“The scum of every county, the refuse of mankind”

Recruiting the British Army in the eighteenth century

Peter Way

“There are two ways of recruiting the British army”, wrote Campbell Dalrymple in his 1761 military manual,

the first and most eligible [best] by volunteers, the last and worst by a press. By the first method, numbers of good men are enrolled, but the army is greatly obliged to levy, accident, and the dexterity of recruiting officers for them; by the second plan, the country gets clear of their banditti, and the ranks are filled up with the scum of every county, the refuse of mankind. They are marched loaded with vice, villainy, and chains, to their destined corps, where, when they arrive, they corrupt all they approach, and are whipt out, or desert in a month.¹

In times of war, the fiscal-military state’s appetite for soldiers proved voracious.² The strength of the British Army in the Seven Years War swelled from roughly 31,000 men to 117,000 (on paper or 93,000 in effective strength) from 1755 to 1762, with the army in America accounting for 30,000 of these troops at its peak strength.³ This did not include the numerous provincial troops of the colonies, which numbered from nearly 10,000 to in excess of 20,000

² Military mobilization constituted the greatest enterprise in European societies at this time. The armies of the main European military powers, France, Spain, the Habsburg Empire, Prussia, and Russia, often reached into the hundreds of thousands in times of war. John Childs estimated that in 1756, for example, Austria’s army numbered 201,000, France’s 330,000, Russia’s 330,000, Prussia’s 143,000, and Britain’s 91,179. Even relatively small states fielded sizeable armies, such as Hesse-Cassel (16,500), Hanover (29,000), and Württemberg (12,000). In total, fourteen states fielded 1,300,000 men, and this prior to full mobilization for the Seven Years War. See Childs, Armies and Warfare in Europe, p. 42.
men in any given year during the war. The combined figure of 40,000 to 50,000 should be doubled to arrive at total combatants when considering losses due to battlefield casualties, victims of disease or accident, desertion, and the end of service terms. These numbers were no small matter for any society, especially considering that the overwhelming majority of recruits came from Britain.

The British Army of the eighteenth century had become a modern volunteer force, with a number of qualifications. Impressment (i.e., conscription) was the most significant departure, although it only ever generated a distinct minority of soldiers. Britain also relied on mercenary forces hired from independent German polities, largely to fight for its interests on the continent, but also in the American Revolution across the Atlantic. The army arrived at this particular configuration as the result of a number of long-term historical processes, the first being political in nature. Throughout the seventeenth century, England engaged in ongoing internal conflict and regime change – civil war, regicide, creation of the Commonwealth, restoration of the monarchy, and revolution – that occupied it at home. But with the defeat of the Stuarts, pacification of Ireland, union with Scotland, and, ultimately, succession of the Hanoverian regime it secured its domestic sphere (excepting several Jacobite uprisings), and expanded its human resources that could be turned from the plow to the sword. Secondly, the changes in military tactics, technology, and scale associated with the military revolution and the rise of the fiscal-military state stoked European wars. Late to join in this acceleration of armed conflict, Britain in the eighteenth century became a leading player, fielding ever-larger armies and constructing a state capable of combating continental powers.

Most profoundly, the economic and social transformations associated with the transition to capitalism positioned Britain at the forefront of modernity in terms of waging war. The conversion of agriculture and landholding patterns to commercial production, the expansion of handcraft industries through the reorganization of production, the tapping of global trade through the creation of commercial trading companies and expansion of the merchant fleet, and the establishment of colonies rich in raw materials substantially enhanced the productivity of Britain's economy, enabling it to fund grossly expensive wars. At the same time,

4 For the numbers of provincial troops requested and the number to actually take the field between 1759 and 1762, see The Journal of Jeffery Amherst, pp. 327-331.
5 Conway estimates that 147,000 men from Britain and Ireland served in the regular army during the Seven Years' War: War, State, and Society, p. 65.
these developments, by pushing many agricultural laborers off the land through enclosure and changes to agricultural practices, as well as many artisans out of the trades due to the inexorable deskilling of the crafts, created a proletariat with nothing but their labor to sell, and in times of war the army proved an insatiable consumer of labor. Furthermore, states fought wars of an increasingly commercial nature to maximize national wealth through the defense of home industries, the protection of trade, and the acquisition of colonies, their resources, and peoples. Warfare intimately intertwined with developing capitalism, and military recruitment played a key role in the freeing of labor power to work in the interests of capital. Mobilization functioned as a component of the process of the “primitive accumulation” of capital (to use Marx’s term), which acted to “free” laborers from traditional economic relationships, alienate them from control of the means of production, and harness their labor to commercial activity that benefited others.

The soldiers’ story forms part of a broader proletarian tale, but it is also specific to military workers. And, in the case of the British Army, even that is not a single tale but one with many plots as Britain pulled together diverse peoples from its dominions through force, inducements, or lack of other options. Soldiers came from specific historical backgrounds characterized by particular economic and social relationships, which recruitment necessarily disrupted, not only for the individual recruit but also for the community from which the army extracted him. By the time of the Seven Years War, market forces obtained in England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, albeit in varying configurations, making their populations receptive to recruitment and giving the British Army its modern complexion. In the American colonies, however, the economy had not developed to this extent and labor scarcity prevailed, meaning fewer men proved receptive to long-term service in the regular army and recruitment met with outright resistance, in a foreshadowing of the Revolution, although many joined the colonial forces on yearly enlistments as a means of accumulating capital for their own economic advancement. More than a simple contract between an individual and institution, states, societies, cultures, and communities negotiated military labor. The fiscal-military state thus played an important role in the economic transformation of England and its satellites through its harnessing of human labor to national warmaking in the interest of commercial economic activity.
Mobilization

Military mobilization in the early modern era occurred in three ways. States commissioned noblemen to raise a stipulated number of troops or contracted fighting units from foreign military enterprisers, but neither provided it with direct control of the fighting force. Finally, the state compelled men to fight through pressing those without apparent employment, criminals, and convicts, or by imposing a levy on districts or cities to field a set number of men, a procedure that met with resistance due to its involuntary nature. By the end of the seventeenth century, however, the modern form of mobilization had emerged, in which the nation-state directly raised and administered a standing army. In central and eastern Europe, particularly in Prussia, centralized systems of conscription developed which essentially coerced military labor in wartime, whereas the Habsburg territories, France, and Spain relied more extensively on volunteers to stock their armies.6

The British came to depend upon volunteers due in part, paradoxically, to its unpopularity. The army’s role in the Civil War and English Revolution engendered a fear that the military posed a potential threat to the civil power and rights of Englishmen that had to be kept in check. The often-unscrupulous operations of regular recruiting parties, and the periodic adoption of press acts during wartime alienated many. To help ease these fears the standing army relied upon annual parliamentary enabling legislation by a Mutiny Act, while the civil power regulated recruitment, and adopted conscription only in times of need.7

Recruits usually received a cash bounty from which to purchase a shirt and shoes. Recruits were acquainted with the articles of war and, according to the Mutiny Act, had to be brought before a justice of the peace or constable more than twenty-four hours after but within four days of enlistment to attest to their willingness to join the army. If a recruit denied his willingness to serve he had to repay the money he had received upon enlisting as well as a penalty of 20 shillings for costs incurred by the recruiting party. Once the party had gathered a body of recruits, they took them to a recruiting depot or back to the regiment. Competition among regiments for troops and the uncoordinated nature of regiment-based recruiting made recruiting

---

6 Redlich, The German Military Enterpriser and His Work Force; Parker, The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, pp. 29-39; Childs, Armies and Warfare in Europe, pp. 49-54; Anderson, War and Society in the Old Regime, pp. 16-32; Wilson, German Armies, p. 277; Black, European Warfare 1660-1815, pp. 218-224.
in England difficult. Death, desertion, drafting into other regiments, and discharges meant the necessity of constant recruitment. J.A. Houlding calculated that the regiments stationed in the British Isles had to recruit 1.5 per cent of their strength on a monthly basis during peacetime, and 2.1 per cent in wartime. Thus, regiments often found it hard to get enough men to maintain their strength. Some recruited year-round, establishing depots and having recruiters on permanent duty. Others turned to “crimps”, private individuals paid by regiments to perform recruiting in the stead of a formal military recruiting party. Recruiters and, especially, crimps who had a vested economic interest in producing recruits, did not scruple at kidnapping men and spiriting them away to military service.8

The British state also coerced men into the army, adopting impressment during every major war of the eighteenth century, although it functioned in a more limited fashion than did the naval press gang. Civil magistrates and constables oversaw impressment, which targeted (in the words of the first Press Act of 1756) “able bodied Men as do not follow or exercise any lawful Calling or Employment, or have not some lawful and sufficient Support”. Such men would be brought before the commissioners to determine if they were suitable for impressment, the officials receiving payment for each man pressed. Owning property or possessing the right to vote protected one from the press, as did providing a substitute. Having a large family, being too old or infirm, bearing a good character, or having friends in high places could extricate a man from service; a bad reputation or lack of employment doomed him to the army.9

The Newcastle ministry by the end of 1755 had decided to raise ten new regiments as the Seven Years War loomed, and the need for these additional forces became more urgent in 1756 when fears of a French invasion heightened. With the numbers of volunteers seemingly dwindling, Parliament passed a Press Act in March 1756, but the Privy Council suspended it within a month as the invasion threat had incited enough men to volunteer.

---

However, by August upon further expansion of the army, it soon became clear the number of volunteers had dwindled, and the government adopted a new Press Act. This act proved less successful, and in 1757 political pressure made Pitt abandoned it. Yet London, for example, yielded 500 pressed men in 1756 for service in the 35th Regiment alone. Coerced soldiers tended, not surprisingly, to be less enthusiastic about military life, often deserting from the transports before sailing and upon arrival in America. Loudoun reported of the 35th’s “raw” troops, “the prest Men, I dare not yet trust so near the enemy”, as he had six desert to the French together, two of whom were discovered starving in the woods and promptly hanged. The army also took up reluctant troops in other manners. People convicted of a crime received pardons contingent on enlisting in the army. Thus, William Desborough, found guilty of stealing sheep in November 1760 and sentenced to death at Huntingdon, earned a pardon by enlisting in a regiment of foot. Similarly John Baker, Jeremiah Smith, Charles Dailey, and Thomas Elliott, sentenced to death for highway robbery at Maidstone that same month, received pardons predicated upon joining the 49th Regiment in Jamaica, which often equated to a delayed form of capital punishment due to the high mortality rate resulting from tropical diseases in the West Indies.

The Duke of Wellington, military hero of the Napoleonic wars, famously referred to his troops as “the scum of the earth”. Such a negative perspective not only mirrored the point of view of British soldiers; it also persists today among some historians of the army. Such classist language not only insults its subject; it also prevents any serious engagement with the social background of soldiers or the historical processes by which they came to serve in the army. Lumping them together as the residue at the bottom of society excuses military historians from conceptualizing these men as either historical agents or victims of power structures; they become merely

14 For example, Chandler and Beckett, the editors of The Oxford History of the British Army, purport: “Soldiers were inevitably recruited from the dregs of society [...] The unattractive features of service life which persisted until the very end of the nineteenth century were not conducive to recruiting the more respectable elements of society” (p. xvi).
soldiers, units of a more important whole, subsumed within histories of the army that assume nationalist discourses. Dalrymple, at least, captured the distinction between “good men” who volunteered and the pressed “scum of every county”, though the class bias of an army officer still came through. Closer attention to the backgrounds of recruits, however, reveals a martial workforce that neatly mirrored the laboring classes of the era, making soldiers more the salt of the earth than its scum.

The common conception of soldiers presumed they hailed from the rootless mass that willingly lived idle and unproductive lives, exactly the people for whom the state drafted vagrancy and poor laws as well as press acts. Stripped of the moral content such a perspective contains an element of truth. The proletariat thrust up by primitive accumulation, the people who lived by the sweat of their labor and had a tenuous grasp on subsistence, undoubtedly counted military service as one certain form of employment. But they alone could never satisfy the army’s demand for manpower during wartime, especially on the scale of the Seven Years War, when recruitment cut deeply into the British populace. At the same time, economic change cut adrift craftsmen as well as common laborers. Periodic downturns and the high unemployment and prices that came with them had an impact throughout the laboring classes, while changes in the nature of craft production undermined some artisans’ ability to achieve subsistence and rendered others surplus to their masters’ need. Elsewhere I have utilized data garnered from the Out-Pension Books of the Royal Chelsea Hospital to explore the economic background of Britain’s soldiers in the Seven Years War, a study that revealed an unexpectedly skilled background: those with trades accounted for almost half the men, while manual laborers made for in excess of 40 per cent. Within the crafts three trades predominated – textile workers, shoemakers, and tailors – crafts among the first to experience the reorganization of production attendant upon primitive accumulation.15

The British Army, as well as drawing soldiers from the wider laboring classes, also cast the net widely in recruiting to fill the ranks. While in reality an expression of English might, the army in its social composition more exactly reflected the imperial reach of that might. Fighting on the scale that William Pitt aspired to in the Seven Years War required an army beyond the means of England alone, even beyond those of Great Britain. England looked elsewhere in its dominions to man its army, to domains already compromised by English imperialism, Scotland and Ireland, and

One could argue that the British Army was the most *British* of institutions by the mid-eighteenth century. Regimental returns for the army in America in 1757 reveal an ethnically heterogeneous rank and file. The English-born accounted for 29.7 per cent of the whole, Scots 27.3 per cent, Irish 27.3 per cent, and continental Europeans 4.3 per cent. Colonials made up 5.3 per cent of the army, while foreign-born residents of America equaled 5.7 per cent (see Table 10.1 and Chart 10.1).

### Table 10.1 Nativity of NCOs and Private Soldiers in America, 1757

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>American Colonials</th>
<th>Foreigners enlisted in Europe</th>
<th>Foreigners enlisted in America</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4212</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>3873</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>3874</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** LO4011/no. 1/90; LO6695/99; LO2533/no. 4/90; LO2529/no. 1/90; LO4012/no. 1/90; LO1944 no. 5/90; LO 6616/88; LO 1683/no. 1/90; LO5661/85; LO1391/no. 1/90; LO1384/no. 2/90; LO3936/no. 1/90; LO6639/89; LO1345/no. 5/90; LO6616/88; LO4068/no. 2/90; Return of Four Independent Companies, 15 July 1757, LO6616/88. The returns represented 14,124 common soldiers and noncommissioned officers of the army in America’s total strength of approximately 20,000 men. See Brumwell, *Redcoats*, p. 20.

**Chart 10.1**

Given the relative populations of these elements of Greater Britain, it is clear that Scotland and Ireland disproportionately manned the army.
Working from population estimates for the respective nations (see Table 10.2), each soldier born in England or Wales (Welsh soldiers are typically subsumed with the English in army returns) who served in the regular army in America in 1757 represented 1,599 inhabitants of their homeland. By comparison every Irish soldier served for 824 fellow Irish people, whereas a Scottish soldier left only 327 Scots proportionately at home. Thus, an Irishman was roughly twice as likely and a Scottish male five times as likely to serve in the American army than an Englishman or Welshman. Furthermore, the data estimated total population, male and female, so to arrive at a true approximate service ratio we need to halve those figures, meaning that English and Welsh men had a likelihood of 1 in 800 of serving in the American army, Irish 1 in 422, and Scots 1 in 164. Moreover, the ratio for Scots overstates the case, as the majority of recruits were drawn from the Highlands, which was less populous than the Lowlands. Finally, these calculations do not take into account those soldiers serving within Great Britain, on the European continent, in the West Indies, or elsewhere in the British Empire. Clearly the male populations of Ireland and Scotland had been harnessed to the British war machine, disproportionate contributions that resulted from specific historical developments. Mobilization thus took place in distinct settings, operating differently in and having a differential impact on each locale. A review of the main theatres of mobilization makes this clear, but also reveals a central thread in the process: the interconnectedness of the raising of armies and economic transformations associated with the emergence of capitalism taking place within these societies.

Table 10.2  Population ratios by nativity for British NCOs and private soldiers in America, 1757

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population*</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Soldiers</th>
<th>Ratio to population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>6,736,000</td>
<td>1760/1</td>
<td>4,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1,265,000</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>3,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3,191,000</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>3,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The fact that soldiers came from all ranks of laboring classes and across the empire means that any engagement with the military as a socioeconomic institution must make allowance for the contingencies of different histori-
cal class experiences. At the same time, the commercialization of human relationships strikes a recurring theme in these different histories. Such change weakened or severed peoples’ grasp on subsistence attained by working the land or plying a trade, as a result preparing them for wage labor including that in the army.

**England, military metropole**

Linda Colley maintained that the series of wars between Britain and France from 1689 to 1815 constructed Britishness, a sense of difference from those people outside Great Britain, largely founded upon Protestantism and forged in warfare, which connected its different parts together. Colley’s model has been criticized for its exaggeration of the integrating powers of Protestantism, her timing of the real unification of national interests within Great Britain, and, most tellingly, its Anglocentrism. In many ways, Britain should be understood as England writ large. England constituted the heart of the British dominions. England’s Parliament controlled Wales and Scotland from 1707, and retained final authority over the Irish Parliament. The fiscal-military state operated essentially in the interest of England in harvesting taxes and duties from across its possessions, and developing military policy with the defense of England as its main priority. English diplomats crafted foreign policy to ensure the established Protestant religion, promoted trade that primarily benefited England, and protected the interests of the Hanoverian regime. And, when diplomacy failed, England’s politicians set the country on a war footing, dragging Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and its other dependencies along too. Fighting wars, however, constituted one area where the English willingly shared the effort and the results.

The opening of hostilities with the French in the Seven Years War and the rapid escalation in the scale of mobilization sent recruiting parties out across England in a quest to satisfy the need for military manpower. The press played a role but voluntarism proved essential to the war effort. Why men willingly enlist to fight in wars is a question that has long intrigued military historians. Patriotism immediately suggests itself, and one should not underestimate its power in an era that witnessed the emergence of strong nationalist and imperialist currents in British culture. Just as often, historians note that recruits joined up for adventure, or in flight from

---

17 Wilson, “Empire of Virtue”.
boring laboring life, overbearing parents, a demanding master, a clinging love interest, or the law. The fact that most recruits were youths in their late teens to early twenties supports the wanderlust explanation. As well, economic necessity prompted enlistment, according to historians of early modern armies. At times of poor harvests and high prices, unemployed or underemployed individuals without the means to support themselves opted for the wage, food, and clothing of the soldier.\textsuperscript{18}

But one must be wary of perceiving a whiplash effect between immediate short-term economic depression and military enlistment. Recruitment cannot be measured by a price index. Long-term economic forces played the primary role, restructuring economies in ways that increased productivity and created a labor surplus that both helped to pay for wars and produced the manpower necessary to do the fighting. And the English agrarian economy proved so productive that it required fewer people to work the land, thus freeing others to work in industry, or indeed the army.\textsuperscript{19}

As the leading commercial nation of Europe, England led the way in the capitalist reconfiguration of society. Agricultural improvement, including the enclosure and conversion of common lands to market production, the reorganization of production within certain trades, and the resultant creation of a landless, tradeless proletariat provided the army with a ready supply of recruits, willing or not. Moreover, England suffered economic depression and incidents of famine beginning in 1756, leading to unemployment, strikes, bread riots, and general discontent at exactly the time recruitment ramped up for the Seven Years War.\textsuperscript{20} James Wolfe, sent with troops to quell disturbances among Gloucester weavers late in 1756, expressed some sympathy with their situation in letters to his mother. “The obstinacy of the poor, half-starved weavers of broad-cloth that inhabit this extraordinary country is surprising. They beg about the country for food, because, they say, the masters have beat down their wages too low to live upon, and I believe it is a just complaint.” At the same time, he recognized their desperation could prove a bonus for the army. “I hope it will turn out a good recruiting party, for the people are so oppressed, so poor and so wretched, that they


\textsuperscript{19} Wrigley, “Society and the Economy in the Eighteenth Century”, pp. 72-73, 76-81, 89-91.

will perhaps hazard a knock on the pate for bread and clothes, and turn soldiers through sheer necessity.”

Stay and starve in England only to get a knock on the head for protesting your condition, or join the army; many faced this conundrum in the Seven Years War. Merchant capital required armed forces to secure and defend its interests, and the changes initiated by capital accumulation – both in the long-term structural changes that freed labor power and in the short-term economic crises that undercut subsistence – generated capital’s own martial labor force. The fact that Britain rose to the status of most advanced economic power and the dominant military power in the mid-eighteenth century derived from no mere coincidence. This story, so familiar from reading Marx and the great British Marxist historians, proves more complex, for remember that only three in ten soldiers in the British Army in America came from England. Viewing the British army as simply the product of internal English economic developments obscures the heterogeneity of the very institution, and the multiple sources of manpower it tapped to wage war, each a product of particular historical forces.

Scotland, the military plantation

“I am for always having in our army as many Scottish soldiers as possible”, William Wildman, Lord Barrington, the member of Parliament for the border town Berwick-upon-Tweed, avowed to the House of Commons in 1751, “not that I think them more brave than those of any other country we can recruit from, but because they are generally more hardy and less mutinous; and of all Scottish soldiers I should choose to have and keep in our army as many Highlanders as possible.” Whereas Colley reads this comment as a measure of Scotland’s successful integration into Great Britain, Andrew Mackillop believes Barrington’s views reflected Britain’s “cannon-fodder policy”, whereby in the aftermath of the failed Jacobite uprising of 1745-1746, Britain harnessed Gaelic militarism to its overseas imperial interests, but not until the Seven Years War did Britain’s policy of stripping the Highlands to wage its wars become fully realized.

22 Here, I will only mention E. P. Thompson and the “bible” of labor history, The Making of the English Working Class.
The fact that English military policy had a direct impact on the governance of Scotland in general and the Highlands in particular derived from the Act of Union and the abolition of the Scottish Parliament. The British Army played a central role in the Highlands, forming six independent Highland companies in 1725 to police the region and build roads to make the “savage” Highlands more accessible to British rule and commerce. In 1739, it formed four further companies, and the ten companies combined to form the Black Watch, the first regiment of Highland troops incorporated within the regular army. In 1745, John Campbell, 4th Earl of Loudoun (commander-in-chief in America, 1756-1758), formed a second regiment. In the short term, British Army recruitment in the Highlands remained inseparable from the repression of the Jacobite threat, finally laid to rest on Culloden field in 1746. The army then raided the territories of rebels, taking prisoners, disarming suspected rebels, laying waste crops, and confiscating livestock. Trials were held and more than 100 captives executed for treason, and many more were transported to the colonies as indentured servants or to serve as troops in regiments stationed abroad. The British government adopted a number of legislative measures intended to subordinate the Highlands, confiscating rebel lands, disarming the populace, banning the wearing of tartans, regulating the practice of religion, and reforming the legal system. The army played a central role in reclamation of the Highlands, becoming the British state's most powerful expression in this region tainted by rebellion. The threat of Jacobitism had directed government policy into a military sphere, and ensured the persistence of a cultural form, clanship, that it was meant to eradicate. In the process, England ghettoized the Highlands as “an imperial-military reservoir”.

Britain then set about reorganizing the region’s economy on the pattern of commercial agricultural production developing in England, establishing the Board of Annexed Estates to manage the thirteen estates annexed to the crown (other confiscated properties were auctioned off to pay debts). It also shouldered the task of “improving” the Highland agricultural economy by converting clan patterns of land management to a more commercial

24 Plank, Rebellion and Savagery, pp. 18-21; Mackillop, “More Fruitful than the Soil”, pp. 13-20, 22, 29.
26 Mackillop, “More Fruitful than the Soil”, pp. 39-40. Scots also had a history of service in continental armies, particularly that of France. See McCorry, “Rats, Lice and Scotchmen”.

basis. It soon developed a program that set about shortening leases, promoting single-tenant farms of sufficient size to produce market surpluses, establishing security of tenure, removing surplus farm labor, restricting subtenure and evicting unwanted tenantry, better managing husbandry, and developing new villages. These acts led to large-scale eviction in some areas and sparked fears of depopulation. In 1760, the commissioners proposed “the propagation of a hardy and industrious race, fit for serving the public in war”. This position merely recognized an ongoing process by which military service absorbed much of the surplus labor generated by changes to the Highland economy.

With the outbreak of hostilities with France, concern over the use of Highland troops dissipated, and William Pitt, who took power in November 1756, decided to raise two new battalions of Highland troops from clans that had followed the Stuarts. Fortuitously, just as economic depression in England had facilitated mobilization, so did famine in Scotland in 1757. Another Highland battalion formed in 1758, two more in 1759, and by war’s end ten new battalions of Highlanders had been raised, making the Highlands much more militarized than the Lowlands. The Press Act also draughted Highlanders into the army. In April 1756, with the act about to go into effect, the commissioners of supply and justices of the peace in the County of Inverness decided to canvas the gentlemen of the various districts to identify men to draw up a list of “fitt and proper” men to press into the North American service. A return of troops in the 42nd Regiment present at Schenectady, New York, the next year indicates that Highland justices had in some instances to resort to the last method, as thirty-five men were recorded as serving the six-year term of pressed men.

To understand Scottish recruiting, however, it must be situated in its socioeconomic environment. The country’s population was essentially stagnant, growing at just 0.6 per cent in 1750-1800 (half of England’s rate), meaning that recruitment constituted a net loss demographically. At the

28 Mackillop, More Fruitful than the Soil, pp. 77-83; quotation from Hints Towards a Plan for Managing the Forfeited Estates, cited on pp. 89-90.
30 Commissioners of Supply and Justices of the Peace, Extract minutes, 5, 6 April 1756, LO1017/22; Francis Grant, List of the men of the 42nd Regiment who have Inlisted for a Term of Years according to the Press Act, 16 April 1757, LO4214/74.
time of recruitment for the Seven Years War, Scotland as a whole possessed a three-tiered rural social structure of landlords, tenants, and landless laborers. Land constituted the key to subsistence in what was still essentially a peasant society with greater similarities to mainland Europe than to England. In the rural Lowlands, the social structure rested on ferm-touns, which ranged from small units of twenty families or fewer to some the size of villages. Usually tenants rented the lands in the towns by leasehold from an absent landlord, with a smattering of owner-occupiers evident in some areas. A toun could be held by one tenant or by several with holdings of varying sizes, larger in the south-east, whereas in the north-east smallholdings proved more common. Cottars (families that held small plots of land by subtenure) mostly worked the land, owing duties to the tenant or landowner. Servants engaged for six months to a year in full-time service, who often came from cottar families and could eventually set themselves up as such, also performed agricultural labor. Changes in the eighteenth century favored tenants and owner-occupiers, with their hold on the land being restrained only by terms of lease, and ordinary people’s access to the land became limited. The number of towns held by a single tenant grew in number. They consolidated their holdings and enclosed lands to convert to pasture for their sole use. This erosion of common rights deprived cottars and subtenants of land, converting them to employees of landlords or tenants. Still smallholdings persisted everywhere, and in some areas so did the old heterogeneous holding, common rights pattern. In the northeast counties of Banff, Kincardine, and Aberdeen, the rise of crofting meant that people farmed small strips of land but also worked part-time for farmers through economic need. Crofters came to replace cottars.

The dwindling availability of land meant people often combined farming of smallholdings with wages earned from labor on farms, as craftsmen, or in the building trade. Rural underemployment became common especially outside the peak farm work seasons, and this pushed people into paid employment, bringing them into competition with tradespeople, especially in cloth manufacture. Weavers often experienced slack periods and had to find employment elsewhere. Outside towns little full-time manufacturing work existed, except in the mining and salt industries. The linen industry, which doubled production about every twenty to twenty-five years between 1730 and 1800, depended on finding cheap, exploitable labor, and developed a putting-out model of production whereby the raw materials were sent out to rural workers for

spinning. In the 1730s-1740s, spinning increasingly encroached on the north and the Highlands. The craft career path broke down and journeymen became lifelong wageworkers. Journeymen’s societies emerge by the early eighteenth century and, later, permanent organizations arose among such trades as tailors and shoemakers. Rising prices caused the most disputes, leading to calls for higher wages, but typically the state backed the capitalist.34

In the Highlands the bàle or clachan, the traditional township and basis of settlement and management, functioned essentially as a communalistic, multi-tenanted farm managed by tacksmen, who leased lands from clan leaders and sub-leased portions to clan members. From the 1730s, landowners, who viewed traditional clan practices as an impediment to improvement, began eliminating the bàle along with tacksmen in the move to single-tenant farms and crofting communities of individual smallholdings and common pasture. The defeat at Culloden freed clan leaders to pursue progress and break down the communalistic ethos of the clans, in the process subordinating Scottish Gaeldom to the market and British imperialism.35 Military recruitment played an important role in the process. For the Highland elite, recruiting regiments constituted the main means of “colonizing” the resources of the British fiscal-military state. Recruiting targeted those on the margins of the Highland economy, not established tenants or proven rent-payers. Faced with rising recruitment bounties, landlords sought to transfer the costs of recruiting to their main tenants by asking them to fill quotas or pay for substitutes. These men resisted because recruitment drained the very manpower they required to commercialize their holdings, drove up wages, and made them maintain subtenants and cottars on the land to satisfy landlord levies rather than to evict them and improve the land.36 Also, the need for recruits meant that those at the bottom of Highland society wielded some control over the terms of enlistment. Landlords faced with scarcity felt compelled to offer favorable terms to recruits. Enlistment bounties exceeded the amount allowed by the government in the late 1750s. Those without sufficient liquid capital had to grant land in place of monetary bounties, either securing existing landholdings or promising grants of new land upon returning home from service. In return for providing military recruits, subtenants demanded to
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hold land directly from the landlord, and thus circumvented tacksmen. Thus recruitment, in part a matter of landlord coercion, also proved a means of social advancement for the subtenantry. Recruiting raised the expectations of landless and subtenant groups, and these were met by subdivision of the land. Mackillop concludes that “one of recruitment’s most important social effects lay in the fact that it undermined the hierarchical structure of Highland farms and expedited the emergence of crofting.” Good in the short term in that it expanded access to land by the lowest ranks of highland society, in the long term, however, it led directly to the Highland Clearances in the postwar era.

The Jacobite revolt of 1745-1746 provided the British fiscal-military state the wedge with which to pry open the Highlands for economic improvement. Military recruitment played a key role in that improvement, skimming off former rebels and the common people uprooted by the commercialization of the Highland economy. While lairds and recruits alike exploited the capital generated by the military leviathan, in the end the army’s needs transformed the region and the clearances followed in its train. At the same time, Scots came to play a central role in the British Army and Highlanders crafted a unique military persona, with the tartan becoming as much a symbol of British militarism as the red coat.

Ireland, island garrison

Ireland’s relation to the fiscal-military state differed from that of Scotland in that it did not serve primarily as a military plantation that produced troops for Britain’s overseas military enterprise. The army officially did not recruit Irish Catholics and only enlisted Irish Protestants during wartime, although significant numbers of Irish did enter the army. The island functioned first and foremost as a military depot and source of funds to support British militarism. By stationing 12,000 soldiers there in times of peace, amounting to more than one-third of the peacetime army, England could maintain a large force without immediately threatening the homeland but easily within reach in times of need. Moreover, by placing these regiments on
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the Irish establishment paid for by taxation set by Ireland's Parliament, Britain colonized its resources and expropriated its wealth. Finally, given the troubled history between the English and Irish, garrisoning 12,000 troops on the island made them a de facto occupying force, suppressing Irish Catholics, and elevating Irish Protestants, but keeping both subordinate to Britain. Ireland's unique role resulted from its particular history of colonization by, rebellion against, and religious strife with England.

England viewed Ireland, unlike Scotland or Wales, as a colony. More so than other British colonies, however, its history involved successive invasions and military conquest. First came the wave of Anglo-Norman invaders, followed by “New English” colonizers of Ireland in the period 1560-1660. The rebellion of 1641 led to the Cromwellian reconquest and the imposition of a Protestant ascendancy. The English Revolution and the defeat of James II and VII by William of Orange’s Protestant armies handed control of provincial power and land to the Anglo-Irish ratified in the Treaty of Limerick of 1692, and there soon followed a series of penal laws restricting the political, economic, and social rights of Catholics. Unlike Scotland, however, Ireland retained its parliament, although first Catholics and then Presbyterians would lose the franchise, making it an expression of Anglo-Irish will. This became the body nominally overseeing the Irish establishment of the British Army.

The English Disbanding Act of 1699 set the Irish establishment at 12,000, where it remained until 1769 (although at given times a number of regiments could be on duty elsewhere in the empire). During peacetime, desertion, death, and the old and infirm serving in the ranks vitiated its nominal strength, reducing the number of effective soldiers by as much as a quarter. Conversely, during wartime, the establishment expanded, for example, reaching 17,000 for a period in 1756-1757 and 24,000 from 1761 to the peace in 1763. As it had before the Treaty of Limerick, the Irish Parliament dominated by the Anglo-Irish paid for the army from its revenues, yet had no control over the number of troops or the expense, as a royal proclamation applied the act to Ireland. Here nakedly appears Ireland's colonial status in military matters. The Lord Lieutenant, the king's civil representative in Ireland, also acted as a military governor, but exerted limited control over this force. The regiments remained subject to the British Mutiny Act, and their primary functions entailed the defense of England and the provision
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of reserve military forces for deployment elsewhere at the expense of the Irish. Only in the 1740s did Britain place regiments sent abroad from Ireland on the English establishment and assume their expense. The Anglo-Irish derived patronage opportunities from it, such as the awarding of commissions and contracts for supplies. Unlike the Scottish example, though, the Anglo-Irish did not directly tap the resources of the British fiscal-military state, instead colonizing the Irish in general through additional taxes. The British government profited substantially, but from the perspective of many Irish, however, the army must have seemed like a giant parasite.

The “Irish” army was Irish in name only. In 1701, Britain proscribed Catholics from serving in the army. Catholics did join the army unofficially, but they had to abjure their faith when enlisting. Many Irish Catholics, in fact, demonstrated their true allegiance by enlisting with Britain’s enemies. Britain also normally rejected Irish Protestants from army service: first to ensure Catholics did not enter the army by claiming to be Protestant; and, secondly, as Presbyterians comprised two-thirds of Irish Protestants, to keep out suspected dissenters. During wartime, however, manpower needs overrode these concerns and the army recruited Irish Protestants. The Irish army, then, amounted to a force of 12,000 English and Scottish troops garrisoned in Ireland and paid for by the Irish through taxation set by the Irish Parliament, which exerted minimal control over the army. Some historians have argued that the combination of penal laws and a standing army did not make Ireland a police state, but the presence of this many soldiers makes it hard not to view the army as an occupying force.

Ireland’s economy in the eighteenth century experienced similar changes to those in Scotland and England, with the expansion of commercial agriculture, the development of new manufacturing activities, and the reorganization of traditional forms of craft production producing surplus labor that elsewhere armies would partially absorb. Yet political and religious reasons prohibited paid military labor as an option for many set
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free from the soil and trades. A quick look at Irish economic development identifies the factors that lay behind enlistment when war opened the door to military service for many. A landed aristocracy, urban and rural middle classes, and lower classes of peasants and laborers comprised the Irish social structure. By 1700, most landlords came from the Anglican Anglo-Irish, as the penal laws restricted Catholics landholding in a number of ways, while the middle class was more heterogeneous. Catholics formed the majority of the lower classes, particularly those that tilled the soil, and dominated the countryside. Peasant society had been organized communally into a clachan, a pattern similar to that in Scotland. A group of families leased the land collectively with each getting equal access to land for tillage and pasture in a system called rundale. From the seventeenth century, this arrangement came under increasing pressure from ongoing broad shifts in land management wrought by those who wished to farm the land for commercial purposes, most notably by enclosing tilled land for pasturage of sheep and later livestock. The commercial pressures began the breakup of the peasantry. Some proved able to transform into small tenants with enough land and livestock to farm on their own and pay cash rent. The majority became laborers, most of whom held only small pieces of land they rented with labor, while the rest sold their labor to pay cash rent for small plots in the conacre system. “In both cases, however”, according to Sean Connolly, “their true position was of a rural proletariat exchanging their labour for the means of subsistence.” The relationship between landlord and tenant also altered as a result of the commercialization of land use. Landowners tended to lease their lands in blocks to middlemen who then rented the lands to peasants for a profit, often squeezing too much out of those who worked the land, rendering them vulnerable to even minor problems affecting the Irish economy.

Ireland experienced repeated crises of subsistence with famines occurring in 1720-1721 and 1728-1729, but most devastatingly in 1740-1741, which caused mortality comparable to the Great Famine of the 1840s. The harvest failure of 1756-1757 must also have played a role in the recruitment of the army. Commentators at the time have pointed to the shift from tillage
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to pasturage for commercial purposes as a root cause of Irish poverty and social dislocation. Landlords enhanced productivity in large part by weakening the bond between peasants and the soil: by enclosing and consolidating the land; appointing middlemen tenants to further exploit smallholders; shortening leases to an annual basis; and charging excessive or “rack” rents, among other tactics. The net effect was to force people onto ever-smaller pieces of land for cultivation with their only recourse to find paid employment of a temporary or permanent nature. This cottier class grew over the century. Some lost all ties to the land and joined a swelling proletariat that sought work where it could be found, on large farms, in urban centres, or across the Irish Sea, and, indeed, in the military of one power or another. Peasants suffered under this yoke for the most part, but periodically rose up against landlords and improvers using clandestine collective violence to seek to roll back change, most notably in the Houghers campaign of agrarian terror of 1711-1712 and the Whiteboys movement that emerged in 1761.

Ireland’s small but developing manufacturing sector provided a main source of employment for the displaced agrarian classes as well as craftsmen. Many of Ireland’s products came from agriculture. Improved farms produced beef, butter, grain, and (indirectly) beer and flour for urban consumption and, more importantly, for the international provision trade (including supplying the army). The manufacturing sector developed somewhat more slowly, and British trade restrictions have often received the blame, especially the Woolens Act of 1699, which prohibited the export of wool and woollen cloth from anywhere but England. This situation undoubtedly harmed the weaving trade, and protests against the act occurred periodically. Still, wool production for the domestic market remained an important industry. Much of the weaving into cloth took place rurally on the putting-out model, with women spinning yarn in their households. Production soared with the abandonment of the English import duty in 1739.

Linen manufacture concentrated in Ulster constituted the leading sector in the economy. Irish linen production took off with the immigration of
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English and Scots, and by the 1670s large-scale commercial production was already evident. In 1696, England removed import duty on Irish linen and in 1705 allowed direct export to other colonies. Economic growth transformed northeastern Ireland. Ulster’s eastern counties came to depend on linen manufacture to the degree that they became net importers of food. Petty producers working in households carried on weaving using their own yarn or that purchased on the market, sometimes employing journeymen weavers. The spinning of yarn and weaving of coarse linen spread west and south of Ulster, while elsewhere farmers raised livestock and crops to support industrial towns. The Ulster economy became overdependent on linen and subject to shock when trade worsened, more so in the east where agriculture had largely been abandoned. When the economy took a downturn in Ulster, some chose to cross the Atlantic to escape, as occurred in 1718-1729 when thousands left as a result of poor harvests, famine, rising tithes, and problems within the linen trade. The Irish economy prospered in the 1730s as the linen trade grew. Conacre continued spreading, with land subdivided to provide small lots for weavers’ subsistence needs. This system also exposed them to any agricultural disruption as happened in 1740, when crop failure caused food prices and rents to rise, famine set in, and the linen trade declined. This crisis prompted another wave of migration, many indenturing themselves to get to the colonies. As the linen industry matured, more weavers were unable to set themselves up as independent producers. All those people who depended on the industry, the women who spun the linen and farmers who grew food to feed the linen workers, also suffered when trade did. Desperation led some to join the Oakboys or Hearts of Oak, formed in 1763 to protest economic conditions.

Irish economic development in the eighteenth century had a negative impact on many. While national wealth and consumption grew substantially from 1700 to 1760, it did so for those already better off. The majority lived a subsistence existence and poverty pervaded society. Cottiers found themselves more vulnerable to their landlords, while the urban poor crowded into slums in the major cities. The spread of commercial agriculture and manufacturing set many adrift. This proved particularly the case at times
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of economic dislocation, such as the years 1756-1757 when bad harvests and high prices prevailed, coincidentally the time when recruitment for the Seven Years War first spiked.61

The Seven Years War affected the army in Ireland early on. The two regiments sent to North America with General Edward Braddock in 1755, the 44th and 48th, had come from the Irish establishment at a peacetime strength of 310 rank-and-file. Drafting 420 men from regiments in Britain and Ireland brought each of the two units to 520 before they left Cork.62 Such drafting became the norm throughout the war whenever the government ordered reinforcements for North America; whether for existing regiments rotated across the Atlantic or newly raised units, drafts from those forces remaining behind brought them up to strength.63 The escalating demand for fighting men prompted the dispatch of ever more troops from the Irish establishment: in September 1756, the 22nd Regiment and drafts from the twelve Irish battalions; and in 1757 the 17th, 27th, 28th, 43rd, and 46th Regiments, as well as further drafts.64 In turn, the remaining units in Ireland found it necessary to recruit so as to return to strength. To meet these additional manpower demands, Whitehall decided to lift the ban on enlisting Irish Protestants, seemingly as early as 1756. In April of that year, a lieutenant of the Royal American Regiment complained that recruiting for the new unit in Ireland had been very difficult as twenty-four companies were to be raised for service and 1,600 men had already been enlisted, making for thin pickings. And, in August, the Earl of Halifax reported that 1,100 men had been raised in Ireland to fill up the regiments in America.65

The large number of Irish in the American army by the summer of 1757 attests to the rapid recruitment of Protestants in the short time since the prohibition had been lifted. The regiments sent from the Irish establishment in 1756-1757 for which returns survive exhibited the highest proportion of Irish soldiers: the 17th (39.8 per cent), 22nd (41.4 per cent), 27th (45.8 per cent), and 28th (56.3 per cent). The Irish also accounted for 33.9 per cent of
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the four companies of the New York Independent Regiment, a clear indication of the recruiting of Irish natives in the American colonies.66

Irish Protestants (and clandestine Catholics), dammed up as a source of military labor by imperial policy much of the time, flowed fairly evenly throughout the army once the war-induced need for men opened the sluice gates. The Irish did not attain the same prominent profile in the army as did Highlanders. The contingent basis of their enlistment made them seem more a last resort, while the bogeyman of Catholicism complicated their relation to the British. Nonetheless, in the Seven Years War, they formed a significant component of the army, and their experience with improvers, landlords, and bosses no doubt colored their relationships within the military.

German military migrants

The scale of conflict in the Seven Years War strained manpower resources to such a point that Britain had to look beyond its dominions for war workers. Across the English Channel it found what it needed in two forms: foreign princes willing to hire out their military forces; and individuals who could be recruited directed into the British Army. Although not part of the British Empire, German peoples of Europe did play an important role during the Seven Years War, both on the continent where Prussia proved an essential ally and where mercenary units from other states fought in the British interest, and as recruits to the regular British Army dispatched to the American theatre. Ultimately, Britain decided to fight the war in North America with its own army and to fight in Europe primarily by proxy. In January of 1756 Britain signed the Convention of Westminster with Prussia to prevent that state from siding with France. Frederick the Great waged total war, exploiting resources and civilians to the full, and his policies had a significant impact on western and northern Germany, which had been largely conflict-free since 1714. Not only did Prussia forcibly harness people to the war machine but also the ferocity of continental conflict uprooted many, making them ripe pickings for recruiters from various armies. Frederick’s military support came at a price for Britain, which promised in 1758 to provide Prussia with £670,000 annually to subsidize its war effort. At the
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same time, Britain assumed the cost of the entire Hanoverian army, which would amount to £1.2 million per year.67

Britain also hired the services of mercenary soldiers. With the decline of independent military enterprisers, mercenary captains who hired their companies to fight for other, larger states found it difficult to raise armies of a sufficient size from their own territories. They could recruit in foreign domains, or could contract units from another army to support their own. Increasingly, they hired a specific number of troops raised and maintained by a foreign power, particularly smaller states in the Holy Roman Empire, in return for the payment of a subsidy. Subsidizing forces from abroad tended to be faster and simpler than raising new regiments at home. Subsidy agreements also proved more flexible, as troops could be hired for short periods and dispensed with when not needed. Political considerations also played a part, as subsidy agreements served as a form of political alliance with mutual responsibilities stipulated.68 Since the Glorious Revolution, the British had depended on a largely volunteer army, but could do this only by extensively utilizing foreign soldiers. Peter Taylor argued that the fear of a standing army led the English to “subcontracting the defense of their liberties and privileges to Germans, Native Americans, and Africans.” The “tributary overlords of German territorial states” secured much English business in supplying troops from within Europe, pushing most independent military contractors out of the market. They could meet this demand for soldiers for hire as their subjects legally owed them military service, but in doing so they had to alter the political economies of their states.69

Many (including William Pitt) thought at the time the Hanoverian regime of Britain in fact cared more about their status as Protectors of Hanover than as defenders of the British realm, and the outbreak of hostilities with France in the colonies in 1754 prompted Britain again to contract with German territories – Hesse-Cassel, Ansbach, and Würzburg – to hold men in reserve to help protect Hanover. Hanover itself received an annual subsidy of £50,000 to expand its army by 8,000 men. During the invasion scare of 1756, Britain paid for twelve Hanoverian battalions and eight Hessian battalions to be stationed in the south of England.70
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The “military-subsidy relationship” England had with Hesse-Cassel sheds light on the phenomenon. Subsidy treaties usually took the form of mutual defense pacts, with arrangements for payments made per man supplied, a subsidy to the state for the duration of the war, and pay for the soldiers. The soldier’s food would be paid for out of his “subsistence” (or pay). The British received soldiers who were trained and equipped in return. During the Seven Years War, Britain contracted with Hesse-Cassel, a part of the Holy Roman Empire, for 12,000 men in 1755, almost 19,000 in 1757, 12,000 two years later, and more than 15,000 in 1760. From 1751 to 1760, British subsidies accounted for 40 per cent of all state revenue for Hesse-Cassel. The monies allowed for the maintenance of a standing army of 14,000 within the landgravial domain, equivalent to 1 soldier per 19 Hessian civilians, as opposed to a ratio of 1 to 36 in both England and Prussia.71

The Hessian state raised subsidy armies by developing a military tax, the Kontribution, for the training, equipping, and payment of troops, but the increased military expectations posed ideological problems for the Landgraves. To circumvent the novelty and scale of demands, they targeted “marginal” people – the masterless, indolent, those deemed the most expendable.72 The state in the 1740s became increasingly intrusive of the household and defined marginality more loosely, taking servants, day laborers, and apprentices when it could not be demonstrated that their labor was essential to the local agricultural economy. Just before the Seven Years War, the Landgrave promised not to force people into service if they could not be spared without harming the household. But in 1762, the state removed the distinction between the militia and subsidy army, and all suitable males were expected to serve if called. This penetrated the peasant household more deeply, taking away from the head of household decisions central to its economy and familial relations.73 The nature of the state, society, and economy of Hesse-Cassel became attached to the dictates of the British fiscal-military state, albeit more indirectly than within Great Britain and its colonies. From London, Hessians were viewed as so much military labor; from Hesse-Cassel, with the fortunes of the state resting on the sale of its population as soldiers, the people could not but take on a military cast.

The British Army also attempted directly to exploit the continental market in military labor. Warfare had wracked much of Europe throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth, causing social and
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economic dislocation. In some areas, as Aaron Fogelman’s study of German immigration in the period reveals, the devastation proved so severe that traditional cultural practices had been subverted, opening the door for the emergence of new forms of social relations and economic production, with expansive states, profit-minded nobles, and commercially oriented peasants looking toward the market. For many pushed to the margins, emigration became an increasingly attractive option, particularly in southwestern Germany and parts of Switzerland. War in the seventeenth century had severely disturbed society in the region through depopulation, and significant change followed in its wake during the decades of peace. States grew in size and became more intrusive in village life. In agriculture, a shift occurred from the three-field system of usage that included common land to more commercial agriculture. The depopulation caused by warfare broke down traditional social and economic practices but also eventually led to marked demographic growth and socioeconomic change. As land proved readily available, people began marrying earlier and setting up independent households, farmed the land more intensively, and practiced partible inheritance. At the same time, both local nobles and the state sought to assert their control over their domains and enhance revenues. Peasants fought enclosure, attempts to alter inheritance patterns and restrain early marriage, and initiatives to push them into manufacturing, at times taking direct action. By the mid-eighteenth century, however, population growth peaked and landholdings were becoming too small to support a family. These processes led to a wave of emigration.74

The labor demands for the all-out North American offensive were such that the army turned to the continent to fill out the ranks. Britain’s Hanoverian dynasty and Protestant faith made Germans an obvious source to tap. Thus, when in February 1756, the government decided to raise a new regiment from among the Germans and Swiss resident in America to be called the Royal Americans (the 62nd, later 60th, Regiment), seasoned non-commissioned officers (NCOs) and soldiers were to be enlisted in Holland, Germany, and Switzerland to complement these raw recruits. Recruiting orders did stipulate “none but healthy Steady Men being protestants, and as many as he can procure who have already been in the Service”. The recruits should be between eighteen and thirty-five years old, 5’2” or taller, and no Frenchmen were to be taken. To secure as many recruits as possible, the army allowed the colonel some money “for the passage of a small number of Women and Children, which he will be indispensably [sic] Obliged to

take for the Success of the Affair and the acquisition of proper Men". The British in Frankfurt and Cologne found they were competing with recruiters from the imperial Prussian and Danish armies and were having some trouble meeting their requirements. The pickings proved so thin that one officer suggested getting men as indentured servants for America and then converting them to soldiers, presumably against their will. But in April, one recruiter reported that he expected to raise 100 good men in Germany. Later in August, he noted that, while the recruits seemed fairly good, he had hoped for more experienced soldiers, or tradesmen, but they were recruiting late in the season. An officer in New York upon reviewing these German recruits for the Royal Americans, complained that the majority were “Raw men”, while he also discovered “12 strange little Lads they Call Miners” and ten boys for drummers.

A glimpse into the nature of the German influx into the army can be found in one particular recruiting document of troops raised in Europe for service in the Royal Americans by Herbert, Baron de Munster. The data reveals that 94 of the 152 men recruited as privates and noncommissioned officers (61.8 per cent) reported having prior occupations, each with some specific skill ranging from gardener to peruke-maker but with only brewers, miners, and tailors reaching double figures. No one listed farmer or laborer, although it is safe to assume that some of the fifty-eight individuals who returned no occupation had performed manual labor or came from family farms. Recruits averaged twenty-four years of age, typical for the army as a whole, and it is likely that some had not yet set up independent households. Most appear to have come from German principalities, with Switzerland at twelve recruits the next most likely place of nativity, but others hailed from as far afield as Scotland (two NCOs), Poland, and Bohemia. Clusters of recruits came from individual places, as well: four from Basel, Switzerland; ten from Darmstadt in Hesse; ten from Frankfurt in Hesse; five from Freinsheim in the Palatinate; and nine listing Saxony as their birthplace. These recruits came from mixed occupational backgrounds, but one instance
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occurs of people of a particular occupation from the same town enlisting. Thirteen miners signed up from Clausdal (Clausthal) in Saxony in the Harz Mountains, a town that since the sixteenth century had been associated with the iron-mining industry promoted by the dukes of Brunswick. It is not clear what prompted this exodus from mining in Clausdal, but these individuals likely were the “12 strange little Lads they Call Miners” the Royal American officer referred to upon their arrival in New York.

The regimental returns from 1757 showed 607 foreigners enlisted in Europe with the army in America, or 4.3 per cent of the whole. The Royal Americans had also been active in recruiting foreigners in America. The returns show 803 such recruits in 1757, but it is not clear whether this figure included Scots and Irish recruited in the colonies as well as Germans, although the army sent German-speaking recruiting officers to Pennsylvania and posted recruiting announcements in “Dutch”. A clearer example of the German presence as a whole lies in the dispersion of foreigners throughout the regiments. Seven of seventeen units returned no foreigners recruited in America, and 507 of the 803 men (63.1 per cent) had found homes in the four battalions of the Royal American Regiment, the one specifically raised from Germans in the colonies. This regiment also had commissioned officers from Europe who spoke German.

Wars past and rapid socioeconomic change yielded a harvest of men from German Europe to fight in the red coat of Britain in the Seven Years War. At the same time, the desire of some heads of small states to profit from bartering their military labor power to Britain condemned their people to wage war not of their own making. Britain’s war industry proved blind to national or ethnic boundaries when it came to filling the ranks.

**America, reluctant recruiting ground**

Lord Loudoun, commander-in-chief of the American army, arrived in New York on 23 July 1756, and shortly thereafter began expressing his opinions of colonials. The general wrote in late August that colonials “have assumed to themselves what they Call Rights and Priviledges, Tottaly unknown in the Mother Country and are made use of, for no purpose, but to screen them, from giveing any aid, of any sort, for carrying on the Service”. Relations

80 From an analysis of the returns utilized in Table 10.1.
81 [Loudoun] to Cumberland, 29 Aug. 1756, LO1626/52.
between the army and colonists soon had congealed into bad blood and they grew only more heated under Loudoun's vice-regal rule. Conflict erupted between the army and the colonies over issues of provisioning, quartering, and trade, but the mobilization of military manpower constituted a root source of disagreement. Raising an army in America brought the fiscal-military state across the Atlantic and to colonies that had little experience of the military revolution. Attempting to extract even a small proportion of the British Army from the colonies cut into the heart of local economies and made the British-American relationship all too frequently an adversarial one, as a Chester County, Pennsylvania, tavern-keeper made all too clear. On 12 December 1757, John Baldwin discovered Sergeant James Jobb of the New York Independent Companies attempting to enlist two young men and "Swore by God that he would beat the brains of any Scoundrell Soldier" recruiting in his inn. The sergeant "answer'd that he had Lord Loudoun's Orders for what he was about", to which Baldwin replied, "God Dam Lord Loudoun and his Army too, they are all Scoundrells and a burden upon the Country[.] What had he or his Army done Since their comeing but deprived the people of their hands [indentured servants and hired laborers], and if the Country Served them right they would kick them all out, like a parcel of Scoundrells, as they are, for they would never do the Country any good." Baldwin then attacked Jobb, wounding him, while his friends attacked the recruiting party, causing them to flee. Two days later, Baldwin and his companions disrupted Jobb and his party when recruiting in another tavern in Wilmington, Delaware, leading to a "Ryot" and the wounding of several soldiers. Baldwin had laid his hands not only on one poor recruiting sergeant, but also on the pulse of the conflict over recruiting: who would control America's labor, army officers or colonial masters, and to what ends, state or private?

The supply of military labor, both the provincial troops raised by the colonies and the regular troops recruited by the army in the colonies, provided a flashpoint for internecine conflict. Every year the commander-in-chief informed the colonial governors of the number of provincial troops he expected the colonies to raise for the campaign. The scale of mobilization demanded by the British eclipsed past war efforts and the economic wherewithal of the colonies, so foot-dragging naturally occurred. The often-strained relations between the executive and legislative branches of colonial governments, the assemblies' control of the purse strings, and in certain instances the prevalence of internal sectarian politics meant the number of
provincial troops actually fielded often fell well short of those requested. For example, the army requested 9,000 provincial troops for the 1756 campaign against Fort Crown Point and the provinces fielded 6,434 privates and NCOs. And General James Abercromby called for 20,000 provincial troops in total for the 1758 campaign and, although this was supported by Pitt’s promise to reimburse the colonial governments, in April he reported that fewer than 18,000 had mobilized.83

Constitutional concerns regarding the exercise of imperial powers only partly explain the colonies’ reluctance to mobilize on the scale expected of them. The negative impact of extracting so many men from the civil economy worried officials, but so did the fact that broad mobilization caught up those of a status not normally expected to serve in the ranks. Governor Thomas Pownall explained Massachusetts’s failure to meet Abercromby’s request for provincial troops in 1758 in terms that revealed the same class politics operated in the colonies as did in Britain.

I believe the real Truth is in attempting to raise 7,000 Men, we have overreached our Strength, the last thousand edges too near upon those who from their Situation & Circumstances thought it would not come to their Share […] Laws will execute themselves while they extend only to a given rank of Men, but when they begin to entrench upon a Rank above that, you are sensible how much they labour and are obstructed.84

Class status played a key role in provincial mobilization throughout the war. The colonial assemblies forced men into service in their regiments, while the usual allowance of the provision of a substitute worked to ensure most draftees came from the laboring classes.85 Colonial leaders thus did not scruple at forcing many of their own citizens into the provincial regiments,

84 Pownall to Abercromby, 19 June 1758, AB366/8.
but balked when their own class confronted the possibility of having to serve in the front ranks.

The colonies took advantage of their control over the raising and provisioning of provincial troops to limit the impact of mobilization; however, the army exercised direct authority in the recruiting of colonials to the regular forces, and this subject proved more contentious in the British-American relationship. Colonial resistance to British recruitment to the armed services, in particular impressment to the Royal Navy, had a long tradition.\textsuperscript{86} In the Seven Years War, however, the enlistment of volunteers to the army provoked much controversy, superficially because of the tactics used in recruitment, but at root due to the impact mass mobilization had on the labor requirements of the colonial economies.

Enlisting in America ran essentially the same as in Britain, even though the part of the Mutiny Act dealing with recruitment did not apply until 1756. Recruiters were allowed levy money for each man, from which they had to provide necessaries, provisions, and transportation, as well as offer a bounty to lure men into the service. But commanding officers pressured them “to get the Recruits as cheap as you can”.\textsuperscript{87} Recruiting officers, in their rush to man the army, at times stooped to trickery, and this inflamed public opinion. James McDonell claimed that, while drinking with a friend, he fell in with a recruiting party from the New York Independent Companies, “as he was told next Morning, being that Night so Drunk that he doth not remember seeing a Red Coat in the house, and was greatly surprised in the Morning when the said Corporal told him he was enlisted”. He deserted and received 200 lashes in punishment.\textsuperscript{88} Other prospects could require greater subtlety. A Royal Americans recruiting party owed Joshua Boud money for food and lodging in his public house. He took a dollar, he thought in payment, but the soldiers said he had enlisted and took him before a magistrate, who, despite his refusal to enlist, confined him without subsistence until he yielded.\textsuperscript{89}

Sharp recruiting practices, acknowledged and tolerated to a degree in Britain, prompted more controversy in the colonies, and to an extent tainted all recruiting for the regular army. Horatio Sharpe, Maryland’s governor,

\textsuperscript{86} Most notably, a November 1747 impressment riot in Boston. See Rogers, Empire and Liberty, pp. 38-40; Brunsman, “The Knowles Atlantic Impressment Riots of the 1740s”.
\textsuperscript{87} Lt Col Gage’s Recruiting Instructions, [3 Jan. 1758], LO5328/115. Levying recruits to the Royal American regiment required an estimated £5 per man in 1756. See Estimate of the several Articles of Expense on the American Service, [March 1756], LO6738/22.
\textsuperscript{88} WO/71/65/361-366, 14 July 1757.
\textsuperscript{89} Joshua Boude, Petition to Loudoun [1756], LO2456/57.
informed Loudoun that recruiting parties for the 44th and 48th Regiments had attacked a vessel in a river and assaulted several persons, including a County High Sheriff in his own house. Some citizens brought “Vexatious Suits” in the courts of law against recruiting officers for performing their duties. Debts owed by putative recruits were invented or inflated and the men got themselves incarcerated to prevent their having to join the army. Colonists could turn to violence if obstruction did not work. A Philadelphia mob attacked recruiters in 1756, beating a sergeant to death, jailing the rest, and liberating the enlisted men. Three riots took place in Wilmington, Delaware, in the fall of 1757, in which recruiters suffered beatings. Although the recruiting officer knew the identity of the mob leaders, he did not trust local authorities to prosecute. “I have had my party out in the Country but they generally get Mob’d”, Captain Mackay reported from Portsmouth, Maine, in December 1757; “one of them was beat in the Streets the other Evening by five Sailors, as yet I can make no discovery of the Authors, but I have a warrant out against one who has taken the liberty to threaten”. In Boston on February 3, 1758 a “Broil [...] between a Mob, & some of the Recruiting Parties” took place over NCOs allegedly committing “some imprudences that hurt ye Service. To see a Drunken Man lugg’d thro’ ye Streets on a Souldiers back guarded by others wither it was or was not to carry him before a Justice to swear must certainly give a Strong impression of ye method of enlist- ing & certainly have an ill effect on an inflam’d Mobb”, warned Governor Pownall of Massachusetts. However, Boston justices investigated the “Noise & Tumult” and attributed it to “some mistaken apprehensions among some Young and undesigning Persons”. Questionable recruiting practices help explain some of the colonial opposition to the mobilization of manpower, but deeper social and economic factors also played a role.

The struggle over labor most clearly evinced itself in the army’s recruitment of indentured servants. From the military’s perspective, the need for fighting men trumped all other concerns during wartime; to masters

90 Horatio Sharpe to Loudoun, 18 May 1757, LO6353/80.
91 In one instance, the 44th Regiment had to pay the attorney general of the Jersies £12. 16s. for defending recruiting officers from such suits: John Duncan, 44th Regiment of Foot on Account of Recruiting &c for the Year 1757, 24 June 1757, LO6600/86.
93 Pargellis, Lord Loudoun in North America, p. 107; Rogers, Empire and Liberty, p. 42.
94 Capt. Charles Crucikshank to Loudoun, 14 Dec. 1757, LO5012/111.
95 Samuel Mackay to Col Forbes, 16 Dec. 1757, LO5023/111.
96 T. Pownall to Loudoun, 6, 13 Feb. 1758, LO5547/119, LO5569/120; Boston justices to Pownall, 7 Feb. 1758, LO5550/119.
who viewed their servants as commodities, enlistment constituted theft. Instructions for raising the regiments for the 1755 campaign indicated that indentured servants should not enlist without the consent of their masters, but in the wake of Braddock’s defeat the need to bring the regiments up to strength led Governor William Shirley of Massachusetts, acting commander-in-chief, to remove this exception. By February 1756, a crisis brewed. Horatio Sharpe warned that masters, “having a great part of their Property vested in Servants”, were outraged by the practice, and expressed fears that “an Insurrection of the People is likely to ensue”. Corbin Lee, who managed an iron forge in Maryland worked by indentured servants, complained not only of the loss of the labor but also of the tactics practiced by recruiters. “It is not unusual with many of these recruiting Gentlemen when they meet with a person that will not be bullied out of his Property and tamely give up his Servant without any sort of Recompense immediately to deem him an Enemy to his Majesty’s Service.” He believed the actions of the recruiting officer to be “Illegal nay felonious; for they stole into our Plantations disguis’d like thieves in the dead of night made our Servants Drunk forced them to inlist and curried them off”. The Pennsylvania General Assembly advised the lieutenant governor that many masters had complained “a great Number of Bought Servants are lately inlisted by the Recruiting Officers now in this Province, and clandestinely or by open Force conveyed away”, yet according to the law masters possessed “as true & as just a Property in the Servant bought as they had before in the Money with which he was purchas’d”.

Complaints soon turned to legal action. “The officers have been arrested for entertaining these Servants, Violences used by the Populace” in Pennsylvania and Maryland “for recovering them from the Officers, and the Servants imprison’d for inlisting”, lamented William Shirley. He looked to the king to establish a policy in an attempt to allay “the present disputes & Heart-burnings”. Masters of two servants enlisted in New York sued the recruiting lieutenant of the 48th Regiment in 1756, and he had to post bail or be jailed. That same year several Pennsylvania masters initiated legal proceedings against recruiters. Colonial lawyers, revealingly, argued that servants, as property, had no free will, and thus could not be taken against

97 Recruiting Instructions [1755], LO727/15.
98 Horatio Sharpe to William Shirley, 2 Feb. 1756, LO793/186.
99 Corbin Lee to Gov. Horatio Sharp, 30 April 1757, LO3506/76.
their masters’ wishes.101 Direct action against recruiters also occurred. Pieter Van Ingen of the Royal Americans enlisted a servant of Samuel Henry at Trenton, New Jersey, in August 1756. Henry later confronted him in a tavern demanding his servant or money in recompense, striking him on the head with an iron-tipped cane when he refused. Van Ingen chased him off with his sword, but Henry returned with friends in an attempt to capture the servant. Again the recruiting party drove them off. When they tried to leave, though, Henry attacked Van Ingen with a pitchfork, which he parried with his sword. He retreated inside and had his men fasten knives to poles. They sallied forth and routed Henry’s party, which surrendered the field and the servant. But when mob rule failed, Henry turned to the law, and had a justice send a constable to Van Ingen demanding he give up the man or the money, or go to jail. Van Ingen refused and a writ was served upon him, and he was jailed in a “Stinking” cell despite the protest of his colonel as to the illegality of his imprisonment.102

The ongoing furore over recruitment necessitated state intervention. Parliament extended the Mutiny Act to the colonies and adopted legislation on the recruitment of both free individuals and indentured servants in March 1756.103 To quell any complaints that free men had been duped into enlisting, the law required a recruit to be taken to a justice of the peace after twenty-four hours and within four days of his listing to swear to his willingness to enlist. If he balked, he had to return the levy money and pay 20s sterling for expenses; otherwise he was considered enlisted. The act also addressed the thorny issue of recruiting indentured servants, making it lawful to recruit indentured servants who volunteered, but stipulated that, if the owner protested within six months, the recruiting officer must either give up the servant upon being repaid the enlisting money, or pay the master a sum to be determined by two justices of the peace based on the original purchase price and the amount of time left to be served.104 Parliament with this act codified the fiscal-military state’s premise that the army’s need for manpower prevailed over private


102 Pieter Van Ingen, Affidavit, 18 April 1757, LO3376/74; James Prevost [to Loudoun], 5 April 1757, LO3294/72; John Smyth, certificate, 6 April 1757, LO3300/73.

103 Great Britain, Parliament [An act for the better recruiting of His Majesty’s Forces on the Continent of America; and for the Regulation of the Army . . .]. 25 March 1756, LO2583/21.

104 In response, Benjamin Franklin filed a petition on behalf of fellow Pennsylvania masters claiming £3,652 and a half pence Pennsylvania currency for 612 servants listed: List of Servants
interest, whether communal or familial concern for the liberty of individuals who enlisted, or masters’ property in human labor for the purpose of individual economic gain. In taking this position the act effectively made the army the preeminent employer of labor in the colonies, at once master to free laborers and bonded servants purchased from reluctant owners.

The recruiting legislation did not prevent conflict from occurring over mobilization in the colonies, however, as it did not remove the root issue of control of labor power. “We shall have a great deal of difficulty to recruit of our Regiment”, confessed an officer, “the People of this Country having no great affection for a red Coat, nor do they stay long with us after they list when they find an opportunity to take their leave.” Another complained “there is a general backwardness in the people of this province to the Kings service, which is but too much encouraged by all sorts of people, as they seem to consider every man, we enlist, as a real loss to the Province”\(^{105}\). Thus regiments in Halifax found it necessary to recruit as far south as Maryland in 1756, having more luck the further south they went, whereas those in South Carolina two years later had to strike 300 miles northward.\(^{106}\) The physical requirements were also lowered with any man “free from Ruptures, Convulsions, and Infirmities, and fit for service”, being acceptable. In 1758, Loudoun remarked that if the army wanted to get “fighting men, We must not at present Insist either on Size or Beauty”. Perhaps this explains how John Rainsdown, described as “hump back’d, crook’d Legs, and 4 feet 6 inches high”, got into the Royal Americans.\(^{107}\) Still, the army operated well below its strength on paper. Such reluctance to serve in the regulars played a role in Pitt’s decision to send ever more regular regiments to America.

The army competed directly with other employers for labor but government policy limited what they could offer recruits. The colonial provincial regiments in particular monopolized men of recruiting age because they offered better terms of employment. The provinces paid higher bounties

Belonging to the inhabitants of Pennsylvania and taken into His Majesty’s Service, 21 April 1757, LO341/74.
106 Charles Lawrence to Loudoun, 19 Oct. 1756, LO2042/46; Officers belonging to the Regiments in Nova Scotia upon Recruiting Duty, [9 Nov. 1756], LO2186/50; John Tulleken [to Loudoun], 29 Jan. 1758, LO5486/118.
than the typical £3 inducement for regular recruits.\textsuperscript{108} The regular army’s term of service also played a role as well. As a rule, men enlisted for life during peacetime. The need for ever more bodies during wartime, however, forced the army at times to offer short-term service, usually three to five years, but sometimes fewer. Nonetheless, life enlistment remained the basic experience of regular troops in the Seven Years War.\textsuperscript{109} By comparison, provincial soldiers typically signed on for the campaign, usually spring through fall. Provincial service paid better wages as well. Regular soldiers received a daily wage of eight pence, two of which were deducted as “off-reckonings” for payments to various offices (the Exchequer, Paymaster General, Chelsea Hospital, the regimental agent), and to provide the troops’ annual regimental clothing, necessaries, and accoutrements (a further seven pence per week went to the regimental surgeon and paymaster, and to cover company expenses for a man’s “necessaries” like shoes, gaiters, arms repair, and barbering).\textsuperscript{110} Fred Anderson, for example, calculated the net income (wage, food, and lodging) of a Massachusetts soldier at 2s provincial currency per day, or roughly twice that of a regular.\textsuperscript{111} Virginia provincials, by comparison, received only 8d a day local currency (worth 40-70 per cent of sterling), which compared unfavorably to the 2-3s a day wages for unskilled labor or to the earnings of provincials in neighboring colonies, no doubt contributing to the need for the colony to conscript troops in the war’s early years and to offer higher bounties later on.\textsuperscript{112} The average wage for the provincials from the more northerly colonies who did most of the fighting, however, was significantly more than their redcoated comrades in arms.

Many colonists did join the regulars despite all the conflict surrounding recruitment, especially in the first two years of the war. For the regiments that returned the nativity of troops in 1757, those born in the American colonies accounted for 755 of 14,166 men (5.3 per cent) and natives of Europe enlisted in the colonies for 803 (5.7 per cent), making more than one in

\textsuperscript{108} For example, Massachusetts bounties inflated from £3-£4 in 1755 to a peak of more than £26 in 1760. See Anderson, \textit{A People’s Army}, p. 225.

\textsuperscript{109} For example, the 45th Regiment, which had been stationed in Halifax since the previous war and had recruited extensively in North America, reported in 1757 that of its 955 soldiers: 819 (85.8 per cent) had enlisted for life, 1 for twenty years (0.1 per cent), 1 for seven (0.1 per cent), 5 for six (0.5 per cent), 2 for four (0.2 per cent), and 127 men (13.3 per cent) had signed on for three years. See Muster Rolls of the 45th Regiment, April 1757, LO6987/76.


\textsuperscript{111} Anderson, \textit{A People’s Army}, pp. 38-39.

\textsuperscript{112} Titus, \textit{Old Dominion at War}, pp. 4-45, 163 n. 87; Robert Dinwiddie to Loudoun, 24 May 1756, LO1175/26.
every ten soldiers an “American” recruit (Table 10.1).¹¹³ In recruiting such numbers, the British Army did not merely target the marginal but reached into the heart of colonial production. In a sample of sixty-six regular recruits mostly from the Boston area, forty-one (62.1 per cent) came from artisanal backgrounds (with shoemakers and tailors being most represented), eleven (16.7 per cent) came from agriculture, eleven (16.7 per cent) had performed manual labor, and three (4.5 per cent) clerical or professional work.¹¹⁴

An account of recruiting in America clearly reveals the army’s impact on colonial economies. Great differences existed between regions, most strikingly between north and south because of the latter’s growing dependence on slavery. But in the mid-Atlantic region and New England, the two main areas of recruitment for the army, petty production based upon the household in the agricultural and the craft sectors, proved the norm, with familial labor playing an important role and, particularly in the mid-Atlantic, bonded labor making significant contributions.¹¹⁵ At the same time, labor scarcity prevailed throughout the colonies. Military recruitment exacerbated this situation and this clash between household production and state-sponsored enterprise on an Atlantic scale partly explains the fractious experience of mobilization. Its effect on indentured servitude figured centrally. First without any explicit policy, then with the backing of a British parliamentary act, the army “freed” many servants from bondage and introduced them to paid military labor. Although it promised reimbursement for the loss of contract time, cash could not immediately replace scarce labor. Likewise, the recruiting of free men hit farm and craft households, where the young men targeted by the army performed important labor as family members, apprentices or journeymen, and servants. Their call to arms produced cries of concern as it meant a loss of labor, one reason why colonials looked more favorably upon enlistment to the provincial regiments, given the annual term of service and the fact that money earned tended to be expended locally. To the extent that the regular army (with the government’s backing) facilitated the recruitment of such men and their abstraction from family and village for longer periods, it had a direct impact on domestic economies.

¹¹⁴ For a full presentation of this data, see Way, “Rebellion of the Regulars”, pp. 768-769.
British demands for support thus met with American recalcitrance and outright resistance to the effort to mobilize manpower in the Seven Years War. In the process of a massive mutual enterprise, feelings of difference sharpened, acquiring an edge that the infusion of funds from the British fiscal-military state and the shared military success of the later war years blunted, but the blade had been tempered and needed only another imperial crisis to whet the distinction between Briton and American.

**Conclusion**

Warfare in the eighteenth century operated according to the principles of the military revolution, the basic premise of which hinged on bringing as many men as possible onto the battlefield. For every nation-state, mobilization occurred within a particular political economy at a particular moment in history. In the era of the Seven Years War, a rapidly commercializing economy spread across British dominions and created a surplus of labor that facilitated raising the army. England’s control of other political states, achieved through successive colonization of Ireland and union with Scotland, cemented by the repression of the Jacobite threat, enabled the expropriation of their wealth to fund military endeavors and the exploitation of their populations as sources of military labor, while commercialization of their economies along English lines freed individuals from ties to the soil and trades. The attempt to exercise similar force in the American colonies, where labor scarcity prevailed, encountered more resistance from people less used to the yoke of British rule, whose economic activities relied upon the control of labor that could be sorely spared for soldiering. However, the financial might of Britain bought American compliance, particularly in the funding of the provincial regiments, and colonists in the tens of thousands joined the fight against France either as regulars or colonial troops. Warfare for Britain thus required not a simple conjoining of state interest and military acumen, but rested upon the historical development of capital and ongoing class formation, enabling the fiscal-military state to colonize the resources and labor power of dependent polities. As a result, the nation could rely on volunteers to practice the art of war in its interests.