it became more representative of organised labour in Scotland in general, more closely aligned the TUC and STUC and brought with it closer affiliation of Scottish branches of key TUC members. Soon the TUC and STUC were collaborating in nationwide recruitment drives.

By 1924, the two groups had begun to focus almost exclusively on industrial matters. Whereas both organisations had long fought to be recognised as legitimate political actors worthy of the attention of MPs and ministers of state, the rise of the Labour Party meant attention could return to industry. Writing in 1924, the General Council (which helped to coordinate activities between the two groups) noted:

> The Trade Unions had now obtained recognition, and a strong National Labour Party provides a medium for the expression of general social ills and possible political reforms. The Trade Union Movement, emphasising the necessary permanency of its of organisation, irrespective of the political party in power, demands

164

Control in Industry. It is therefore essential that Congress concentrates on enlarging its functions as a national organ for the improvement and development of Trade Unionism in its industrial aspect, in order that the objective be made possible of achievement (ibid. 97).

No longer was the movement to pass resolutions demanding political action, there was no more need for the organisation and dispatch of deputies to political conferences. With the Labour Party now a credible force in national politics, trade union focus was now firmly on issues of labour. "Indeed, with the problems of industrial organisation in the forefront, and the co-operating with the British TUC the keynote, nothing was heard on the subject of Home Rule until 1931, when a Home Rule resolution was rejected" (ibid.).

This change in focus was secured, in part, by the 1922 general election. This election was a turning point for the Labour Party as it was finally a significant actor in British politics, particularly in Scotland. Against the backdrop of renewed rent strikes (broadly supported by the ILP), higher unemployment, improving party organisation and a voters turnout of over 70%, Labour took 30 Scottish seats in 1922 (Dyer 1996: 135-140; Hutchison 1986: Chapter 9). When Ramsay MacDonald formed the first Labour government in 1924, the Party's new trajectory was confirmed. Like the unions who supported it, the Labour Party's attentions were refocused by this new position. The impact of these wins can be explained succinctly. Scottish Labour members could no longer reconcile policies of working to gain power at Westminster, while simultaneously supporting efforts to undermine it. In light of the changes noted above, the Party's focus changed to one of national administration. Economic decline, amalgamation and the increasingly tangible possibilities of significant change offered by national power generated internal reorganisations. By 1927, the Party was prohibiting membership in potentially competing organisations (most importantly for this analysis the SHRA), resulting in an acrimonious split and the severing of ties between Labour and Home Rule.

165

Analysis and Conclusion

On the ground, muddling through the day-to-day, it is easy to miss the contingent nature of social life. We too often accept the "just-so" stories afforded by the way things turned out. As Jack Goldstone (1998: 832) relates, such explanations rely on "Dr. Seuss-like explanatory principles, 'it just happened to happen and is not very likely to happen again'." As I illustrated in Chapter 1, nationalism has offered the converse of these explanations, relying instead on overarching teleologies of progress or convergence to a single ideology. I have sought to steer a middle course by employing a model—the garbage can ecology—that identifies generalisable characteristics such as variable attention spans and the interaction of unlike species while respecting contingency, the messy details and rough edges that shape social life.

In this chapter, I have taken a bird's eye view of events that reshaped the Home Rule ecology. I have detailed how a contingent series of events realigned a set of networks, in turn altering what they were capable of doing and how they went about doing it. I have detailed the flow of problems, solutions and people and explained how their connections to Home Rule were altered. War-making, political reorganisation and economic transformation concatenated, shifting attention, clearing away problems previously attached to Home Rule, pulling actors into new activities and rewiring the career and embedding structures that had defined the pre-War ecology. In short, events outside of the ecology came to control it. The process of war-making had a number of unintended consequences. Organised labour's ranks were swollen. Emboldened by centralised administration of industry, some elements of labour radicalised and, with partial government capitulation, further redefined the relationship between workers and the state. This new relationship was further shaped by the rise

of Communism. A new evolutionary path (albeit, as will become apparent in the next chapter, a dead end) was blazed through the Home Rule ecology.

The knock-on effects of these unintended changes were soon felt in politics. Decades of contention and an incremental zigzag of compromise and disappointment had finally resulted in a near universal franchise. This expanded electorate was demographically distinct from its pre-Act predecessor and its first opportunities to act tipped Scottish politics into a new balance. With the Liberals in rapid decline, Labour experienced electoral breakthrough. This breakthrough brought a new set of challenges and in turn, a redirection of interest. With a successful political party to represent its interests, organised labour turned back towards work and away from politics.

Slowly, but surely, the jurisdiction of Home Rule was changing. Problems once attached to it were finding new solutions. Those who sought to control it were moving into new areas of work. And in turn, the variable flows of people and activity that had been the hallmark of the pre-War ecology were trundled off into new arenas. For the Home Rule ecology, the disentangling of these lineages forced change. The shape this change took was a function of three factors: availability of actors; ability to focus their attention; and their configuration in the ecology. The changes outlined in this chapter dramatically limited actors' availabilities, shifted their attention and left significant vacancies in the ecology. Just how these environmental transformations impacted the organisation of Home Rule is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 6: From Lobbies to Parties

On Friday 27th July 1917, "the first public gathering since the
declaration of war which seriously considered the government of Scotland"
(TSN August/September 1917: 452) was convened at Dowell's Rooms,
George Street, Edinburgh. Organised under the auspices of the ISHRL, the
meeting brought together a host of battle hardened Home Rule activists
from the Liberal tradition. They had gathered "for the purpose of
considering what ought to be done to further the movement for Scottish
control over Scottish affairs." To cries of "hear, hear" and repeated rounds
of applause, ISHRL leader and Edinburgh Town Councillor F. J. Robertson
explained:

> Since the outbreak of war the country was supposed to be under a
> party truce the object of which was to suspend controversial
> legislation. It was notorious, however, that it had never been
> observed (hear, hear). Pre-war questions such as Irish Home Rule,
> Tariff Reform, Women's Suffrage, Electoral Reform and Redistribution
> were being vigorously discussed everyday, and there was no valid
> reason why the claim of Scotland for self-government should not also
> receive consideration (applause).

Following a detailed listing of Scotland's ills, its ignored problems and
its mishandled War-time administration, the assembled delegates resolved
that the "meeting should constitute itself into a Scottish National Committee
which would be independent of all political parties (loud applause)." Like the
ISHRL which had aided in its formation, the Scottish National Committee
"would welcome support from any political candidate or party which
approved of these objects...." However, lobbying was simply the beginning.
As Mr. J. Peacock noted:

> the present was an appropriate time to take action as Federal Home
> Rule was being widely discussed. He approved of the formation of a
> National party as he was convinced that by no other means could
> they attain their object. [Further] Scottish Members of Parliament
> should show their independence by not accepting office in any
> government until Scotland had Home Rule (Hear, hear).

The paper promised that "full reports of the work of the Scottish National
Committee will appear in *The Scottish Nation* which is published on the first

day of each alternative month during the War. The next issue will appear on 1st October" (TSN August/September 1917: 450).

Unfortunately, the activities of the Scottish National Committee are lost to the mists of time as *The Scottish Nation* for 1st October 1917 failed to appear.[1] Even though we lack a record of the Scottish National Committee's further exploits, the minutes of its inception are enlightening nonetheless. Despite the broad similarity of claims—the founding resolution called for the establishment of a parliament in Edinburgh and the relocation of all administrative offices to Scotland—its plan of action was markedly different from its predecessors. Specifically, it was Peacock's demand for a national party which would refuse its seats in government barring Home Rule for Scotland. The claim itself was not as radical as the relational break it illustrated.

This claim marked the beginning of different trajectories within the Home Rule ecology. The Liberal Party's fading fortunes coupled with the reorganisation of Scottish social life driven by the War facilitated political realignment. The changes made a new set of actors available and authorised to act. With groups such as labour unions, socialists and radicals moving to the foreground, new careers structures were spawned, new organisational relations were available for embedding into and the reorganised ecology chose and channelled actions and actors in new ways.

Where the pre-War ecology had operated against the backdrop of emerging actors seeking political access, its structure ensured that demands were channelled via the Liberals. The short-run contingencies spawned by war-making exploited longer-run developmental trajectories such as economic realignment and franchise expansion to transform these relations.

---

[1] I am uncertain if this is simply a case of selection bias or if the paper did in fact cease publication as the British Library's Newspaper Archive does not hold any further issues of *The Scottish Nation* past the August/September 1917 issue. Despite searches throughout the secondary literature I have been unable to find any mention of the Scottish National Committee.

The immediate result was that the Home Rule ecology was opened to a different set of actors. While they continued to attach many of the same problems—land reform, labour conditions, housing, legislative backlog, Westminster's ignorance of local condition and so forth—to the solution of Home Rule, the channels they used to make them changed. In this chapter I explore the organisation of the post-War ecology. As the last chapter illustrated, a series of contingent events concatenated to disrupt the autocatalytic dynamics of the pre-War ecology. How these networks reconfigured is the topic of this chapter.

In contrast to other scholarly examinations of this period, I do not begin with the National Party of Scotland and work my way backward attempting to identify the single acorn responsible for the forest of oaks (cf. Finlay 1994; Mitchell 1996; Morton 2000). Viewed from the perspective of 1918, it was in no way apparent that in 10 years time an independent Scottish national party would exist. Further, there was no reason to expect that the four organisations that came to form the party would ever be in a situation to collaborate. To begin with the end and work backwards, seeking the future in the past, assuming that things "had" to happen this way, is teleological. It elides the contextual, relational and temporal contingencies that define history. Similarly, to point to the increasing number of published demands for a Home Rule party and assume that public sentiment was driving political change is to place the cart before the horse. As the Scottish National League showed some 20 years earlier, demands for a party are a dime-a-dozen. Rather than a history of sentiment, we need to recognise the way that shifting relations provide or limit opportunities to act and chances to mobilise people.

Avoiding these traps, I follow a similar plan of organisation in this chapter as I did in Chapter 4. I review the process of refunctionality—the use of existing organisational materials for new purposes—from three nested

perspectives: careers; organisational embedding; and ecological control. I begin with the jurisdiction of Home Rule and work out to explore who sought to work with it, how they collaborated, how they fought, what problems they attached to the solution and how the structure of their interactions shaped the realm of the possible. To simply the complexity of events, I divide the period into two phases: 1918-1927 and 1927-1930 which aligns with the significant changes in the structure of the ecology.

What will become apparent throughout the course of discussion is that the post-War ecology behaved in very similar ways to its pre-War predecessor. Lobbies exploited their ties to existing political organisations to press their claims for Home Rule. They locked into the surrounding environment by collaborating with sympathetic groups. They sought to focus the attention of parties. And they experienced significant and rapid changes when these parties moved out of the jurisdiction. The garbage can model of ecological interaction detailed earlier continues to apply here. While the actors changed, the processes shaping interactions within the ecology of Home Rule remained relatively stable as illustrated by the continued importance of the mechanisms of careers, organisational embedding and ecological control.

Contentious Careers

The post-War Home Rule ecology's careers systems remained very similar in structure to those of its pre-War predecessor. The rules of social matching remained participation in left-wing politics and a willingness to champion Scotland's cause. What did change were the organisations doing the matching and the rhetoric that justified devolution. Central to both of these changes was the rapidly diminishing presence of the Liberals. While the Party remained in support of Home Rule, its presence in and ability to shape the ecology were declining. The result was the formation of three

171

distinct career paths into Home Rule: 1) a mainstream path; 2) a radical labour path; and 3) a path of structural isolation.

The Mainstream Path

Driven by opposition to the War, particularly the introduction of conscription, a number of Liberals on the left-wing of the Party had joined the ILP. As a result, the Labour Party became the main party-based conduit of Home Rule demands in the post-War period. And with Labour came its affiliates. Whereas both groups had been players in the pre-War system, they were brought to the foreground by the events detailed in Chapter 5. As these groups were brought centre stage, the rhetoric of devolution changed from a Presbyterian self-sufficiency to socialism.

The Scottish ILP's relationship to Home Rule was positive, but incomplete. Its 1919 conference passed a resolution calling for a Scottish parliament, but defeated a proposed amendment demanding "a Scottish Socialist Government in Scotland, after an Irish delegate had declared that the only freedom which mattered was economic freedom" (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 61). The body went further in 1922 calling for an assembly so Scotland could determine its own form of government. The Scottish Council of the Labour Party was perhaps the weariest of Home Rule. It was staunchly against collaboration with other political organisations and as a result did not approve of the efforts of lobbies. Despite the limitations forced on the Party by it constituents, in the period immediately following the War through the middle of the 1920s, the ILP remained the chief political party champion of Home Rule.

Following the War, the Party's union affiliates were more willing to provide unconditional support. It is true that many of the main bodies affiliated with the Labour Party had long been active supporters of Home Rule. But with the reduced capacities of the Liberals and the union's own expanding organisational strength resulting from War-time mobilisation,

172

they were in a position of greater presence in the post-War ecology. The STUC passed resolutions, with large majorities, supporting Home Rule every year between 1914 and 1923. Two years in particular, the 1918 and 1919 meetings were noteworthy because of the presence of both the Prime Minister and Secretary for Scotland at meetings where Home Rule led the agenda (ibid.).

It was against this backdrop that the first post-War lobby was founded. The Scottish Home Rule Association appropriated the name of its pre-War predecessor which had been moribund since the turn the century and officially passed into oblivion with Waddie's death in 1912. The organisation's inception was noted in the pages of the July 1920 issue of The Scottish Home Rule Association Newssheet.

> On September 9th 1918, when the war darkness seemed to lessen and an armistice was in sight, a group of people, including Mr Robert Allan, Mrs Crossthwaite, Messrs Wm. Gallacher, Tom Johnston, H. S. Keith, R. E. Muirhead and Robert Smillie met in the Central Hall, Bath Street, Glasgow, called together by R. E. Muirhead.

Quoting from the meeting minutes, the paper continued:

> On the suggestion of Mr Keith, Mr Muirhead took the chair. He intimated apologies for absence from Rev. Jas. Barr, Govan; Miss Cameron, Highland Land League; Mr Joseph Duncan, Farm Servants Union; Mr Peter Fyfe, Chief Sanitary Inspector, Glasgow; Mr Robert Hay, Dunfermline, all of whom expressed their deep interest in the movement and best wishes for success.

> Mr Muirhead then made a statement outlining the history of the Scottish Home Rule movement and his work in connection with it during the past fifteen years....[2] It was now proposed to institute a non-party national movement in order to press to a final issue the Scottish claim to self-government.

The assembled group unanimously passed a resolution to organise a National Convention "to which representatives of all shades of political opinion and every phase of industrial activity would be invited." The resolution continued:

---

[2] Muirhead was a Home Rule veteran having worked with the YSS, serving on the national publication committee and with Bridge of Weir branch (YSH 1911-12: 8). He was also a founding member of the Scottish National Committee. He collaborated with Tom Johnston to found *Forward* a journal of left-wing and labour politics, which had become central outlet for radicals during the War. It was, at one point, band by the Government as seditious for its support of strikes.

> That this meeting...being convinced that the present centralised system of government of different nationalities from London is inefficient and inconsistent with national sentiment, resolves to form itself into a committee for the purpose of organising and focussing the Scottish demand for self-government in respect to Scottish affairs.

The article concluded with a statement of its operating model.

> It will be clearly seen that this organization is entirely non-party, does not side-track or dissipate its energies in working for reforms which Home Rule will bring in the best way, but aims only for the realization of Home Rule, and admits women on the same terms as men, and invites all organizations, including local governing bodies, etc., in sympathy with its objects (emphasis original).

Similar to its pre-War namesake, the SHRA's inception wove together careers from a variety of fields and timelines. James Barr and Robert Smillie both of whom had been active with the pre-War SHRA and had continued their careers in radical politics were founding members. Barr was a radical Presbyterian minister who had left the Liberal Party for Labour during the War. Robert Allan, also of the Miners' Union and Joseph Duncan, of the Scottish Farm Servants' Union, also provided direct links with the STUC. William Gallacher, who became the organisation's president, was at the same time president of the Scottish Co-Operative Wholesale Society, which, as I will show, provided helpful links in terms of embedding.

True to its proclamation, the SHRA was non-party, attracting representative from the ILP, Liberals and Conservatives. At the time of founding, Muirhead was the secretary of the Lochwinnock branch of the ILP and James Maxton, who became involved shortly after its inauguration, was a rising star in the party. The Unionists were represented by H. S. Keith, ex-Provost of Hamilton and the Marquis of Graham. The Liberals were represented by J. M. Crosswaite and Robert Hay, former leader of the YSS. Despite this initial flush of cross-party collaboration, though, the resultant career matching system was shaped by relationships with the ILP and labour unions.

Radical Labour

During the same period, other parts of the labour movement were spawning new careers structures into Home Rule. The radical wing of the Clydeside movement had been reinforcing its links to traditional labour unions resulting in 1919 general strike demanding a 40-hour work week. The movement's growing demands for socialism were being channelled into the Socialist Labour Party and the successor organisation to Clyde Worker's Committee, the Scottish Workers' Committee. These two organisations had emerged from the radical labour movement that developed in Clydeside during the war. And while they had ties to both the mainstream labour movement and the Labour Party, they operated as distinct entities.

With the formation of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) in 1920 there was a schism between these groups. John Maclean, the de facto leader of the movement was unimpressed by Soviet communism and had advocated that the groups remain separate from the CPGB. Maclean was a supporter of Sinn Fein and, in the face of renewed land agitation in the Highlands, was certain that a similar movement could be fermented in Scotland. While Maclean was serving yet another jail term for sedition, Willie Gallacher, Maclean's rival in the movement had secured the affiliation of the Socialist Labour Party and the Scottish Workers' committee to the CPGB following his return from a meeting with Lenin in Moscow.[3]

Maclean remained the head of a small contingent of socialist members which became the Scottish Workers Republican Party in 1921. The organisation maintained cordial ties with both the CPGB and Labour Party. It was differentiated from these groups, though, in its operations. The SWRP was the first Home Rule Party. After receiving the backing of the local Labour Party to stand in the Gorbals division of Glasgow in 1923, Maclean

---

[3] As an aside, the Marquis of Graham left the SHRA after confusing Co-operative leader and SHRA president William Gallacher with the communist Willie Gallacher.

prepared an explicitly Home Rule and separatist platform. However, before having the opportunity to act, he died before the election (Milton 1973).

The subsequent debates surround the meaning of Maclean's commitment to Home Rule are irrelevant. Whether or not he was a true "nationalist" or simply using the issue to strike a "blow to the heart of British Imperialism" (McHugh and Ripley 1983: 46; see also Cairns 1990) is not my concern. What is important is that new career paths through the ecology were forming. Collaboration amongst labour groups, engendered by War-time economic and political reorganisations were intercalating networks in new ways, building new actors and new ways of acting. Ultimately, this evolutionary branch proved a dead end, but it illustrative of new behaviours emerging in the ecology as a result of its shifting relations.

The Path of Structural Isolation

Following the failure of the George Buchanan's 1924 Home Rule bill and the subsequent silence in the Labour camp, prominent SHRA activist Tom Gibson defected to the Scots National League. The SNL, an obscure, London based organisation, founded at some point in 1920 (the exact date is not readily apparent) was dominated by radical romantics. Most of its founders had worked together in the HLL and earlier SHRA as well as a number of Gaelic cultural organisations. Had it not been for Gibson's defection, the SNL would have most likely remained a structural isolate. It was poorly organised and vitriolic in its hatred of England, the English and anything associated with Westminster. The organisation's early activities had been to support Maclean's campaign and Sinn Fein, but in terms of lobbying activities or claim-making, the SNL was more a private club rather than a public organisation. However, with Gibson's defection, the SNL gained an able organiser who was critical in restructuring the group (Finlay 1994: Chapter 2).

By 1926, the SNL had begun to publish the *Scots Independent* and had organised branches throughout Scotland and England (including London, where the majority of the early founders lived, and Liverpool). The organisation was explicitly anti-party refusing work with any organisation which had ties to England. Further, and in a complete break from the earlier period, the SNL was a separatist group. Call itself "The New Force in Scottish Politics" the SNL outlined its organising principles:

> **Object**—To set up, as is our national right, a new independent Scottish Parliament, which shall have full control over all Scottish affairs, domestic and international.

> **Standpoint**—The Scots National League affirms that the exercise of authority in Scotland is the exclusive right of the Scottish nation, to whom belong the Sovereign rights over the land and economic resources of Scotland, and that the aspirations of the Scots Democracy shall be supreme in the furtherance of the social and economic welfare of the people of Scotland.

> **Membership** is open to all men and women who shall signify their adherence to the Object and Standpoint of the League. Annual minimum subscriptions, 3/-.

> **The League** is a Federation of Autonomous Branches, each of which controls its own affairs.[4]

Divisions within the SNL generated another career path along similar lines. Like the communist, the SNL was marked by bitter debates over the minutia of obscure ideological points. The result of one of these debates was the succession of Lewis Spence from the SNL and the establishment of the Scottish National Movement. Spence's split from the SNL took with it the entire Dunfermline and a large part of the Glasgow branches. While more willing to cooperate with other groups than the SNL, the SNM was similarly isolated and remained so until the end of the 1920s when it offered another opportunity to act by happenstance of availability. Like Maclean's SWRP, the SNL and SNM highlight the radical reorganisation in the ecology after the War. With no single organisation dominating the field, a variety of new career paths were opened. And groups that would have been unable to

---

[4] This proclamation was published in nearly every issue of the Scots Impendent.

survive under the selection rules of a Liberal dominated environment were able to cling to life in this one.

Organisational Embedding

Efforts at locking into the surrounding environment came in a number of forms. Draft legislation, meetings with interested parties, newspaper articles, the vetting of candidates and public demonstrations dominated this period, much as they had done the last. Efforts will still being made to capture the attention of parties and the public. Ties were still being differentiated. And Scotland special needs were still being proclaimed. What were distinctly different in this period were the conflicting approaches taken by the mainstream and isolated branches of the ecology. Whereas the SHRA worked hard to embed into a broad a swath of public organisations as possible by working with any and all interested parties, the SNL fought just as hard to remain aloof. In this section I review these contrasting efforts at controlling the Home Rule jurisdiction.

Consensus and Conciliation

The SHRA's embedding programme relied on building as broad a base of affiliates as possible. Quickly after its establishment in 1918, the SHRA began to amass a staggering array of affiliations. Exploiting its connections to the Co-operative movement, ILP and trades unions, the SHRA signed up branches throughout Scotland. The August 1921 issue of the SHR, reporting a 25% complete list of affiliates, listed 38 Co-operative groups, three ILP branches, 12 trade unions, and 12 "other" organisations (SHR Agust 1921: 8). Like the ISHRL, the SHRA also sought support from local government. In April 1922, the SHR reported that Irvin, Ayr, Rothsay, Saltcoats, Blairgowrie, Inverness and Allan Town Councils as well as the Convention of Royal Burghs had all expressed their official support for the SHRA. The Annual meeting of May 1922 boasted over 100 different organisational attendees from Co-operative societies, unions, the STUC, Liberal's

association and the ILP. The same issue reported that "including individual members and members of Organisations affiliated, the total represents approximately 1,850,000 persons" (SHR May 1922: 43). In total, between 1920 and 1928, the SHRA organised some 493 public meetings with other organisations.

Despite these efforts to embed into as diverse array of organisations as possible, the SHRA remained dominated by the ILP. During the period between 1918 and 1928, no less than 29 Labour MPs were affiliated with the SHRA. The depth of domination is evidenced by participation in the SHRA organised public rallies. These started life in 1922 as an effort to involve MPs and other interested "opinion makers" more closely with the Home Rule cause with the first was held in March 1922 at a large public demonstration held in Glasgow.

The meeting was chaired by William Gallacher and included a platform occupied by Liberals, ILP members, temperance organisers, Co-Operative Guild members, trades councils leaders, union and municipal representatives. Gallacher noted that

> he believed that it was the first great National Meeting, which had been convened since the Union of Parliaments, for the purpose of securing Self-Government for Scotland, and that Scotland should again take the place it never should have lost among the great Self-Governing Nations of the world. Since the passage of the Irish Treaty, Home Rule for Scotland had become a live issue. They were not out for separation but to get the Scottish people behind the basic principle of Home Rule for Scotland.

Following rousing speeches concerning the social value of Home Rule, it was resolved by Neil McLean MP

> That this public assembly of Scottish citizens, convinced that the time is fully ripe for thoroughgoing measure of Home Rule for Scotland, pledges itself to employee all lawful means to secure that necessary reform with the last possible delay; welcomes the Scottish Home Rule Association as a means whereby the demand for Scottish Self-Government may be organised, focussed and made effective; and urges upon all Scottish citizens the necessity of joining the Association in order to assist in pressing demand for a Parliament and Administration in Scotland (SHR April 1922: 37-38).

179

The next step was the organisation of a series of Home Rule conferences which ran until 1924. Organised as roundtables where MPs from all parties could debate the value of Home Rule, they tended to be dominated by Labour members. The first conference, held in October 1922, attracted six MPs, albeit from a range of parties (SHR October 1922: 17-18). The second convention held in February 1923 drew 17, with responses from 54 of the 74 invited members. However, attendants at subsequent meetings remained below 20.

The SHRA soon shifted tactics and organised the Scottish National Convention. The SHR recorded its history.

> The Convention consists of Scottish Members of Parliament (all of whom were invited), and delegates from a large number of public bodies throughout Scotland, together with members of the General Council of the Scottish Home Rule Association.

Following its first meeting in November 1924 and the failure of George Buchanan's 1924 Home Rule bill, the Convention set itself the task of drafting and distributing a Home Rule bill to Scottish MPs.

> At a Second meeting of the Convention on 30th of last month (October 1926), the report of the Committee was approved, and it was unanimously agreed that the Bill drafted by the Committee was worthy of being placed on the Statute Book, subject of course to amendment when it reaches the House of Commons. The aim of those of drafted the Bill was to produce a Bill which, if passed, would give the future Scottish Parliament the fullest possible power and authority over all things Scottish, while avoiding as far as possible any attempt to dictate to that Parliament of Scotland how it should use these powers (SHR November 1926: 37).

In an effort to produce a draft piece of legislation with as broad a base of support as possible, the SHRA had sent invitations to 116 town councils, parish councils, county councils and educational authorities. Eighteen of which accepted, 41 of whom refused and 57 of whom simply did not respond.

The lack of response and participation from other groups meant the resultant 1926 Scottish National Convention was dominated by more radical elements of the SHRA. The 1926 draft bill was a decidedly different

document than its 1924 counterpart. Advocating dominion status and the

withdrawal of Scottish MPs from Westminster, it served to alienate a number

of Labour Party members. Further, given the Labour Party's long association

with the SHRA, the 1926 bill was largely considered by parliamentarians to

be a Labour Party bill, dividing support in Westminster.

The extreme provisions in the bill were points of contention for the

STUC as well (who had recently begun a process of closer affiliation with the

TUC). The STUC formally requested that the SHRA involve them in future

revisions. Upon learning that the bill had been re-endorsed by the SHRA

without benefit of review, the STUC moved to distance itself from the

organisation (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 103).

Despite early successes, attention was moving away from Home Rule

by the middle part of the 1920s. As the second Convention shows, the

SHRA's early successes with Labour alienated other parties. And with power

at Westminster within reach, the Party's attention was drifting to other

topics. When the Convention-drafted Home Rule Bill was talked out on its

second reading on 13 May 1926, the SHRA recognised the deterioration in

its relationship with Labour. Evidence of this rests with the National

Convention meeting of May 1927. The meeting report lists no MPs, only

SHRA members and SNM president Lewis Spence, who advocated

> a very simple plan which I think may be efficacious and that is to go
> past Westminster entirely, to have nothing more to do with
> Westminster but to go to your local authorities, you County Councils,
> Municipal Councils, Education Authorities and Parish Councils (SHR
> June 1927: 108).

Spence's plan was well-received and marked the beginning of the end of the

SHRA's efforts at embedding into existing national governmental networks,

particular the Labour Party.

The SHRA's broad, consensus based policy of reaching out to as

many groups as possible presumed that other organisations had the energy

and attention to rationally weigh the arguments presented. The reality is

that despite the organisation's exceptional efforts at attempting to induce the attention of parliament in general and Labour in specific, the flow of events was against them. Attention was shifting; the Labour party was centralising and finally enforcing its policy against membership in other organisations. Further, the party was looking towards a national policy of central administration and Home Rule no longer had a role in their plans.

Against the Stream

The SNL's organisational embedding programme was a near mirror image of the SHRA. Where the SHRA had sought to engage the energies of a broad range of organisations, SNL's policy was simply to attack anyone who collaborated with English organisations or did not fits its narrow definition of the Scottish "race". Early issues of the SI contained articles entitled "To the Common Marxist: A Note on Nationality" (SI November 1926: 3), which aimed to build on Maclean's arguments about the importance of Scottish separation to ensure it reached its socialist destiny; "The Irish Menace" (SI December 1926:1) which explained that uncontrolled immigrations from Ireland "threatens the extinction of our nation and standard of living of our Scottish workers"; and general negative comments on the SHRA's 1926 National Convention.

Writing of the 1926 Scottish National Convention, the SI reported the SNL's position.

> It would be ungenerous of us to belittle the great work done by our Home Rule friends in directly public opinion to the disadvantage under which Scotland labours owing to her subordinate position. We cannot, however, follow the train or reasoning which indicates a course of action calculated to accentuate and make permanent our subjection by acknowledging the right of England's Parliament to grant us a measure of political freedom. As a Sovereign nation, it is our inherent right to resume our Independence whenever we, as a people, have sufficient self-respect and moral courage to do so.

The piece ends with a recounting of the SNL's policy, the centrepiece of which proclaimed:

That Scotland must be the sole judge of what part she shall take among the nations of the world, and that whether she shall, or shall not, co-operate in this respect with other nations must be matter for her decide (SI December 1926: 6).

Despite this policy of isolation and its general unwillingness to raise claims with other lobbies, the SNL did draw the attention of existing parties. As the SI reported:

During our short career, the Scots National League has already suffered much adverse criticism. That our critics have mainly relied on misrepresentation and have failed to face squarely the argument for Scots Independence that we present, is a great tribute to the logic of our case. Simultaneously, the classes are told we are Bolshies, the masses are led to believe that we are reactionary. We find ourselves classified, at one and the same time, red, pink, yellow, green, according to peculiar antipathy of the particular critic....

The latest complaint against the League is that we are out to split votes—a very ingenious charge that has successively been levelled against each progressive movement. The Liberals were terribly incensed against young Radicalism, which in turn grew pink with indignation as the red bloom of healthy life lent colour to the checks of the I. L. P.!

To-day the vested interests in the political parties in Scotland— progressive and reactionary—resent the entry, into the political arena of the Scots National League. It is useless to ignore the possibility that the advent of a Scots National candidate in a constituency might have the effect of taking votes from Tweedledee; further, that this result, Tweedledum might temporarily capture the seat and gain an opportunity to twiddle his thumbs in the Westminster Parliament. ... Our object, meanwhile, is neither to split votes nor split heads! Our aim is to achieve that National Independence, without which the progressive democracy of Scotland is neither able to express its voice nor to give its will. Scottish problems demand Scottish remedies; Scottish reforms require Scottish direction.

The course of action for the SNL was clear. The only way to channel demands was mobilise the general public (although they fail to explain how exactly this would be done).

By our adopted policy of running independent National candidates at future elections, responsibility will be placed where it belongs—on those partisans who would maintain party at the expense of National regeneration, and sacrifice the interests of Scotland, even its very life, at the behest of the party whip (SI January 1927).

From Lobbies to Party

The Labour Party's reduced interest in Home Rule stemmed from a number of conflicting demands on it attention. As discussed in Chapter 5,

the party was confronting a host of other issues which were occupying its time. Even long standing members who had previously shown great interest in Home Rule were being pulled in new directions. As James Barr noted at the Scottish National Convention of October 1926:

> Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am not sure that I am really entitled to make the report as for the Committee of the last Convention. It is quite true that I am a member of it, but my public duties have not allowed me to give the full care to the subject or a full attendance at the meetings that I would have wished (SHR November 1926: 38).

The Party's shifting focus meant that less energy was available for participation in the Scottish Convention, which was in turn being dominated by those with greater availability, particularly more radical SHRA members. The result was a constriction of the ecology beginning at the end of 1926 following failure of the second draft Home Rule bill.

The Third Scottish Convention held on 19th November 1927 marked the turning point for political lobbies. The SHRA's usual invitation to MPs, local councillors, party members and other interested parties was not widely accepted. Participants at this meeting were, as a result, a decidedly more radical lot, included members of the SNL, SNM, Labour and Liberal Parties, as well as the usual contingent from the SHRA. The meeting's minutes, recorded in the December issue of SHR (pp. 174-77) cover the opening discussions of the foundation of a national party.

As an opportunity to act, the meeting captured a number of conflicting issues. Questions were a raised by SNL representative C. M. Greive (Hugh MacDiarmid) as to what the party would mean: "Does the Scottish National Party Group mean a Scottish Parliamentary Party or a Scottish Sinn Fein Party?" Queries were raised about whether or not it would support existing parties or stand on its own. Labour and the Liberals were roundly criticised for their ineffectualness in garnering Home Rule. Questions were mooted about the group's policies, strategies, political

leanings, stance on socialism, response to the Highlands and issues of labour organisation. Efforts to define the parameters of Home Rule were repeatedly talked around or shouted down; a new party was the solution, problems could be attached to it later.

The immediate result was a clean break with Labour. As one party member explained during the Convention:

> I have spoken at street corners for twenty years and have never been subjected to so much interruption. When you are speaking of forming a new Party, the only possible thing one can discuss is its relation to existing Parties. There is nothing aggravating in that. I think I can say that in the West of Scotland for the last ten years at least eighty percent if the burden of propaganda for Home Rule has been borne by Socialists. If you are asking me to clear out of the Party, well and good. I am merely wanting to let you know that by this policy you are forcing me out. That is not personal. I will continue to work for Home Rule whether you clear me out or not (p. 175). You will also clear out the Rev. James Barr and many others from the Party.

Anticipating the problems that would bedevil the NPS from its inception, the Labour representative continued.

> And again, from another practical point of view, if any of you address public meetings for this new National Party you will say Scotland requires Home Rule, and you will begin to talk about housing, and this Highland land problem. And what will you answer these people if they ask, what is the National Party going to do for these things? You will have to formulate some policy whether you like it or not (p. 175).

The result was a mass exodus from the ecology. During the SHRA's general meeting of April 1928, two issues solidified the break with Labour. Muirhead announced that he was to stand as a National Party of Scotland candidate for Renfrewshire West. As the Party had no mechanisms for affiliation, he further explained his desire for individual members, including Labour party members to affiliate with the new party. The reaction from Labour was swift and complete. A 1928 Scottish Executive of the Labour Party resolution declared the NPS to be "be in the same category as the Communist or other party which it is not eligible for us to affiliate or become members of" (Keating and Bleiman 1979: 106).

The constricted ecology now consisted of members of the SHRA, SNL, SNM and a contingent from the GUSNA. And while they set to work immediately to create the new party, there were problems on multiple fronts. As Richard Finlay explains, "The National Party of Scotland was not born in a blaze of glory, but rather experienced a slow and painful birth, which was bedevilled by the suspicion and procrastination of the members from all the interested parties" (1994:71).

The move from lobbies to parties was in many ways the transformation from one garbage can to another. Boundaries on participation were loosely defined. Recall that SNL was earlier openly hostile to the SHRA; their current interactions were forced, not by a sudden alignment of interests, but by radical change in the operating environment. Attention was fluctuating: echoing the sentiments of the Labour representative at the third Scottish Convention, for what exactly did this new party stand? With no articulated policies, the early NPS simply adopted, en masse, the SNL radical and ill-defined programme of "Celtic Communism" which was a poorly defined programme of government by idealised clans. Participation was incomplete: while the SHRA dissolved itself in 1929, the SNL remained active with members regularly moving between activities. The connection between problems and solution was unclear which a brief review of the Party's early efforts at electioneering illustrates.

Announcing themselves to the world on 23rd of June 1928, Bannockburn Day, the National Party of Scotland (NPS) entered its first slate of four parliamentary candidates: Roland Muirhead (formerly of the SHRA) would contest the Renfrewshire West seat. John MacCormick (formerly of the GUSNA) was to stand in Glasgow-Camlachie. Hugh MacDiarmid (formerly of the SNL) was put forward as the home rule candidate in

Dundee. And Lewis Spence (formerly of the Scottish National Movement) was to contest a Midlothian seat.

Speaking at the Camlachie branch of the SHRA on 12 September 1928, MacCormick explained the party's political policy.

> In his address to the branch, Mr. MacCormick stated that the policy of the National Party was simply that of adopting whatever would be best for Scotland, but until such time as Scotland obtained control of credit, power and transport, and administered them through a Government of her own, her condition could not be improved" (SHR October 1928: 40).

This lack of clarity continued during the discussions of what relationship the NPS should seek with the UK. As MacCormick explained:

> I remember, for example, the heated discussions which took place as to how our objectives could be stated so as to satisfy those who wished to break away completely from England and the others who had slightly milder views. At last a compromise was devised and the object of the National Party was proclaimed: 'To ensure self-government for Scotland with independent national status within the British group of nations.' Even the word 'Commonwealth' was thus expunged from our vocabulary! (MacCormick 1955: 22-23).

These battles over the meaning of Scotland spilled into public. MacDiarmid continued with his radical Celtic mysticism and anti-English rants, regularly publishing them in the SI and other literary outlets. Further, the loose boundaries of the new ecology were readily illustrated by MacDiarmid's fascist arguments.

> Fundamental developments inevitably produce big men. That is the main criticism of the National Party so far. There is something wrong with it; it has not produced real leaders—or its organisation is still of such a kind as to frustrate them instead of develop them. What I said about the need for aristocratic standards, for a species of fascism applies equally here. I feel we will never make any real headway till we cease to imitate English organisations by running the Party on democratic lines or wanting anything similar in organisation or programme to the English parties (SI May 1929: 90).

As ability to participate was broadly open, there was little control over what issues were brought forward and attached to both the Party and Home Rule. The result was that the NPS became a catch-all organisation absorbing any person or group willing and available to participate. However, given the

significantly reduced attention of potential collaborators, the organisation drifted.

Ecological Control

Ecological control worked in two distinct ways during the two phases reviewed. In the period immediately following the War, claims were routed through Labour Party and union politics. As the inheritor of the Liberal's left wing mantle, the Party's position in the field meant that it absorbed claims, shaped careers and provided opportunities to embed. In a similar vein, Maclean's short-lived SWRP was a product of comparable dynamics. The tight coupling that resulted from the post-War ILP's support for Home Rule meant that they were capable of channelling the flow of events. However, the drift of their attention away from Home Rule, a largely unintentional response to changing flows of events, had significant effects on the ecology as a whole.

The rapid decline of Labour's interest in Home Rule and the accompanying diminishment in interest of their fellow travellers transformed the selection dynamics from participation in labour activities and politics, to availability. As options and opportunities to act within existing political arenas diminished, some of their former machinery was put to new use. As the third Scottish National Convention makes clear, availability was a key factor in reorganisation. This opportunity to act exploited a vacancy created by the Labour departure, which in turn brought a new set of actors to the foreground and allowed previously antithetical problems and solution—Home Rule and separatism—to be matched.

Conclusion

Reorganisation suggests intention. The ideal typical reorganisation as Olsen suggests assumes clarity and control. "Reorganizations have been proposed, implemented and understood mainly as solutions to problems. Organizations are changed deliberately in order to achieve greater

efficiency, more human satisfaction, or some new type of substantive policy" (Olsen 1979: 314). However, it is often the case that reorganisation is a garbage can with problems and solutions matched under condition of ambiguity; where events limit attention spans; where availability is the main criteria of participation. The formation of the SWRP and NPS are just such cases.

The Home Rule ecology had long been occupied by a fluctuating array of actors. New species were formed when these actors were able to create stable mating systems that relied on cross-organisational interaction. Change occurred when, for whatever reason, interactional partners were drawn into new arrangements. Just such a transformation happened during the period between 1918 and 1930. The changes ushered in by Liberal decline and War created a new matching system that tightly coupled Home Rule to labour politics. With the breakdown of these arrangements, new matching criteria based on availability emerged. The transformation from lobbies to parties was an ambiguous reordering resulting from the realignment of a variety of networks.

This was no march of progress. This was not the modernisation of nationalism. This was an opportunity to act marked by vague selection rules, loose coupling and ambiguous matching. Understanding the move from lobbies to parties requires an understanding of the operating environment, how actors were embedded within it and what events pushed them together and pulled them apart.

The rise of parties was not pre-ordained. As is evident, the lobby-party relationship continued despite the turn over of parts. Change occurred only when the relations that had sustained these ties were undone by the concatenation of unpredictable events. The result was reorganisation that took place within an ecological garbage can. Previously distinct streams of activity were, for a time, coupled resulting in new ways of acting. In

189

contrast to competing approaches that explain these changes as the progressive march of nationalism, I have provided an explanation that better fits the data. Contentious mobilisation, like all organisational phenomena, is shaped by relations, sequences and ecologies. And in this particular case, the organisation of the ecology hinged on the matching of careers, organisational embedding and ecological control which resulted in a garbage can capable of mixing new organisational forms.

Chapter 7: Journey's End

And so we reach the journey's end. The proceeding six chapters have restaged long dead campaigns, rehashed forgotten debates, reopened old arguments, reconstructed shifting careers, detailed numerous entries and exits and witnessed the births and the deaths of organisations. They have taken sweeping bird's-eye views of the entire ecology and descended into the minutia of fleeting organisational attention. Now I conclude by returning to the questions that opened this thesis before moving on to discuss larger themes.

In Chapter 1 I posed 10 questions for which we now have answers.

1) How did the problem of Home Rule develop as a contentious issue?

2) Why did it emerge at the end of the nineteenth century?

3) How and why did it transform after World War I?

4) What was the ecology of Home Rule?

5) How was the ecology organised?

6) How and why did it reorganise over the fifty years examined?

7) How did the organisational means by which contentious politics was practiced develop and change?

8) How do we account for the development and transformation of actors—the genesis problem?

9) What processes are involved in emergence and transformation?

10) What mechanisms account for genesis and transformation?

Below I review each question. I retell the tale of organisational development and change in Scottish Home Rule movement by describing each piece of the puzzle and then stepping back to describe the picture that emerges when they are all slotted together.

How did the problem of Home Rule develop as a contentious issue?

Contention developed as a result of efforts to control jurisdiction. Jurisdiction—the variable set of problems attached to the solution of Home Rule—was the central player in my explanation. Setting the problem of work—how it gets done, who does it and why— at centre stage provides a better explanation for the historical facts than nationalism with its focus on fuzzily defined notions of national spirit, public opinion, discourse or identity. This explanation better fits the historical reality for two reasons: it recognises that conflict emerged from differing efforts to solve problems; and it is dynamic, explaining how shifting flows of issues and attention generated changing contentious interactions.

I operationalised the study of this contentious conversation by focusing on the three sets of relationships which varied its flow over time. The first was the relationship between claim-maker and object of the claim. The second was the triangular relationship formed between claimant-object-jurisdiction. The third were the ties to other ecologies. All three sets of relations were nested with moves in one generating (intentionally or otherwise) shifts in other arenas. Taken together they provide a kaleidoscopic view of competition over jurisdictional control. This model explains why close collaborators in one time period can become adversaries in another. The development and transformation of jurisdiction brings groups into contact and their efforts at control spawn contentious interactions. Simply put, Home Rule was contentious because it involved competing claims over the same solution; claims that were rooted in a thickly woven tangle of relations.

Why did it emerge at the end of the nineteenth century?

Home Rule's development was conjunctural, a mix of deliberate action and structural contingency. The explanation I have offered has focused on the intersection of immediate responses to pressing problems,

192

feedback effects, incremental shifts and longer-run structural changes. Weaving these strands together into an explanation required that I treat the four arenas of activity from which it developed—Irish contention, land reform, organised labour and politics—from two perspectives. On the one hand I evaluated them as though they were more or less distinct entities, diverting attention from their external relations to describe their internal organisation. On the other, I considered them as open systems continually interacting with (and being changed by) other activities. Doing so allowed to me explain emergence through the interactions of internal structural changes and the surrounding environment.

Changes in Irish contentious repertoires intersected with Scottish land reform mobilisation, which crosscut with organised labour's increasing use of formal political mechanisms to air demands, which were all embedded in a transforming political system. These changes concatenated because, significantly, these four main networks shared a number of nodes via shared memberships and participation in overlapping areas of work. Gladstone's proclamation tipped these regimes into new alignment as pressures pushed, pulled and redirected activities. Charles Tilly nicely captures the contours of this process in his description of an earlier period of British contention. These environmental changes, he explains, resemble

> an evolutionary cusp, where members of disparate populations encounter one another in a time of rapid environmental change, try multiple strategies for survival, alter their collective boundaries, relations, and characteristics in manners that none of them could have intended, and in the process remake the very environment in which they live (Tilly 1995b: 354).

The Gladstonian realignment spurred a cascade of unintentional changes which can be captured in two critical elements: it provided a solution to a variety of different problems; and it provided an opportunity to act. The end of the nineteenth century did not witness sudden and significant changes in

public opinion or dramatic reformulations in mentalities. What changed were problems, solutions and the means of connecting them.

How and why did it transform after World War I?

Home Rule was a garbage can into which a variety of issues were dumped. The structure of the pre-War regime channelled problems towards the solution of Home Rule within the existing structure of the UK. Governing relations would need to change, the argument went, but the Union would remain intact. However, following the War, Home Rule came to mean separation rather than simply autonomy within the Union. Dramatic changes in the operating environment lead to the radical redefinition of the can.

Mobilisation for war brought with it economic centralisation and lower governmental tolerance of for contention. It was within this context that interactions between the state and organised labour in Scotland resulted in the schism that gave way to McLean's separatist form of communism. Further, in the post-war years, the Liberal party, with its public, albeit half-hearted, support for Home Rule was in steep decline, while Labour was ascendant. Bolstered by redrawn parliamentary districts and a surge in union membership fostered by expanding War production, Labour turned its back on support for Home Rule as it formulated a policy of centralised redistribution. This redirected the STUC. Irish contention was at least partially quelled by 1923 and Home Rule all round was dead. The mass extinction of Home Rule lobbies took place against the backdrop of these extreme environmental changes. The resultant vacancy was taken over by a new set of actors who brought with them a new set of problems which were connected to the solution of Home Rule.

This second wave of organisations arrived at the separation solution by two divergent routes. Communists pressed for separation because of their belief that Scotland was inherently more socialist than the UK as a whole. Given this state of affairs, Scots should be allowed to part company

in anticipation of the revolution. On the other branch of this winding bush, the organisations that became the NPS found themselves separatists more by accident than design. Hammering out a workable plan of action between these groups meant a great deal of satisficing, resulting in a variably applied commitment to separation in some form. In both cases the change in solution spawned from a narrowing of options and the need to create new solutions. As their jurisdiction was eroded they retooled and expanded into new areas of work.

What was the ecology of Home Rule?

I have used the framework of contentious ecologies to solve a number of problems. As I noted in Chapter 2, this model brings with it four significant benefits. 1) It provides a framework for studying the multiple actors involved by connecting them through their involvement in common problems. 2) It expands the frame of reference to include interactions between multiple "unlike species". 3) It provides a way of understanding change without recourse to teleology. 4) It recognises that everything has a past, providing a model of social change based on refunctionality. Ultimately, this ecological approach to contention better fits the historical data by enchaining multiple actors, networks and sequences, linking their coevolutionary relationships and explaining their change over time.

The Home Rule ecology emerged through the enchainment of a number of previously discrete niches and was reproduced through time through their ongoing interactions. Like a lagoon inadvertently created by a beaver dam, a variety of distinct and, heretofore loosely connected, species were brought into contact and competition. The ecology consisted of a wide variety of different species that all made some part of their living from the problems attached to the solution of Home Rule. Interacting within a loosely defined set of parameters, these groups were locked into a coevolutionary

relationship. Interaction, feedback, competition and cooperating established the rules of interaction as well as providing the materials for innovation.

Delimiting the ecology of Home Rule required a central subject; a hub into which the various spokes connected. The problem of Home Rule has provided this. The central subject is a historical particular that is traceable through time, but open to change and redefinition as its constituent relations change. In this case, I have started with a jurisdiction and worked my way out to the actors who sought to manage it. This embeds the problem into a variety of different lineages: Home Rule lobbies and parties; national and local governments; trade unions; communist groups; socialists; unionists; the Co-operative movement; and political parties to note but a few. The ecology, therefore, was comprised of those groups who worked with Home Rule, both directly and indirectly. It was a sprawling, fluctuating mass of overlapping groups, sometimes competing, sometimes cooperating, sometimes ambivalent, but all interacting in the same area of work—Home Rule.

How was the ecology organised?

The Home Rule ecology was organised as a loosely coupled system. James March provides a useful analogy of what this means in practice.

> Imagine that you're either the referee, coach, player or spectator at an unconventional soccer match: the field for the game is round; there are several goals scattered haphazardly around the circular field; people can enter and leave the game whenever they want to; they can throw balls in whenever they want; they can say 'that's my goal' whenever they want to, as many times as they want to, and for as many goals as they want to; the entire game takes place on a sloped field; and the game is played as if it makes sense (Weick 1976: 1).

March's analogy provides a legend for reading the Home Rule ecology. Groups entered and exited with regularity. Attention spans shifted. Claims were transformed. Goals mutated. And throughout Home Rule organisations—both lobbies and parties—continued to employ familiar scripts in their interactions with collaborators, competitors and objects of claims.

On the ground at any particular point in time, repertoires provided action plans for structuring relations between claimants and objects of those claims. However, when put into motion and recognised as a system, the fog of ambiguity that surrounded these interactions rapidly becomes apparent.

I have operationalised this notion of loose coupling as a garbage can where problems, solutions and actors moved in more or less distinct streams connecting in unpredictable ways. To paraphrase Weick (ibid.), the beauty of this conception is that it so elegantly captures the reality of contentious mobilisation. The preceding six chapters have detailed an ecology that was populated by a heterogeneous array of actors with different reasons for being there, different ways of acting, different understandings of the situation, different capabilities for action, variable connections to one another, and shifting levels of commitment and attention. Critically, I have eschewed any division between institutional and extra-institutional politics that has consistently marked the study of contention. Instead of rigid categories of inside and outside, formal and informal, I have focused on interactions in a common area of work and how these changed over time.

I have detailed this loosely coupled system from two perspectives: relational and temporal. Relationally, the ecology was organised into variety of interactional circuits. Three in particular have occupied my attention: 1) ties between actors and jurisdiction; 2) interorganisational ties; and 3) the organisation of the ecology as a whole. From the perspective of jurisdictional ties, I have illustrated how problems are efficacious. Home Rule provided a solution to which a number of problems were attached. Changes in the coupling of problems and solutions partially drove the movement of groups into and out of the ecology. Efforts to control jurisdiction invited participation, spawned contention, facilitated genesis, forced reorganisation and contributed to exits and extinction.

From the perspective of interorganisational ties group collaborated and competed. These relationships were constantly negotiated as organisations invested huge amounts effort in differentiating their ties and what activities they carried. Some of these circuits produced positive feedback loops. For example, the Liberal and early Labour parties' support for Home Rule bolstered lobbies' demands and reinforced their claims. Other circuits, such as the relationship between the NPS and the Labour party, spawned negative feedback loops. This level of analysis provided a window on the ways that organisations worked to get things done. Home Rule organisations mobilised rallies, gathered signatures, proposed legislation, vetted candidates, attended meetings, praised MPs, shamed rivals and fielded candidates as part of their efforts to embed into relations, exploit existing ties, forge new links, induce similar interests and focus attention.

The difficulties of getting things done through interorganisational ties can be explained only by looking up to the structure of the ecology as a whole. From this perspective ecological control comes into focus. Throughout I have considered actors to be clusters of relationships and clumps of functionalities. This view explains embeddedness in multiple networks. As every organisation in the ecology was multiply embedded, their relationships were variable. Historical residuals, current demands and conflicting ties meant that relations that appeared close from one perspective were distant from another. This lack of clarity concerning roles resulted in ambiguous interactions and an ecological structure that in many ways resembled Weick's (Orton and Weick 1990: 203) notion of loose coupling as a system where "elements affect each other suddenly (rather than constantly), negligibly (rather than significantly), indirectly (rather than directly), and eventually (rather than immediately)."

Variable coupling brings the temporal side of ecological organisation to the forefront. Constituent elements of the ecology were turning over at different speeds which shaped the structure of interactions and contributed to the system's variable coupling. I have focused on four sequences. The first were careers of people and ideas. Movement of people through organisations stitched the ecology together as the organisational leaders on which I have focused worked through multiple roles simultaneously. This provided the opportunity to exploit links and build ties, but it also strained attention as the flow of demands made on each role was seldom congruent. Movement of people through roles aided the circulation of ideas as well. One aspect of organisations' learning involved exploiting the distributed cognition fostered by this simultaneous participation in multiple roles.

But careers are more than simply the movement of people; they are a matching process of people and vacancies. And the opening and closing of vacancies was conditioned by organisational interactions, the second sequence I reviewed. Organisational interactions were fluid and often unpredictable. They were regulated by two complementary sets of social forces: events within the ecology and those exogenous to it. Intra-ecological events such as rallies, the development of draft legislation, making claims against a competitor, cross-sponsoring meetings and inviting participation during establishment all provide opportunities to act, chances to confirm core values and openings into which to move. These opportunities were regularly generated by events outside of the ecology. Events such as elections, policy shifts, wars, strikes and changes in the party in power were endogenous events that introduced new problems into the ecology, refocused attention on existing issues, solved some problems, diverted attention and rewired relationships to jurisdiction.

Taken together this mesh of internal and external events produced the third sequence reviewed—ecological control. A key element of my

199

argument was that organisational behaviour and change was driven not only by linkages between actors, but also their availability to act. This problem of availability manifested itself on a number of fronts: attention spans, differing conceptions of the same problem, availability of personnel and ability to balance concurrent demands. Problems came through the system in a haphazard fashion. Exacerbating the unpredictability of these flows were permeable ecological boundaries. Movement into and out of the ecology was unregulated, resulting in varied levels of attention, commitment and engagement. The frequency of entries and exits exerted considerable control over the behaviour of the ecology. The shape of careers, the responses to problems and the ability to get things done were all significantly affected by entries and exits. Who was available, what other projects were occupying their attention and how long their attention could be engaged were the driving temporal factors of ecological behaviour.

The connection between these internal processes and external changes was the fourth sequence I reviewed. Participation in the Home Rule ecology was not exclusive, most members working in a number of different ecologies simultaneously. Events in those fields often redirected attention and facilitated removal from the Home Rule ecology, as when Irish separatists discontinued their active support for Scotland following the fall of Parnell. Other times it reconnected actors to the jurisdiction, as the Boer War did with the Young Scots and Liberalism. More often, though, these events came as external shocks. The First World War, for example, radically altered the landscape of Home Rule by changing the flow of attention, driving entries, exits and mutations.

Taken together, this loosely coupled ecology with its diverse temporal flows was organised as a classical garbage can. Problems, solution and personnel found each other in often unplanned ways. Contrary to our view of mobilisation as a process predicated on clear goals, straightforward

means of engagement and plainly articulated scripts for interaction the Home Rule ecology was an ambiguous playing field. Entry, exit, mutation, unclear preferences and means of action—bluntly unpredictable change— were the defining feature of the Home Rule ecology's organisation. *How and why did it reorganise over the fifty years examined?*

Having detailed the organisation of the ecology, its unpredictable path of change is more easily understood. Because of their shared connections to a single jurisdiction, their shared members, and their relationships built on patronage, competition and cooperation, the heterogeneous array of organisations that populated the ecology was locked in a coevolutionary dynamic. Their interactions were consistently shaping one another and their environment in unpredictable ways. Drawing comparisons with biology, John Padgett captures the functional essence of this ecological arrangement.

> What is life? In biological chemistry, life is a tangled web of regulating loops of chemical reactions that reproduce themselves through time. This history of life is thus a path-dependent series of bifurcating networks, each step of which must lock in to stabilize itself before it can take the next step. Neutral drift at the level of individual molecules is consistent with discontinuous tipping at the level of autocatalytic chemical networks. Viewed from a distance, evolution is a growing bush of coadaptations, refunctionalities, and dead ends, with selective pruning but no inherent teleology (Padgett 2001: 243).

Translated into the language of the Home Rule ecology, connections were multiple but variable in their interactions, turnover was irregular and problems flowed in and out along with those who sought to solve them. This facilitated the opening of niches and the creation and mutation of actors making internal realignments regular occurrences. When confronted with an external shock, such as war, disruption in patronage chains, or political realignment, the ecology changed in ways that were shaped by its structure but not immediately predictable.

201

Padgett clarifies the dynamics of this process explaining that a complete explanation must "emphasize the multiple-network character of these bifurcations".

> Human beings, just like chemical molecules, participate in multiple loops of self-regulating activity. As such, perturbations in one loop may rebound, for good or ill, into other loops. ... The possible trajectories of evolution of one social network...are shaped by the surrounding social networks in which the network is embedded. Burgeoning pressures in one network, moreover, may urge other networks down one trajectory of possibility or another (ibid. 244).

This translates into a model of change driven and shaped by environmental feedback. The Home Rule ecology changed through a process of internal differentiation—the development of new actors using pieces of old ones and the establishment of new ways of working—and external shocks. The timing of shocks was critical to the reorganisation that followed. What fault lines existed, how groups were connected, what types of connections they fostered (patronage, cooperation, competition, close/distant) and what links particular actors had outside of the ecology all influenced reorganisations.

The Home Rule ecology went through a number of small reorganisations throughout the period before the First World War. These included the short-lived proliferation and quick extinction of Home Rule lobbies in the wake of the Gladstonian realignment, the birth of the Labour Party, the disappearance of land reform and the radicalisation of Irish contention. And while these changes were significant in shaping the structure and functions of the Home Rule ecology they were largely absorbed by the system. In spite of these small changes, the dominant organisational form remained lobbies and Home Rule meant devolution within the Union. It was World War I that brought the larger shock and reorganisation. Mobilisation for war and the attendant economic and political changes it entailed tipped the balance of the ecology and forced it into a new alignment. With traditional political supporters such as the Liberals gone, with segments of the labour movement radicalising, with the

Labour Party looking towards national centralisation, with mass extinction of earlier Home Rule organisations and with a much smaller field of actors interested in Home Rule available to reconstruct it, the ecology was dramatically reconfigured.

To succinctly answer this question, ecological change was evolutionary: a process of ongoing interaction, experimentation, diversification and failure subject to contingent change. In his discussion of the Cambrian explosion—a period 530 million years ago when life rapidly diversified and suddenly faced mass extinction—Stephen Jay Gould (1989: 306-08) propagates a "different-rules" model of evolutionary change. This centrepiece of Gould's argument is that "the traits that enhance survival during an extinction do so in ways that incidental and unrelated to the causes of their evolution in the first place" (306). He continues:

> Animals evolve their sizes, shapes and physiologies under natural selection in normal times, and for specifiable reasons...Along comes a mass extinction, with its 'different rules' of survival. Under the new regulations, the very best of your traits, the source of your previous flourishing, may be your death knell. A trait with no previous significance, one that just hitchhiked along for the developmental ride as a side consequence of another adaptation, may now hold the key to your survival. There can be no causal correlation in principle for the reasons for evolving a feature and its role in survival under the new rules...A species, after all, cannot evolve structures with a view to potential usefulness...down the road—unless our general ideas about causality are markedly awry, and the future can control the past (307).

As in biological evolution, the coevolutionary dynamics at work in the Home Rule ecology meant that practices useful in one era—channelling claims through existing parties before the War—were suddenly the source failure in another. And given the central role contingency plays, determining the path of change is only possible in retrospect. Finally, given the wide variety of actors involved, their variable levels of commitment and attention and their loosely coupled connections there was no overarching telos. This leads to the conclusions that change in the Home Rule ecology resulted from ongoing environmental feedback. Critical junctures such as changes in the operating

203

rules of the environment resulted in changes to the organisation of the ecology as structures were connected into new configurations.

The Emerging Picture

Answering these first six questions has placed the key landmarks and topographic features on the map of this journey. With these parameters in place, I will now move on to fill in the details of the main landmarks and answer the last four questions together. This shift in scale moves us from a discussion of the broad landscape to a discussion of the architecture that forms its skyline.

Questions 7-10: The How and Why of Organisation

My last four questions formed the centrepiece of my discussion: how did Home Rulers organise and why did these patterns change over time. These questions were:

7) How did the organisational means by which contentious politics was practiced develop and change?

8) How do we account for the development and transformation of actors—the genesis problem?

9) What processes are involved in emergence and transformation?

10) What mechanisms account for genesis and transformation?

Like shingles on a roof, the answers to the proceeding six questions have overlapped considerably providing support for one another while exposing new pieces of information. In answering these last four questions I am breaking this pattern to instead focus on the mechanisms and processes of organisational development and change. With the first six pieces of the puzzle in place and the broader picture emerging, I now want to turn attention to exploring its details.

Central to my discussion has been the idea of embeddedness. Social embeddedness recognises that actors are clumps of relations with temporally variable functionalities. It acknowledges that as these relations are tied to a variety of other actors and activities, changes in the

organisation of one may cascade—for good or ill—into others. This approach has allowed me to describe the meandering path of development and change without recourse to teleology (that somehow the move from lobbies to parties was part of a process of "modernization"), mental states (changes in preference schedules, values, public opinion, ideologies), or "great men" (the efforts of isolated, heroic individuals).

To operationalise this process of organisational emergence and change, I have employed the mechanism of refunctionality. To understand how existing organisational materials are refashioned into new organisations I reverse engineered the process identifying three central processes: careers; organisational embedding; and ecological control. Like Russian dolls, each of these processes was nested into the others. Shifts in one flow were linked to changes in the other two.

The career-level perspective I developed focused on the structured channels that facilitated the flows of people between organisations. Two contradictory insights emerged from this perspective on organisational emergence and change. With no formal barriers to entry, careers were marked by flows of availability. Unlike a profession which relies on formal means of closure—education, credentials, examination, apprenticeship, mastery of a shared body of knowledge—contentious mobilisation is something akin to an open shop. While it is true that there are informal barriers to entry such as interest and social matching (March and March 1977), the chief qualification for participation was availability. On the one hand, this relatively open flow of personnel and resources brought with it ties to new ideas and other organisations. To use one well known example, Keir Hardy's career spanned Home Rule, organised labour and politics. These overlapping roles provided insights for each organisation through which he worked as he carried knowledge, practise and ties with him.

On the other hand these unregulated career flows often introduced a significant element of instability to organisational development. While occupying multiple roles simultaneously allowed individuals a chameleon-like ability to shift identities as well as resilience in times of change (e.g. Padgett and Ansell 1993; Stark 1996), it regularly weakened the organisations they flowed through because it meant the diversion of personnel and attention. For many, participation was ad hoc, conditioned by the duration of the events that facilitated the initial tie. Like any garbage can, the flows of problems, solutions and personnel were continual, and loose career structures meant that the people they channelled were readily redirected— an entrance in one place is an exit somewhere else. The resultant career structure was a sandpile (Giuffre 1999).

Once developed any new organisation has to lock into its surrounding environment to survive. This is the process of organisational embedding. This process took many forms including petitioning, draft legislation, fielding candidates, organising rallies, holding meetings, publishing newspapers and sending letters. The critical lesson to take from these practices is how they forced organisational change over time. Organisational embedding was first and foremost a problem-solving activity: how can claims be connected with parties capable of doing something about them? Lobbies and parties by their very nature are forced to develop channels and advance claims through another set of organisations while simultaneously balancing the demands of other constituencies. However, contrary to many explanations of contentious politics which assume that the process of identifying targets and attaching claims them to as straightforward, this study has shown this not to be the case. Organisational embedding was a dance with ever changing steps. Home Rule organisations were working to solve problems on multiple fronts simultaneously, mainly by trial and error. They fought to differentiate their ties, to prove themselves as worthy political actors, to gather support

from potential allies and to damn political enemies. What made this process so difficult was the ambiguity that shrouded all of these activities. Capturing and sustaining the attention of any other organisation was a function of three factors: 1) what problems and activities were facing each party in the transaction; 2) identifying and implementing a suitable repertoire to translate claims into recognisable formats; 3) the flow of problems through the ecology. Matching on these three fronts was difficult to accomplish meaning that embedding into the surrounding environment was haphazard and subject to sudden change. This explains how new materials were introduced into organisation building at each iteration.

This brings me to the final element of organisational change I have discussed—ecological control. Ecological control describes the indirect control of activities exerted by the structure of the ecology. Ecological control moves us out of a conceptualisation of contention as purely a two party interaction and brings the wider world into view. As I explained in Chapter Four, ecological control derives from the temporally variable structure of the ecology. As all participants are simultaneously acting in multiple ecologies, they were embedded in numerous different exchange relationships, shaped by different historical residues and subject to different rules all of which shaped their ability to act. Ties to a variety of different groups and projects with variable, sometimes contradictory, temporal demands meant that the configuration at any given point in time shaped the realm of the possible.

In terms of actor genesis and change, ecological control connected past with present by melding historical residues of past conflict, compromises and collaborations (manifested by rules for action, repertoires, and logics of appropriateness) with current demands, available personnel and opportunities to act. Ecological control explains the discontinuous temporal nature of organisational development and change by providing a

framework that explains why "what in one time frame appears as an ecological premise in another appears as a discretionary choice" (Padgett 1981: 83). That is, ecological control explains contingency writ large because it explains how systemic coupling and decoupling—which emerged from the interaction of the ecology's members—controls what is possible.

To Retell the Tale

Let me begin by explaining what this story is not. It was not a tale of modernization, a story of advancement or an explanation of improvement. This was a not a cultural awakening, an ideological epiphany or a sudden realisation of interests. It was not a tale of backward-looking discontents. And it certainly was not an aberrant case in an otherwise elegant history of European nationalism. Strong theories of what this particular episode of Scottish contention should be have blinded commentators to what it actually was. Forcing it into the mould of nationalism and subsequently applying corollaries to explain its aberrant behaviours is more reminiscent of Ptolemaic astronomy than well executed social science. Despite the comfort the existing explanation provides, we are better served by scrapping them in favour of reality.

If this is not a story of teleological advance, or delayed alignment to an overriding trend, what then is it? This is a story of problem-solving under conditions of ambiguity, a tale of muddling through, an illustrated history of loosely coupled systems. It is a difficult narrative to follow with its multitude of entries, exits and mutations. But we can, in retrospect, identify and describe its key features. This is a contingent history of learning while doing, trial and error and happenstance that involved a series of deliberate actions, unintended consequences and error corrections. From Gladstone's initial proclamation to the foundation of the NPS, this has been a story of organisational problem-solving. These attempts at problem-solving shaped, mediated and directed by the relations in which they were constituted.

These lineages connected various activities, produced new actors and new ways of acting all within the confines of surrounding environment. Ultimately, what I have detailed was a complex set of conjunctures viewed from one particular angle.

This brings me to my final point. At the end of Chapter One I explained that my goal in this thesis was to piece together the various paths taken by the Home Rule movement in Scotland between 1880 and 1930, to connect the various travellers, illustrate how their paths intertwined, constituting one another, and how they often parted to separate destinations. And by examining how these processes took shape in one very specific case, I hoped to develop insights in the larger processes of social change, actor building and dissolution, and the epistemology of a truly processual sociology. I will leave it to you, the reader, to decide if I have reached this ambitious goal, but first I want to further bolster my case by reflecting on the benefits and insights generated by its central elements— relations, sequences and ecologies.

Relations, Sequences, Ecologies

I have covered these three primitives of my approach in sufficient detail, so I will not labour them again here. What I want to reflect on now is the benefits they bring and the new insights they offer. Their central contribution has been to provide a way of capturing social life as it truly is: contingent; transactional; and processual. This has lead to a reconceptualisation of contentious politics, organisational development and change and social life in general. From the perspective of how we conceive of and study contentious politics, it has meant the replacement of arguments centred on clear—if malleable—goals and means of execution with the more chaotic reality. Mobilisation, participation, problems, solutions are consistently in flux not only because of competing frames of reference and structural positions, but because of variable attention and

participation. This temporal variability is perhaps the most important—and consistently overlooked—element of contentious politics. Movement into an out of a contentious ecology produces far ranging impacts on what is possible. Further, it challenges the belief that movements have independent trajectories. Contentious mobilisations are simply single strands in a myriad of tapestries. And how the shuttle comes across the loom binds some actors in one frame and separates them in another.

The same insight can be applied to organisational development and change. Refunctionality describes how new actors emerge through old ones by enchaining multiple networks in new ways. Put another way, it explains how the past creates the present by braiding existing lineages into new configurations. Within the context of an ecology organised like a garbage can, we have a model of change that eschews teleology while embracing the reality of continual change. It provides a way of accepting the endurance of names, like Home Rule lobby or party, without accepting the endurance of the named. In effect, these phrases are "a transparent scrim behind which the stagehands are continually moving the props around. Every time we turn on the backlights of synchronic analysis we see a different setting" (Abbott 1999: 223).

Ultimately, relations, sequences and ecologies have served to illustrate that what we think of as social actors are in fact bundles of processes—lineages. Rather than fixed entities, they are "ways of becoming that are characteristic of particular locales in social life...and...the secret of their thingness lies in the way they bind together various proceeding lineages in the social process" (ibid.). Such a view makes explaining change simple: all lineages are open reorganisation as their relations change over time. And while it may not be possible to predict what direction these changes will take, we are at least equipped with a set of tools for making sense (retrospectively) of how it happens. Ecologies help us see that the

210

history of lobbies and parties was the history of those whom they interacted, the history of the push and pull actors into and out of the ecology, a continual series of presents.

In describing how these processes were captured and shaped by their contexts, I have relied on informal descriptions of formal models. From biology I have borrowed the concepts of ecologies and co-evolution, from organisational theory I have taken the garbage can model, and formal models of budgetary decision-making have yielded the notion of ecological control. Together these models have allowed me to gain leverage over context by wresting observation to models (Bearman 2005: 258-59). They offer a framework for colligating and explaining this ever-changing series of interactions. Further, they have yielded mechanisms that connect this necessarily limited study to broader currents in the social sciences.

My combination of simple mechanisms, formal models and metaphors and a broadly inductive approach accomplishes several things. It provides a better explanation of what happened and why. It handles the complexity of this multi-agent system without sheering away the insights that messy details reveal. But perhaps most importantly, it provides us with a framework for learning new things. And it is to this that I turn in the final section.

Final Thoughts

Before disembarking and continuing on our separate ways, allow me one last opportunity to look back and ahead. I have exploited a number of metaphors in this thesis. I like metaphors because they help to explain complex problems in simpler terms. But they are also useful because recognising similarities across different social phenomenon helps us tease out new pieces of information and, in turn, provide an escape from strong theory. For example, I have employed the idea of travel as an overarching theme to organise this thesis. In the first chapter I move from nationalism

211

to contentious politics. In the second chapter, I took another step, moving from substance to process. Chapters 3-6 that made up the middle followed the travels of actors into, out of and across the ecology. This series of moves have all been connected by a desire to loosen the grip that strong theories have had on this particular case and sociology in general. The result has been an improved understanding of the Scottish Home Rule movement and a plan for improving our investigations of contention in general.

As this specific investigation has helped to illustrate, we do not live in a world of causes and effects. Rather, we live in a world of events in structures. Since social life is organised, there is no such thing as an isolated act, only variable impacts within different configurations. As the ecological metaphor helps us to see, it is impossible to do simply one thing as all action is multivocal. This means we must abandon our search for critical variables and root causes. I have proposed an alternative that we instead look for robust mechanisms and clarifying metaphors because they allow us ways of tracing out patterns of connection and how they change over time. This is why description—either formal as in the garbage can model or informal as I have done here—provides a superior frame of analysis.

This brings me to my final prescription. There has been an increasingly fruitful dialogue between scholars of contentious politics and organisational theorists. Social movement theorists have successfully illustrated that new organisational forms often emerge from the heat of political struggle. This thesis, amongst other things, is an attempt to rebalance the conversation by showing how organisational theory can significantly improve our understanding of contention. Recognising that we live in an organised world means that we can improve our scholarly travels through it by setting out along the organisational path. And while this path

212

cannot take us everywhere we may wish to go, it can provide us with a map that explains how we might get there in the end.

Appendix 1: Notes on Data and Method

From the outside, the British Library's newspaper archive at Colindale in north London is a dour sight. Its nondescript brick frame, fronted by a small patch of grass and tall wrought iron fence, stands too close to a busy two lane road. To the right of the heavy wooden entrance doors sits a weathered bench where patrons, freed from the demands of squinting at yellowing newspaper often sit in summer, eating their lunch and basking in the mid-day sun. Opening the doorway involves the researcher in a standard ritual of admission. Bags are checked, relevant papers, pads, pens and notebook computers removed, and a small, numbered plastic disc issued for their eventual retrieval.

Climbing the stone steps with their gleaming brass handrails carries the researcher onto a bustling floor, full of large tables covered by A2-sized books with fire-stitched covers being intensely combed by post-graduate students, academics, amateur genealogists and other interested parties. Immediately the overpowering smell of old newsprint welcomes both the neophyte and the initiated. After flashing my British Library membership card to the librarian on duty, I am free to ascend the gentle ramp, pass through the automatic doors and enter the climate-controlled comfort of the reading room. (Its air-conditioned environment a Godsend during the short bursts of oppressive heat occasionally experienced during the British summer.) Upon finding a seat and completing a small paper request slip, a treasure trove of information is soon wheeled to the carrel and left at my feet. Despite its sombre exterior, the Colindale newspaper archive is a wonderland for historically oriented researchers, for within this faceless brick box resides a wealth of information.

Newspapers are available from throughout the United Kingdom and the wider world. Included among the national daily and Sunday papers, the popular periodicals and produce of local presses are a number of papers

devoted the cause of Scottish Home Rule, labour politics and Liberal party activities. Flanked by meeting notices, letters to the editor, ads for tinned soup, books on Scottish history and handmade boots are demands for self-government, advice to politicians, labour leaders and fellow activists, discussions of pending legislation, notes on parliamentary votes, calculations of taxes paid, obituaries, announcements of organisational foundations, mergers and dissolutions and intra- and inter-organisational disputes. From these papers, the world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Home Ruler comes into focus with public claims, displays of worthiness, problems cited and solutions proposed. And taken together, the claims, announcements, advice and demands made in these papers have provided the bulk of the data for this thesis. In this appendix I discuss the process of gathering and interpreting these data.

The Newspapers

My discussion of the transformations described was principally disciplined by a complete review of seven newspapers:

1. *Liberal Home Ruler/The Leader* (Published: 17 July 1886 to 14 July 1888, issues 1-105; became *The Leader* with issue 106, 21 July 1888 and ran 21 July 1888 to 11 May 1889, issues 106-148);

2. *The Fiery Cross* (Published: January 1903 to July 1912, issues 1-43, [British Library lacks issues 23, 25, 27]);

3. *The Scottish Nationalist* (Published: March 1903 to June 1903, Issues 1-4);

4. *The Young Scot* (Published: November 1903 to May 1905, Vol. 1, No. 2- Vol. 2, No. 8);

5. *The Scottish Nation* (Published: November 1913 to August/September 1917, issues 1-33);

6. *The Scottish Home Rule Association News-Sheet/Scottish Home Rule* (Published: July 1920 to November 1922, Vol. 1, No.1-Vol. 3, No. 5; became *Scottish Home Rule* with Vol. 3, No. 6, December 1922 and ran December 1922 to September 1929, Vol. 3, No. 6-Vol. 9, No. 11 [Not published between May and August 1929; April 1929 issue was too damaged to read]);

7. *The Scots Independent* (Published: November 1926 to January 1935; reviewed Vol. 1 [November 1926] through Vol. 4 [December 1930]).

215

Five of the papers were explicitly devoted the cause Scottish Home Rule: *The Fiery Cross*; *The Scottish Nationalist*; *The Young Scot*; *The Scottish Nation*; *The Scots Independent*; and *The Scottish Home Rule Association News-Sheet/Scottish Home Rule*. Four of these five papers were official newspapers of Home Rule organisations. *The Young Scot* was the official paper of the Young Scots Society; *The Scottish Nation* was the official paper of the International Scots Home Rule League; and *The Scots Independent* was the official paper of the Scots National League, becoming a quasi-official paper of the National Party of Scotland. *The Scottish Home Rule Association News-Sheet/Scottish Home Rule* was the official paper of the post-War SHRA and chronicled the activities of the developing NPS. *The Fiery Cross* was produced by Theodore Napier, an Australian of Scottish parentage, who was a member of the pre-War SHRA and was an unofficial outlet for SHRA materials. *The Scottish Nation* was produced by Charles Waddie, Honorary Secretary of the SHRA, and served its short life as a quasi-official journal of the pre-war SHRA. *The Liberal Home Ruler/The Leader* was a publication produced by Home Rule elements of the Liberal Party which developed in the mid-1880s. The paper provided explicit support of the Gladstonian project of Home Rule All Round, with Irish Home Rule leading the way.

Six of these papers were available from the British Library's Newspaper Archive at Colindale. *The Scottish Home Rule Association News-Sheet/Scottish Home Rule* was not held by the British Library, but was held by National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh. Thanks to a Colyer-Fergusson Award from the Kent Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities I was able to travel to Edinburgh in March 2004 to access these records. Thanks are also due to the NLS library staff who spent a considerable amount of time in the library's subterranean storage facility tracking down the misfiled papers.

I supplemented the primary data gathered from this septet of papers with reviews of a number of more sporadic publication and pamphlets. These included:

- *The Young Scots Handbook, 1911-1912*;

- *Home Rule and Political Parties in Scotland: A Review. Dedicated to and published by the Scottish Home Rule Association* (1889);

- *The Deep Fact of Nationalism. The Cases of Scotland and Ireland Contrasted* (1914); and

- *The London-Scottish Associations Year Book* (later published as: *Douglas's Year Book of Scottish Associations, The Douglas Year-Book*) (1905-1925).

In reviewing these publications, I was mainly interested in two broad categories of information: 1) claim-making and 2) collaboration. I was specifically interested in two closely paired varieties of claim-making. The first were claims made against governments—local and national—and what, if any responses were made; the second were claims raised against other organisations, including political parties and other Home Rule groups. Collaboration covers a wide variety of activities: interorganisational collaborations; proposed legislation; rallies; petitions; and other organisational activities that either directly involved outside groups or sought to establish links with interested parties, including the general public. More broadly, both types of information provided insight into a number of areas central to this investigation such as shifts in jurisdiction, conflicts in managing it, organisational interpretation of issues, changing problem-solving techniques and the ebb and flow of attention. These publications provided such a variety of information because they served two roles simultaneously. 1) They sought to rally support for the cause. 2) They functioned as a trade press keeping those working in movement abreast of

217

the state of the art. These dual roles provide a record of public activities and organisational life.

Why Newspapers?

Newspapers have become increasingly used as sources of social science data over the last two decades (for reviews see e.g., Earl et al. 2004; Franzosi 1987; 2004; Tilly 1995b: Appendix 1), particularly in the study of historical collective action and contentious politics. Their usefulness stems from their provision of tangible and traceable materials covering long dead events. As Charles Tilly notes, studying social life raises three immediate questions:

> *First*, how does the phenomenon under investigation leave traces? *Second*, how can analysts elicit or observe those traces? *Third*, using those traces, how can analysts reconstruct specific attributes, elements, causes, or effects of the phenomenon? (Tilly 2002b: 249; emphasis original).

Despite the potential problems of bias and selection, newspapers provide independent coverage, often from multiple angles, of a variety of activities, answering Tilly's first two questions. Critically, the traces they provide couple tightly with the relational stance I have taken throughout this work, which answers Tilly's third question. Specially, I have screened these newspapers for evidence of public relationships: relations between organisations and targets of claims; interorganisational ties through shared members, collaborations on projects and work with similar problems; and details of how these ties and activities changed over time.

Bringing order to this jumble of events, I created an event catalogue. An event catalogue is "a set of descriptions of multiple social interactions collected from a delimited set of sources according to relatively uniform procedures" (ibid.). Such a catalogue provides a coherent way of following a changing central subject. As my focus was on shifting organisational responses to a variable set of problems, my criteria for inclusion were broad. Events were noted for inclusion if they fell into one of

218

four categories: 1) details of organisational activities; 2) claims made against the governments; 3) claims made against other organisations; and 4) interorganisational collaborations. Given the time and financial constraints involved with this project, I was forced to be selective. Rather than documenting every event that met these criteria, I took copies of only the most representative pieces. In total my catalogue consists of approximately 400 individual newspaper articles, which in turn cover approximately 1000 events, activities and descriptions.

Secondary Sources

My work with secondary sources raises two issues worth exploring in detail: 1) locating secondary sources; 2) working with incongruent data. In locating relevant secondary sources I used four main approaches: experts; bibliographic search engines; published biographies; and snowball searching. My initial leads were kindly provided by Professor Hugh Cunningham of the School of History at the University of Kent. His interest in British national identities over the last three hundred years provided me with a number of interesting pieces. Research librarians at the University of Kent and the National Library of Scotland also provided help, particularly in identifying obscure pieces.

My use of computerised bibliographic search engines was hampered by the fact that the academic study of Scottish history is a relatively closed world. Most work is published in specialist journals, conference publications and by small presses. As a result, a considerable amount of the work published is only sporadically indexed in the major bibliographic search engines. This problem was most immediately evident in the fact that the *Scottish Historical Review*, perhaps the premier journal of Scottish History, is not indexed in any of the major bibliographic search engines. This was overcome by the yearly index produced by the publishers. This index includes not only every piece published in the *SHR*, but details of conference

presentations, PhD theses, books and other academic publications relating to Scotland. Coupled with other snowball searches (generated from known secondary sources), a review of these indices provided a considerable amount of secondary literature.

These searches were augmented by two detailed bibliographies. This first, Kenneth C. Fraser's *A Bibliography of the Scottish National Movement (1844-1973)* (1976), covered both primary and secondary materials. The second, Gordon Bryan's *Scottish Nationalism and Cultural Identity in the Twentieth Century: An Annotated Bibliography of Secondary Sources* (1984), covered materials published through 1983. Their chief limitation was age. As they were compiled and published long before I began my own research, both were out of date. The gaps were partially filled by a review symposium organised in 1998 by the journal *Scottish Archives*. This issue covered work on archival and secondary materials and provided a number of citations to works that had appeared during the period intervening years since the publication of Fraser's and Bryan's books.

Issues of congruence lined up along two axes: 1) disciplinary differences; and 2) substantive differences. Disciplinary differences were most clearly manifested in the central subjects chosen and the way in which explanations were colligated. Most of the work on the Scottish Home Rule movement and Scottish politics more generally takes the interactions of a small number of individuals as its central subject. Personalities are described in detail, mental states are reconstructed, interests assigned and the narrative reconstructed accordingly.[1] Making use of these sources required efforts similar to those who gather life-histories and other oral narratives: the stories need to be pulled apart and rearranged. Links had to be built between the local, closed narratives regularly presented and broader environment processes. I am neither disparaging the work of these authors

---

[1] I outlined the dubiousness of these models in Chapter 2, so I will not labour the point here.

nor am I trying to reinforce the divide between historians and other social scientists. But the differences that exist between how researchers in each field approach and handle data presented a set of challenges worth noting.

Throughout, my argument has been that the Scottish Home Rule movement is best understood as an organisational problem. As I discussed in Chapter 1, this approach runs contrary to the mainstream, as most scholars have evaluated it through the lens of nationalism. The result is that most secondary works focus on issues that are either peripheral or antithetical to the aims of this study. Further complicating matters is that those works that do discuss Home Rule organisations have limited their focus only to organisations that claimed prominent members or ultimately became part of the contemporary SNP. This overlooks a number of small, short-lived groups that played a role in shaping the ecology. It also means that most discussion sets out to explain why these groups failed to behave like "proper" nationalist and/or focuses almost exclusively on why they failed.[2] Confronted with a large body of secondary data that provided few direct links, I used what Lustick (1996: 618-19) calls "explicit triage" to tease out relevant information. I detail this process below.

Bringing Together Primary and Secondary Data

Creating an explanation from these diverse primary and secondary data I benefited from criteria outlined by political scientist Ian Lustick (1996) and sociologist Thomas Beamish (2002: Appendix A). Lustick (ibid. 617-19) describes four approaches for confronting the problems of selection bias in historical work relying on secondary data. 1) *Be true to your school*: recognising from the outset that historical writing is a theoretically diverse activity forces the user of secondary works to avoid the assumption that these works are a single, synthesisable body of work. Comparing conflicting approaches keeps the researcher honest. 2) *Explaining variance in*

---

[2] Success and failure are defined throughout the literature in terms of goal attainment.

historiography requires researchers to question background assumptions to generate theoretical arguments suitable for testing. Similar to suggestion one, conflicting pieces of information are noted and used to challenge the chosen approach. 3) *Quasi-triangulation* employs works that approach the same subject from differing archival sources. 4) *Explicit triage* is part of a theoretically informed programme of colligation in which the researcher acknowledges the reasons for selection.

Beamish, on the other hand, looks to evolutionary biology and palaeontology to solve these problems. He confronts the issues of diverse data by advocating consilience. Consilience looks for "'proof' through the accumulation of small scale empirical observation based in a diverse array of data…it is oriented towards observing gradual small-scale changes as the bedrock on which immense phenomenon of history are built" (Beamish 2002: 146). Consilience recognises the evolving network nature of any subject and aims to explain by describing the overlapping interactions that produce and sustain it.

Together this programme of theoretically informed triage and consilience guided me in identifying relevant materials across a number of sources and arenas of activity. Confronting a body of secondary works that offered little explicit insight (particularly on the period before the First World War) forced me to cherry-pick relevant materials. But as I have argued throughout, the Home Rule movement was not a single thing, but was, like any actor, an emergent phenomenon. Therefore, drawing insights from a variety of primary and secondary sources was a necessary factor to understand it. Further, bringing these two lines of data together was a process not unlike the movement itself. I encountered brilliant moments of clarity, disheartening deadends and slow, laborious marches through ambiguous fields of fact. In the end, data collection and analysis were far from a simple linear course moving from identification to collection to

222

analysis. Rather it was a process of identifying and piecing together patterns from diverse source materials. The end result was a set of data that ultimately generate a number of novel insights and produced an explanation that the individual pieces alone would be unable to do.

References

Abbott, Andrew. 1983. "Sequences of Social Events: Concepts and Methods for the Analysis of Order in Social Processes." *Historical Methods* 16(4): 129-47.

_____. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1990. "Vacancy Models for Historical Data" Pp. 80-102 in R.L. Brieger (ed.) *Social Mobility and Social Structure*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1996. "Mechanisms and Relations." Paper presented at the Conference on Social Mechanisms, Stockholm 6-7 June 1996.

_____. 1999. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at 100*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 2001a. *Time Matters: On Theory and Method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 2001b. *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso.

Ansell, Christopher K. 1997. "Symbolic Networks: The Realignment of the French Working Class, 1887-1894." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(2): 359-90.

Armstrong, Elizabeth. 2002. "Crisis, Collective Creativity, and the Generation of New Organizational Forms: The Transformation or Lesbian/Gay Organizations in San Francisco." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 19: 361-95.

Bearman, P. 1993. *Relations into Rhetorics: Local Elite Structure in Norfolk England, 1540-1640*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

_____. 2005. *Doormen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____, Faris, R. and Moody, J. 1999. "Blocking the Future: New Solutions for Old Problems in Historical Social Science." *Social Science History* 23(4): 501-33.

Bender, Jonathan, Terry M. Moe and Kenneth W. Shotts. 2001. "Recycling the Garbage Can: An Assessment of the Research Program." *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 169-190.

Berelson, Bernard, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William McPhee. 1954. *Voting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brand, Jack. 1978. *The National Movement in Scotland*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Breiger, Ronald L. 1974. "The Duality of Persons and Groups." *Social Forces* 53(2): 181-90.

Breuilly, John. 1982. *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cairns, Gerard J. 1990. "John Maclean, Socialism and the Scottish Question." Scottish Labour History Review 4: 6-9.

Cedarman, Lars-Erik. 2005. "Computational Models of Social Forms: Advancing Generative Macro Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(4): 864-93.

Clarke, Lee. 1989. *Acceptable Risk: Making Decisions in a Toxic Environment*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1993. "Organisational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890-1920." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(4): 755-98.

_____. 1997. *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 2002. "Invention, Innovation, Proliferation: Explaining Organizational Genesis and Change." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 19: 397-411.

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17(1): 1-25.

_____, _____ and _____. 1979. "People, Problems, Solutions and the Ambiguity of Relevance" Pp. 24-37 in J.G. March and J.P. Olsen (eds.) *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations*. Bergen, Norway: Scandinavian University Press.

Collier, Ruth Berins and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, The Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Coupland, Reginald. 1954. *Welsh and Scottish Nationalism: A Study*. London: Collins.

Crowley, D.W. 1956. "The Crofter's Party, 1885-1892." *Scottish Historical Review* 35: 110-26.

David, Paul A. 1994. "Why are Institutions the 'Carriers of History?': Path Dependence and the Evolution of Organizations and Institutions." *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 5(2): 205-20.

Danto, Arthur. 1985. *Narration and Knowledge*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dyer, Michael. 1996. *Capable Citizens and Improvident Democrats: The Scottish Electoral System 1884-1929*. Edinburgh: Scottish Cultural Press.

Earl, Jennifer, Andrew Martin, John D. McCarthy and Sarah A. Soule. 2004. "The Use of Newspaper Data in the Study of Collective Action." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 65-80.

Eley, Geoff and Ronald Grigor Suny. 1996. "Introduction: From Moment of Social History to the Work of Cultural Representation" Pp. 3-37 in G. Eley and R. G. Suny (eds.) *Becoming National: A Reader*.

Ertman, Thomas. 1997. *Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, William. 1990. *Scotland: 1689-Present*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Finlay, Richard J. 1992. "'For or Against?': Scottish Nationalists and the British Empire, 1919-1939." *Scottish Historical Review* 71 (191/192): 184-206.

_____. 1993. "Scottish Nationalism and Scottish Politics, 1900-1979" Pp. 19-26 in M. Lynch (ed.) *Scotland, 1850-1979: Society, Politics and the Union*. London: Historical Association Committee for Scotland and The Historical Association.

_____. 1994. *Independent and Free: Scottish Politics and the Origins of the Scottish National Party, 1918-1945*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

_____. 1997. *A Partnership for Good? Scottish Politics and the Union since 1880*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Fligstein, Neil. 1990. *The Transformation of Corporate Control*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Franzosi, Roberto. 1987. "The Press as a Source of Socio-Historical Data: Issues in the Methodology of Data Collection from Newspapers." *Historical Methods* 20(1): 5-16.

_____. 2004. *From Words to Numbers: Narrative, Data and Social Science*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, Kenneth C. 1976. *A Bibliography of the Scottish National Movement (1844-1973)*. Dollar, UK: Douglas S. Mack.

Fry, Michael. 1987. *Patronage and Principle: A Political History of Modern Scotland*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Galaskiewicz, Joseph. 1985. "Interorganizational Relations." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11: 281-304.

Garvin, Tom. 1981. *The Evolution of Irish Nationalist Politics*. Dublin: Gill and McMillan.

_____. 1986. "The Anatomy of a Nationalist Revolution: Ireland, 1858-1928." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 28:468-501.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Giuffre, Katherine. 1999. "Sandpiles of Opportunity: Success in the Art World." *Social Forces* 77(3): 815-32.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behvaior*. New York: Pantheon.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1990. "Sociology and History: Producing Comparative History" Pp. 275-91 in H.J. Gans (ed.) *Sociology in America*. London: Sage.

_____. 1998. "Initial Conditions, General Laws, Path Dependence, and Explanation in Historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 104(3): 829-45.

_____ (ed.). 2003. *States, Parties, and Social Movements*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Brian. 1994. *How the Leopard Changed its Spots: The Evolution of Complexity*. New York: Scribners.

Gorski, Philip S. 2000. "The Mosaic Moment: An Early Modernist Critique of Modernist Theories of Nationalism." *American Journal of Sociology* 105(5):1428-68.

Gould, Stephen J. 1989. *Wonderful Life: The Burgess Shall and the Nature of History*. New York: WW Norton.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3): 481-510.

Griffin, Larry J. 1992. "Temporality, Events, and Explanation in Historical Sociology: An Introduction." *Sociological Methods and Research* 20(4): 403-27.

Hanham, H.J. 1967. "Mid-Century Scottish Nationalism: Romantic and Radical" Pp. 143-179 in R. Robson (ed.) *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark*. London: G. Bell and Son.

_____. 1965. "The Creation of the Scottish Office, 1881-1887." *Juridical Review* 10: 205-244.

_____. 1969a. *Scottish Nationalism*. London: Faber.

_____. 1969b. "The Problem of Highland Discontent, 1880-1885." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th Series, XIX: 21-65.

_____. 1978a. Review of Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966. *American Historical Review* 83(1): 173-74.

_____. 1978b. *Elections and Party Management: Politics in the Time of Disraeli and Gladstone*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.

Harvie, Christopher. 1998. *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707 to the Present*. London: Routledge.

227

Haydu, Jeffrey. 1998. "Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and as Sequences of Problem Solving." *American Journal of Sociology* 104(2): 339-71.

Hayes, C.J.H. 1966. *Essays on Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan.

Healy, Kieran. 1999. "The Emergence of HIV in the U.S. Blood Supply: Organizations, Obligations, and the Management of Uncertainty." Theory *and Society* 28: 529-58.

Hechter, Michael. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

_____. 1985. "Internal Colonialism Revisited" Pp. 17-26 in E.A. Tiryakian and R. Rogowski (eds.) *New Nationalisms in the Developed West*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Hobsbawm, E. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hroch, Miroslav. 1985. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriot Groups among the Smaller Nations of Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hull, David L. 1975. "Central Subjects and Historical Narratives." *History and Theory* 14: 253-74.

Hunter, James. 1974. "The Politics of Highland Land Reform, 1873-1895." *Scottish Historical Review* 53: 45-68.

_____. 1975. "The Gaelic Connection: The Highlands, Ireland and Nationalism, 1873-1922." *Scottish Historical Review* 54: 178-204.

Hutchison, Edwin. 1996. *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hutchison, I.G.C. 1986. *A Political History of Scotland, 1832-1924: Parties, Elections and Issues*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

_____. 1999. "The Impact of the First World War on Scottish Politics" Pp. 36-58 in C.M.M. Macdonald and E.W. McFarland (eds.) *Scotland and the Great War*. Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press.

_____. 2001. *Scottish Politics in the Twentieth Century*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Ikenberry, G. John. 1994. "History's Heavy Hand: Institutions and the Politics of the State." Paper presented at the conference on The New Institutionalism, University of Maryland, USA, October 14-15.

Jalland, Patricia. 1979. "United Kingdom Devolution 1910-14: Political Panacea or Tactical Diversion." *The English Historical Review* 94(373): 757-85.

Kellas, James G. 1965a. "The Liberal Party in Scotland 1876-1895." *Scottish Historical Review* 44: 1-16.

_____. 1965b. "The Mid-Lanark By-election (1888) and the Scottish Labour Party (1888-1894). *Parliamentary Affairs* 18: 318-28.

_____. 1991. *The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity*. London: Macmillan.

Kendle, J.E. 1969. "The Round Table Movement and 'Home Rule All Round'." *The Historical Journal* 11(2): 332-53.

Kiely, Richard, Frank Bechhofer, Robert Stewart and David McCrone. 2001. "The Markers and Rules of Scottish National Identity." *Sociological Review* 49(1): 33-55.

Kohn, Hans. 1955. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Knoll, Andrew H. 2003. *Life on a Young Planet: The First Three Billion Years of Evolution on Earth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lee, Clive H. 1999. "The Scottish Economy and the First World War" Pp. 11-35 in C.M.M. Macdonald and E.W. McFarland (eds.) *Scotland and the Great War.* Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press.

Leifer, Eric. "Interaction Preludes to Role Setting: Exploratory Local Action." *American Sociological Review* 53(6): 865-78.

Levitt, Barbara and James G. March. 1988. "Organizational Learning." *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 319-40.

Lewin, Arie Y., Chris P. Long and Timothy N. Carroll. 1999. "The Coevolution of New Organizational Forms." *Organization Science* 10(5): 535-50.

Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. "The Science of Muddling Through." *Public Administration Review* 19: 79-88.

_____. 1979. "Still Muddling, Not Yet Through." *Public Administrative Review* 39(6): 517-26.

Lustick, Ian S. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 90(3): 605-19.

MacCormick, John. 1955. *The Flag in the Wind: The Story of the National Movement in Scotland*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Mahoney, James. 2000. "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology." *Theory and Society* 29(4): 507-48.

March, James C. and James G. March. 1977. "Almost Random Careers: The Wisconsin School Superintendency, 1940-1972." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22: 377-409.

March, James G. 1991. "Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning." *Organization Science* 2(1): 71-87.

_____ and Johan P. Olsen (eds.). 1979. *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations*. Bergen, Norway: Scandinavian University Press.

_____ and _____. 1983. "Organizing Political Life: What Administrative Reorganization Tell Us about Government." *American Political Science Review* 77(2): 281-96.

_____ and _____. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* 78(3): 734-49.

_____, Lee S. Sproull and Michael Tamuz. 1991. "Learning from Sample of One or Fewer." *Organization Science* 2(1): 1-13.

McCrone, David. 2001. *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Nation*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

_____ and Richard Kiely. 2000. "Nationalism and Citizenship." *Sociology* 34(1): 19-34.

McCullagh, C. Behan. 1978. "Colligation and Classification in History." *History and Theory* 17: 267-84.

McHugh J. and B. J. Ripley. 1983. "John Maclean: The Scottish Workers' Republican Party and Scottish Nationalism." *Scottish Labour History Society Journal* 18: 43-47.

McLean, Paul. 2002. "Beyond Embeddedness to Co-Evolution: Revitalizing the Network Analytic Study of Markets." *Accounts: A News Letter of Economic Sociology* 3(1): 8,11.

Melucci, Alberto (1996) *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milton, Nan. 1973. *John Maclean*. Bristol: Pluto Press.

Mitchell, James. 1996. *Strategies for Self-Government: The Campaigns for a Scottish Parliament*. Edinburgh: Polygon.

Mische, Ann and Harrison White. 1998. "Between Conversation and Situation: Public Switching Dynamics Across Network Domains." *Social Research* 65(3): 695-724.

_____ and Philippa Pattison. 2000. "Composing a Civic Arena: Publics, Projects, and Social Setting." *Poetics* 27(2-3): 163-94.

_____. 1996. *Strategies for Self-government: The Campaigns for a Scottish Parliament*. Edinburgh: Polygon.

Morton, Graeme. 1996. "Scottish Rights and 'Centralisations' in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." *Nations and Nationalism* 2(2): 257-79.

_____. 1999. *Unionist Nationalism: Governing Urban Scotland 1830-1860*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press.

_____. 2000. "The First Home Rule Movement in Scotland, 1886-1918" in H. T. Dickinson and Michael Lynn (eds.) *The Challenge to Westminster: Sovereignty, Devolution and Independence*. East Linton, UK: Tuckwell Press.

Nairn, Tom. 1996 [1974]. "Scotland and Europe" Pp. 79-104 in G. Eley and R.G. Suny (eds.) *Becoming National: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1981. *The Break Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-nationalism*. 2nd ed. London: NLB and Verso.

Newby, Andrew. 2003. "Edward McHugh, the National Land League of Great Britain and the 'Crofters War', 1879-1882." *Scottish Historical Review* LXXXII (213): 74-91.

O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *Parnell and His Party, 1880-1890*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

O'Day, Alan. 1998. *Irish Home Rule, 1867-1921*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

_____ and John Stevenson (eds.). 1992. *Irish Historical Documents Since 1800*. Dublin: Gill Macmillan.

Olsen, Johan P. 1979. "Reorganisation as a Garbage Can" in J.G. March and J.P. Olsen (eds.) *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations*. Bergen, Norway: Scandinavian University Press.

Orton, J. Douglas and Karl E. Weick. 1990. "Loosely Coupled Systems: A Reconceptualization." *Academy of Management Review* 15(2): 203-223.

Özkirimli, Umut. 2000. *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan.

Padgett, John F. 1981. "Hierarchy and Ecological Control in Federal Budgetary Decision Making." *American Journal of Sociology* 87(1): 75-129.

_____. 1997. "The Emergence of Simple Ecologies of Skill" Pp. 199-222 in W.B. Arthur, S.N. Durlauf and D.A. Lane (eds.) *The Economy as a Complex Evolving System, II*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

_____. 2001. "Organisational Genesis, Identity, and Control: The Transformation of Banking in Renaissance Florence" Pp. 211-57 in J.E. Rauch and A. Casella (eds.) *Networks and Markets*. New York: Russell Sage.

_____ and Christopher K. Ansell. 1993. "Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400-1434." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(6): 1259-1319.

_____ and Paul D. McLean. 2004. "Obligation, Risk, and Opportunity in the Renaissance Economy: Beyond Social Embeddedness to Network Co-Constitution" Pp. 193-227 in F. Dobbin (ed.) *The Sociology of the Economy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

_____. 2006. "Organizational Invention and Elite Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(5): 1463-1568.

Pagie, Ludo and Melanie Mitchell. 2002. "A Comparison of Evolutionary and Coevolutionary Search." *International Journal of Computational Intelligence and Applications* 2(1): 53-69.

Parker, Ian. 1996. "The Land Issue and the Future of Scottish Liberalism in 1914" *Scottish Historical Review* 75(1): 52-71.

Powell, Walter, Kenneth W. Koput and Laurel Smith-Doerr. 1996. "Interorganizational Collaboration and the Locus of Innovation: Networks of Learning in Biotechnology" *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41(1): 116-45.

Reid, F. 1966. "Socialist Sunday Schools in Britain, 1892-1939." *International Review of Social History* 11: 18-47.

Roberts, Jeffrey. 2004. "Waves of Innovation: Changing Organisational Repertoires in Scottish, Irish and American Direct Action Politics, 1880-1930" Pp. 163-181 in S.K. Kehoe and I.H. MacPhail (eds.) *A Panorama of Scottish History: Contemporary Considerations*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

Rosenthal, Naomi, Meryl Fingruntd, Michele Ethier, Roberta Karant and David McDonald. 1985. "Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteenth-Century Women's Reform in New York State". *American Journal of Sociology* 90(5): 1022-54.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1985. *Islands of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1991. "The Return of the Event, Again: With Reflections on the Great Fijian War of 1843 to 1855 between the Kingdoms of Bau and Rewa" pp. 37-99 in A. Biersack (ed.), *Clio in Oceania: Towards a Historical Anthropology*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Sewell, Jr., William H. 1996. "Historical Events as Transformations of Structures: Inventing the Revolution at the Bastille." *Theory and Society* 25(6): 841-81.

Simmel, G. 1950. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. K. Wolff (ed.). New York: Free Press.

Simon, Herbert A. 1973. "The Organization of Complex Systems" Pp. 3-27 in H. H. Pattee (ed.), *Hierarchy Theory: The Challenge of Complex Systems*. New York: Braziller.

Smout, T.C. 1986. *A Century of the Scottish People, 1830-1950*. London: Collins.

Somers, Margaret. 1998. "We're No Angels: Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science." *American Journal of Sociology* 104(3): 722-84.

Stark, David. 1996. "Recombinant Property in Eastern European Capitalism." *American Journal of Sociology* 101(4): 993-1027.

_____ and Laszlo Bruszt. 1998. *Post-Socialists Pathways: Transforming Politics and Property in East Central Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Steinmo, Sven, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth (eds.). 1992. *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stewart, John. 2001. "'Christ's Kingdom in Scotland': Scottish Presbyterianism, Social Reform, and the Edwardian Crisis." *Twentieth Century British Politics* 12(1): 1-22.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1965. "Social Structure and Organizations" Pp. 142-193 in J.G. March (ed.) *Handbook of Organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

_____. 1968. *Constructing Social Theories*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1990. *Information and Organizations*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

_____. 1991. "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing about Mechanisms in the Social Sciences." Philosophy of Social Science 21(3): 367-388.

_____. 2001. *When Formality Works: Authority and Abstraction in Law and Organizations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics". *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 369-404.

Tilly, Charles. 1995a. "To Explain Political Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* 100(6): 1594-1610.

_____. 1995b. *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758-1834*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. 1998a. "Contentious Conversation." *Social Research* 65(3): 491-510.

_____. 1998b. *Durable Inequalities*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

_____. 2002a. *Stories, Identities and Political Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

_____. 2002b. "Event Catalogs as Theories." *Sociological Theory* 20(2): 248-54.

_____. 2004. *Democracy and Contention in Europe, 1650-2000*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, John N. 1999. "The Evolution of Species Interactions." *Science* 284(5423): 2116-2118.

Unwin, Derek. 1965. "The Development of Conservative Party Organisation in Scotland until 1912." *Scottish Historical Review* 44(158): 89-111.

van den Berghe, Pierre. 1987 [1981]. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. London: Praeger.

Volkov, Vadim. 2002. *Violent Entrepreneurs: The Use of Force in the Making of Russian Capitalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Waldron, Arthur N. 1986. "Theories of Nationalism and Historical Explanation." *World Politics* 37(3): 416-33.

Webb, Keith. 1977. *The Growth of Nationalism in Scotland*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Weber, Max. *From Max Weber*. H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, (trans. and eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

White, Harrison C. 1970. *Chains of Opportunity: System Models of Mobility in Organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. 1992. *Identity and Control: A Structural Theory of Social Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

_____ 1997. "Can Mathematics be Social? Flexible Representations for Interaction Process and Its Sociocultural Constructions." *Sociological Forum* 12(1): 53-71.

Wood, Ian. 1975. "Irish Nationalism and Radical Politics in Scotland, 1880-1906." *Scottish Labour History Journal* 9: 21-38.

Zelizer, Viviana. 1996. "Payments and Social Ties." *Sociological Forum* 11(3): 481-95.

_____. 2000. "The Purchase of Intimacy." *Law and Social Inquiry* 25: 817-48.