



## Politics, Patriotism and Women in Ireland, Britain and Colonial America, c.1700-c.1780

O'Dowd, M. (2010). Politics, Patriotism and Women in Ireland, Britain and Colonial America, c.1700-c.1780. *Journal of Women's History*, 22 (4), 15-38.

### Published in:

*Journal of Women's History*

### Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

### Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

### Publisher rights

Copyright © 2010 The Johns Hopkins University Press. This article first appeared in *Journal of Women's History*, Volume 22, Issue 4, Winter, 2010, pages 15-38.

### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).



PROJECT MUSE®

---

## Politics, Patriotism, and Women in Ireland, Britain and Colonial America, c.1700–1780

Mary O'Dowd

Journal of Women's History, Volume 22, Number 4, Winter 2010, pp. 15-38 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press  
DOI: [10.1353/jowh.2010.0606](https://doi.org/10.1353/jowh.2010.0606)



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jowh/summary/v022/22.4.o-dowd.html>

---

# POLITICS, PATRIOTISM, AND WOMEN IN IRELAND, BRITAIN AND COLONIAL AMERICA, C.1700–1780

Mary O'Dowd

*The use of the consumer boycott as a political tool is commonly associated with pre-revolutionary colonial America and has been identified by historians as an important means through which American women were politicized. This article argues that from the late seventeenth century, Irish political discourse advocated the non-consumption of imported goods and support for home manufactures by women in ways that were strikingly similar to those used later in North America. In Ireland and, subsequently in the American colonies, the virtuous woman consumer was given an active public role by political and social commentators. Rather than being a “brilliantly original American invention,” as T. H. Breen has argued, the political exploitation of a consumer boycott and the promotion of local industry were among what Bernard Bailyn has described as the “set of ideas, already in scattered ways familiar” to the revolutionary leaders through the Irish experience. The article also argues that a shared colonial environment gave Irish and American women a public patriotic role in the period, c. 1700–1780 that they did not have in the home countries of England and Scotland.*

The American ladies have shown themselves foremost in zeal for the public cause, they have sustained the want of most of the luxuries and many of the necessarys of life, without murmur and shall it be said that virtuous Irishwomen have less virtue and love for their country? Do not imagine, that public spirit misbecomes the graceful reserve and amiable timidity of the female character. No. Public spirit is the accomplishment and perfection of private virtue. Fly therefore, I conjure you to the relief of your country; claim your share in glorious association for the common good, I should say salvation;—let not a shred [or] an atom of English or Scotch manufacture be round about your persons, or in your houses.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the editor of the Irish newspaper, the *Freeman's Journal* encouraged women to participate in the non-importation movement launched in Ireland in 1779. In its praise for the actions of women in colonial America, the editorial endorsed a perception that the political use of the consumer boycott originated in north America and spread eastwards across the Atlan-

tic to Ireland, a view that most historians have also implicitly confirmed.<sup>2</sup> Historian T. H. Breen's influential study, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* argued that the consumer boycott was a "brilliantly original American invention."<sup>3</sup> Although acknowledging that "a few isolated boycotts may have taken place in other countries," a central thesis of Breen's book is that the American movement represented a "spectacularly successful new form of political action" that politicized the private acts of consumption of thousands of American men and women.<sup>4</sup> In his emphasis on the new access to public life that the consumer boycott gave to women, Breen built on the work of American women historians such as Linda Kerber and Mary Beth Norton who identified the market place as a prime location for the empowerment of women in pre-revolutionary America.<sup>5</sup> More recently, Jennifer Moon has advanced the debate to suggest that during the Revolutionary period, the promotion of home manufactured textiles was linked to the employment of the poor, particularly poor women which in turn shaped "developing notions of political economy and republican ideology" in the urban centres of Boston, Philadelphia and New York. Moon also argued that the establishment of textile factories for the destitute created an innovative role for labouring women in economic growth.<sup>6</sup>

From the perspective of an Irish historian, the debate on the development of the consumer boycott and the related promotion of home manufacturing in colonial society looks very familiar. Starting in the late seventeenth century, Irish political discourse advocated the non-consumption of imported goods and support for home manufactures in ways that seem strikingly similar to that of North America. While historians have long recognised Irish influences on events in colonial America in the second half of the eighteenth century, there has been no sustained attempt to explore these connections in more depth or to link developments in America back to their Irish model or precedent.

My aim in this article is, therefore, three-fold. First, I examine ideas about political economy that developed in Ireland, particularly in relation to the advocacy of consumer boycotts and the promotion of home produced manufactures and women's involvement in these developments. Secondly, I explore how these ideas might have influenced events elsewhere but particularly in colonial America. Finally, I suggest that the shared colonial circumstances of Ireland and North America gave women a specific role in public discourse in the 1760s and 1770s that they did not have in the imperial home countries of England and Scotland.

## Irish Patriotism, Women and “Public-Spiritedness”

The origins of Irish patriotic thought can be traced to the mid-seventeenth century and it is more closely associated with the Anglo-Irish community than with the indigenous Irish population. A central concern of the Protestant patriots was the status of the Irish parliament and the preservation of its legislative independence. They resented, in particular, attempts by the London authorities to legislate for Ireland, especially when such efforts appeared to benefit the economic interests of English merchants at the expense of their Irish counterparts. William Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound By Acts of Parliament in England ...* (1698) was the first detailed articulation of the view that the Irish economy was damaged by restrictions imposed by the imperial parliament.<sup>7</sup> Molyneux's text was followed by others condemning, in particular, the legislative limitations on the export of Irish wool that had been passed in the English parliament in 1699. The hostility generated by the laws restricting Irish trade gradually mutated into expressions of support for the purchase of Irish manufactured goods. In 1713 Jonathan Swift penned a powerful endorsement of this view in a pamphlet entitled *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufactures*. The publication proved politically controversial because of its rejection of English trade with Ireland.<sup>8</sup>

In a more pragmatic fashion, the Dublin administration's response to the trade restrictions was to sponsor alternative new industries that would not compete with English manufactured goods, but might replace imported goods from other countries such as France. In the 1660s, a Council of Trade was formed to channel private and public funding towards the development of Irish manufactures. This was followed in 1711 by the creation of a Linen Board to promote the production of linen as an alternative to woollen products. One of the key tasks of the Linen Board was the provision of funds for the establishment of spinning schools to teach young girls to spin fine quality linen that could rival with foreign equivalents. By 1751, the Board had provided funding for the establishment of 182 schools.<sup>9</sup>

Intermittent public campaigns were also launched to promote the consumption of Irish manufactures and the boycott of foreign imports in which women, in particular, were called on to exercise their consumer power through the purchase of Irish made goods. In 1664, the Council of Trade advocated “a general subscription against wearing foreign manufactures.”<sup>10</sup> Mary Somerset, 2<sup>nd</sup> Duchess of Ormond, the wife of the Lord Lieutenant (the head of the Irish administration), took up the campaign and in the early 1700s issued invitations to social events in Dublin Castle with instructions that the guests dress in Irish produced cloth.<sup>11</sup> In 1729, in a highly publicised move, Kathryn Conolly, wife of William Conolly, speaker

of the Irish House of Commons, distributed scarves made of Irish linen at her husband's funeral.<sup>12</sup> Throughout the eighteenth century, successive wives of lord lieutenants continued the custom initiated by the Duchess of Somerset instructing guests attending social events in Dublin Castle to dress in Irish manufactured cloth.<sup>13</sup>

There were thus two elements to Irish patriotic thought at this time: a resolve to improve public finances and a charitable or philanthropic desire to alleviate the chronic poverty of the country. A relationship was perceived between the development of Irish industry, Irish prosperity, and the promotion of projects and work for poor families. There was from the beginning a strong association between Irish patriotic thought and notions of "improvement," both economically and morally.<sup>14</sup> In his seminal study on the development of Irish nationalist thought, Joep Leersen pointed out that in the first half of the eighteenth century Irish patriotism was less about railing against English interference in Ireland and more about "political philanthropy: a desire to contribute to the public benefit, to live up to one's responsibilities as a citizen by contributing actively to the improvement of society."<sup>15</sup> Appealing mainly to the wealthier Irish Protestant community, patriotism was presented as a means of assisting poor, largely Catholic, families. Individuals could demonstrate their patriotism through the promotion of Irish manufactures and through the sponsorship of enterprises intended to provide employment for poor men but also, crucially, for poor women.

The connection between social activism and economic reform was articulated in the writings of Jonathan Swift, George Berkeley, and other Irish Protestant patriot writers. The form of patriotism espoused by these writers was summed up by George Berkeley in *Maxims of Patriotism* which was published in 1750: "A patriot is one who heartily wisheth the public prosperity, and doth not only wish, but also study and endeavour to promote it."<sup>16</sup>

Although directed primarily at a male readership, there was also an explicit gender dimension to the discussion on Irish patriotism and public philanthropy. A favourite theme of the pamphleteers was the extravagance of wealthy women who imported, at great expense, the latest French fashions rather than purchase Irish-produced goods. In 1722, Swift followed up his 1713 pamphlet with *A Proposal That All The Ladies And Women Of Ireland Should Appear Constantly In Irish Manufactures*. Swift's work was essentially a satirical critique of wealthy women who boosted the Irish import market at the expense of local manufacturers. George Berkeley was also aware of the consumer power of women. In his most famous text, *The Querist* (1736-1737), Berkeley linked wealthy women's preference for foreign silks and fine cloth to the chronic state of the Irish economy and among his queries were:

“whether a woman of fashion ought not to be declared a public enemy?”; and “how far the vanity of our ladies in dressing and of our gentlemen in drinking contribute to the general misery of the people?”<sup>17</sup>

Incorporated into the writings of Swift and Berkeley is, therefore, a scathing criticism of wealthy Irish women. At the same time, however, male patriots of early-eighteenth-century Ireland endorsed a more positive image of the ideal Irish woman. In sharp contrast to the woman who ostentatiously dressed in the latest imported fashions, the patriotic Irish woman donned the coarser and, less flattering, Irish-manufactured cloth. The latter might not look as fashionable as her sisters draped in French silk but, according to the patriotic writer, the selfless virtue of the woman in supporting the Irish poor would shine through and give her a special beauty.

This commentary on the patriotic Irish woman was not, however, just the construct of the male patriot writer. It was fashionable among wealthy Irish women in early eighteenth century Dublin to wear Irish-manufactured fashion. The diarist Mary Delaney frequently wore Irish-produced cloth to social events at Dublin Castle. On one occasion, in 1732, she noted the dullness of the “brown stuff manteau and petticoat” that she and her companion, Anne Donnellan had donned for two assemblies in the castle although she tried to reassure herself with the notion that “tis said now that people are convinced ‘fine feathers do not make fine birds.’ We ‘adorn our clothes;’ other people are ‘adorned by their clothes.’”<sup>18</sup>

In Ireland from the early decades of the eighteenth century, patriotism gradually evolved, therefore, into both a fashionable and a gender inclusive sentiment. The linking of moral and economic reform also facilitated a recognition of the vital contribution that women as consumers could make not just to Irish prosperity, but also to the development of notions of Irish patriotism. This particular form of Irish patriotism was reinforced by Protestant evangelicalism which many aristocratic and middle-class women espoused in the middle decades of the eighteenth century. The purchase of Irish made goods was perceived as both an act of Christian charity inspired by religious fervour and as a patriotic gesture. Philanthropy and patriotism overlapped and it was often very difficult to distinguish between them.<sup>19</sup> In 1746, Samuel Madden explicitly associated the philanthropic endeavour of wealthy women with the wider prosperity of Ireland: “It is chiefly to the prevailing of this generous regard to our poor in our ladies, that our island is to date its prosperity or misery, for as the great business of dress is entirely under their influence,... if they once resolve to grace, and encourage our manufactures by wearing them, we shall see them vastly improved, in proportion, as foreign ones are discouraged, to the mighty benefit of our people. We can never forget when our starving manufacturers had collections made for them in our churches, and our ladies took up a resolution

to wear their stuffs and silks, what an influence it had, and what great assistance it gave to thousands of poor families."<sup>20</sup>

The promotion of Irish-manufactured goods and textiles was also linked to the traditional debate on luxury and its association with effeminacy, extravagance, and vice. The Irish version of the luxury debate "focused chiefly on the extravagant consumption of imported luxuries" and formed part of the political discussion on the restrictive nature of the Irish commercial market.<sup>21</sup> The consumption of domestic produce was presented as the antithesis of the vanity and reckless spending associated with imported luxury items while the wearing of Irish-made clothes was extolled as a public manifestation of private modesty.<sup>22</sup> Through her choice of fashion, therefore, the patriotic Irish woman demonstrated not only her charitable support for Irish poverty but she also made manifest, in a very public way, her sense of modesty and private virtue.

American historians of women have explored the extent to which concepts of virtue were gendered. In its classical republican sense, as understood in pre-Revolutionary America, Ruth Bloch concluded that virtue referred to "male public spirit, that is to say, the willingness of citizens to engage actively in civic life" and that female virtue was a more private matter denoting personal modesty, chastity and simplicity in "tastes and manners."<sup>23</sup> Thus women were excluded from civic activism. In Ireland, however, there was a public dimension to female virtue. In 1732, the author of an anonymous pamphleteer from County Cork linked the female virtues of motherhood and chastity with political action: "The Faithfulness of an *Irish Wife* has ever been held in the greatest Esteem; the Tenderness of an *Irish Mother* has always raised Admiration. ... The *Maidens of Ireland* have ever been a Proverb for *Chastity*. In a Natural Sense they have the Applause of the World for this Virtue: I have the strongest Reasons to hope they will shew it in a Political Sense too, and be *chaste* to their Country, by rejecting Foreign Fineries, be they ever so *Ravishing*."<sup>24</sup>

The author recommended that Irish women follow the example of what he described as the "active virtue" of women in the Roman Empire.<sup>25</sup> In 1746, Mary Delaney also identified a relationship between female honor and what she described as the "public-spirited" nature of "all the ladies .... dressed in Irish stuff" who attended a ball in Dublin Castle.<sup>26</sup> Over thirty years later in 1779, the editor of the *Freeman's Journal* expressed a similar sentiment when he assured "virtuous Irish women" that the "Public spirit is the accomplishment and perfection of private virtue."<sup>27</sup> The form of female public spiritedness or virtue that was promoted in Ireland in the early-eighteenth-century was similar to the notion of the "virtuous consumer" that Breen identified as emerging in colonial America in the mid-1760s. The virtuous consumer "voluntarily exercised self-restraint



in the consumer marketplace."<sup>28</sup> As Breen notes, consumer virtue was a more gender and class inclusive sentiment than classical republican virtue although it was nonetheless confined to those with the means to purchase manufactured goods. In Irish terms, this meant that the notion of the virtuous consumer excluded the majority of women who were poor. The latter were not, however, simply perceived as the passive recipients of the charity of the Protestant patriotic lady. Incorporated into Irish patriotic thought was a belief in a political economy in which poor women as well as men were engaged in gainful and useful employment. Of all the proposals put forward by Irish patriot writers to alleviate Irish poverty, the most valued were those that provided employment for women and children as well as for men. It was for this reason that many pamphlet writers wrote enthusiastically about the public benefits of promoting the linen industry.<sup>29</sup> The preference for projects that engaged women in financially rewarding work is also evident in the work of the most practical manifestation of Irish civic patriotism, the Dublin Society for Promoting Husbandry and Other Useful Arts founded in 1731.

### **"On the Ladies of this Kingdom the Success of this Institution Alone Depends"**

The establishment of the Society had been inspired by the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture established in Edinburgh in 1723 by a group of improving landlords.<sup>30</sup> Like its Scottish counterpart, the Dublin Society aimed to promote improvements in Irish agriculture as well as Irish manufacture. The Society took an active and practical interest in the setting up and encouragement of local industries. Although founded as a private association, the Dublin Society was closely associated with the Irish parliament. Many members of the parliament were among the founding members of the Society and the parliament channelled funding for local manufacture through the Society. In 1750 a royal charter was granted to the Society and from the 1760s it was in receipt of an annual parliamentary grant of £8,000 to promote and support indigenous industry in Ireland. The Society utilised its private and public funds to sponsor a system of premiums and prizes for particular projects.<sup>31</sup>

From its foundation, the Society demonstrated its awareness of the vital role that women could play in the advancement of the Irish rural economy. Its management committee was especially interested in promoting work that employed women and children and would, therefore, provide a family income. Among the projects supported by the Dublin Society were the establishment of schools and classes to teach spinning to young women, and the sponsorship of competitions and prizes to encourage the

production of fine linen that could compete qualitatively with imported cloth. The Society also recognised the importance of engaging aristocratic and wealthy women not just as consumers of Irish produced cloth but also as promoters of local enterprise. Wives of landlords who sponsored spinning competitions or engaged in philanthropic work in local areas received financial as well as moral support from the Society.<sup>32</sup> In 1765, for example, the Society awarded a premium to Dorothy and Jane Lamb who had established a spinning school for 90 girls in County Limerick, and it issued a subsidy and a book on silk worms to Mrs Elizabeth Cortez from County Cork who was breeding the worms and was also teaching others how to do the same.<sup>33</sup> Although membership of the Society was restricted to men, two women, Lady Bingham and Lady Arbella Denny were given honorary membership in recognition of their contribution to projects that had been partly funded by the Society. Lady Denny was nominated in 1767 for promoting work schemes for girls in the Dublin Work House as well as for her wider advocacy of Irish industry while Lady Bingham became an honorary member in 1768 in recognition of her endeavour in establishing a bone lace factory in Castlebar, County Mayo.<sup>34</sup> Both of these women were portrayed as role models for patriotic Irish women. They combined religious commitment with practical action that helped to alleviate poverty through the employment of poor women.<sup>35</sup>

The Dublin Society used its parliamentary grant to subsidise a wide range of local industries. The largest grants were given to the silk and woollen industries, both of which found it difficult to compete with foreign imports. The Society not only sponsored schemes to breed silk worms and manufacture silk in Ireland, but in 1764 it opened the Irish Silk Warehouse in Parliament Street in one of the most fashionable parts of city, close to the parliament buildings and Dublin Castle. The Society offered premiums to Irish silk manufacturers who sold their cloth through the Warehouse. The long-term success of the Warehouse was limited but in the early years of its existence, it helped to boost the income of Irish silk manufacturers, a development that led to the opening of a similar establishment for Irish woollen cloth in 1773. In both these endeavours, the Society engaged the services of women, appointing fifteen patronesses (including Lady Denny) to each Warehouse to offer guidance to manufacturers on the most up-to-date patterns and colors and to advise on other "useful" matters.<sup>36</sup> The appointment of the lady patronesses was intended to resolve the continuing problem of home produced textiles: they were never as fine or a stylishly cut as the imported product.

The billhead of the Irish Silk Warehouse included a fashionably attired woman, seated at a spinning wheel, an image that integrated the two distinguishing characteristics of the Irish patriotic woman, her dress and her

socially useful employment. A common suggestion in much of the early-eighteenth-century patriotic literature was that society ladies substitute spinning and sewing for leisure occupations although it is unlikely that many women took these suggestions seriously.<sup>37</sup>

The wealthy patronesses of the Warehouse seemed to have viewed their involvement as a form of charity work, and most continued to purchase more fashionable attire in Dublin and London shops. Occasional purchases from the Silk and Woollen Warehouses are nevertheless documented in the household account books of large estate houses.<sup>38</sup> The support for Irish wool and silk thus contributed to the formation of a positive public image for wealthy women which was in sharp contrast to that which emerges in Swift's writings in the earlier decades of the eighteenth century. As the *Freeman's Journal* acknowledged on the opening of the Silk Warehouse in 1765: "On the Ladies of this kingdom the success of this institution alone depends and as I assure myself, they will exercise upon this patriot occasion, that taste and candour, which are so peculiarly their characteristics. I have no doubt, but the scheme will meet with their patronage and encouragement."<sup>39</sup>

The establishment of the Irish Silk Warehouse also marked a significant stage in the Irish debate on luxury. Silk might be perceived as the embodiment of the extravagance and profligacy associated with luxury, but if this luxury item was manufactured in Ireland and purchased in the Irish Silk Warehouse, it became a means to public virtue. Luxury was, thus, redefined and decoupled from its association with vice. By the 1770s, patriotic newspapers were printing lists of luxury items that were manufactured in Ireland. Many were items used by women and such lists also helped to construct a positive public image of wealthy women who continued to purchase luxury items but did so from Irish manufacturers.<sup>40</sup> And this too is a transition that occurred in pre-Revolutionary America.

### **British Admirers of the Dublin Society**

The activities of the Dublin Society were followed with considerable interest by civic-minded men in Edinburgh and London as well as in the colonial urban centres such as Boston, Philadelphia, and New York. The combination of philanthropic voluntarism and patriotic sentiment evident in the proceedings of the Dublin Society was admired and imitated. In Edinburgh, while the Scottish Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture had provided the initial model for the Dublin Society, it too looked enviously to Ireland for ways to exploit private and public funding to eradicate Scottish rural poverty. The primary achievement of the Society was the establishment of the Board of Trustees for Fisheries and Manufactures in 1727 which was given responsibility for administering parliamentary

funds allocated to Scotland under the terms of the Act of Union. The Board of Trustees was clearly inspired by the perceived success of the Irish Linen Board although it had a wider remit than its Irish precursor and in effect combined the work of the Dublin Society with that of the Linen Board.<sup>41</sup> The Scottish Board was particularly concerned to advance the linen industry. Like its Irish counterparts, it sponsored spinning schools to teach girls how to spin fine linen and it encouraged landlords as well as landladies to support privately sponsored projects on their own estates.<sup>42</sup>

Unlike Ireland, however, these activities were not embedded in a patriotic discourse. Scottish political rhetoric that promoted public and private philanthropy tended to stress the moral virtue of eradicating idleness and of inculcating a "spirit of industry and diligence" among the poor rather than patriotic virtue.<sup>43</sup> Idleness was associated with political unrest. Patrick Lindsay, for example, who was a member of the Board of Trustees, linked idleness with those who were "discontented, turbulent, and mutinous, fond of publick disorder, and ready to increase it."<sup>44</sup> Employing the rural poor was, thus, perceived as a means of fostering political stability and social order. The Scottish Act of Union of 1707 had established a different political setting for Scottish economic projects than that which existed in Ireland. While some members of the Scottish Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture endeavoured to follow the Irish example through resolving to wear home manufactured linen, the non-consumption of imported goods did not form a central part of Scottish political discourse as it did in Ireland.<sup>45</sup> Scottish economic commentators were also more ambiguous about the role of Scottish trade within the imperial context. The consumption of luxury items was regarded with distaste by some but there was also a recognition that the Scottish economy benefitted from trading in a global market. Many agreed with David Hume's argument that the luxury market opened up new economic opportunities for Scotland and, therefore, contributed to the maintenance of political order and the advancement of society.<sup>46</sup> While Scottish enlightenment writers identified the status of women in a society as an indicator of its progress, they had less interest in the potential of women's economic contribution to Scottish prosperity.<sup>47</sup> The notion of the virtuous female consumer does not, therefore, feature in Scottish economic writing before 1780.

In England, the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce was founded in 1754 by William Shipley. The latter corresponded with men associated with the Dublin Society and acknowledged that he utilised the format and rules of the Dublin Society for his new association.<sup>48</sup> Shipley shared the patriotic aims that sustained the Dublin group and his organisation appealed to the anti-French sentiments of many English merchants. Shipley was also keen to involve women in the

Society's activities in ways that were very similar to those of the Dublin Society. Premiums were awarded, for example, to spinners of fine cloth and women who experimented with the manufacturing of British silk through the breeding of silk worms.<sup>49</sup>

The English Society failed, however, to achieve the same public recognition as either its Irish or Scottish models. Its members looked for a royal charter and for a parliamentary grant like those given to the Dublin and Edinburgh Societies but its endeavours never got further than indirect lobbying of prominent politicians and a half-hearted parliamentary enquiry into the potential value of a grant.<sup>50</sup>

The reason for the weakness of the political support for the Society was linked to the perceived role of the economy in public discourse and, as in Scotland, support for the market in luxury goods. Pamphleteers and public commentators pointed to the trade rivalry represented by French manufacturers but their criticism of the purchase of French fashions by wealthy women did not resonate politically in England in the same way as it did in Ireland.<sup>51</sup> While Whitley's society and other voluntary associations of the mid-eighteenth century promoted English patriotism, this did not translate into a public advocacy of women as active patriots or as virtuous consumers. There was considerable implicit, if not explicit, sympathy for the views of Bernard Mandeville whose *The Fable of the Bees* agreed with David Hume that the luxury market contributed to the economic prosperity of society. Mandeville argued that consumers of luxury goods might be morally condemned for their association with excess and vice, but from an economic perspective, their purchases promoted English trade.<sup>52</sup> As Edward Hundert has noted, Mandeville "challenged his readers to confront the sheer power of ... [women's] unadorned avarice."<sup>53</sup> The anti-slavery movement of the 1790s contributed to a more positive image of the female consumer but prior to that date, English political and economic discourse retained a negative view of the wealthy woman and her desire for imported goods.<sup>54</sup>

### **American Admirers of the Dublin Society**

Across the Atlantic in the British colonies we can document a different response to the activities of the Dublin Society and the wider Irish debate on the relationship between patriotism and schemes to alleviate poverty. In Boston, New York, and Philadelphia the manner in which the Dublin Society had successfully forged a link between private philanthropy and public funding received significant coverage in the local press. In the 1740s and 1750s, newspapers in all of these cities regularly included reports of the activities of the Dublin Society as well as of other Irish-based philanthropic schemes to promote industry among the poor.<sup>55</sup>

The interest in developments in Ireland was also manifest in the establishment of societies similar in aims and approach to the Dublin Society.<sup>56</sup> The first was announced in Boston in 1748. Entitled initially the United Society for Manufactures and Importation, the society planned to establish a linen production factory which would simultaneously employ poor women and children and benefit the local economy by reducing the importation of British cloth. An awareness of events in Ireland was clearly manifest in this endeavour. As Gary Nash has noted, "linen production had been promoted in Ireland since the late seventeenth century and was now regarded there as the sure-fire method of curing urban poverty. Here then seemed to be the answer to the bundle of problems that had beset the town [of Boston]." <sup>57</sup>

In 1750, the Boston Society (renamed the Society for Encouraging Industry and Employing the Poor) sponsored the reprinting of a pamphlet by the Irish landlord and philanthropist, Richard Cox. The pamphlet had first been published in Dublin in 1749, but the American edition included a new introduction that noted that "the circumstances of this Province, and those of Ireland, tho' not altogether similar, are in so many Respects alike."<sup>58</sup> The pamphlet in the form of a letter to Thomas Prior, one of the founders of the Dublin Society, related how Cox had developed a linen manufacturing project on his estate in Bandon in County Cork. Training and employment of women were central to Cox's scheme as they were to the scheme supported by the Boston Society.

Cox had advanced public awareness of his project through an annual ceremony. Every May Day he organised on the town green a "general Review" of spinning wheels that he had hired out to graduates of his school. In order to encourage young women to take up spinning, Cox's daughters and other "young women of the best Distinction" participated in the review and also demonstrated their spinning skills. The review, according to Cox, was a festive occasion which demonstrated the moral as well as the economic benefits of the scheme. As with other Irish patriotic writers, spinning for Cox was not just the means to a prosperous economy but also the medium through which moral reform could be achieved among indigent as well as better-off women. This view was encapsulated in the title page of his pamphlet which quoted lines from "Proverbs ch xxxi," that emphasized the link between virtue and flax spinning.

V. 10. Who can find a virtuous woman? For her Price is far above Rubies.

13. She seeketh Flax, and worketh willingly with her Hands.<sup>59</sup>

The spinning woman was thus not only rescuing the poor from destitution but she could also transform the social utility of women in general.

The reprinting of Cox's pamphlet in Boston in 1750 was aimed at potential sponsors of a spinning factory in Boston. Three years later, in another attempt to raise funds, the project was publicized through a large public assembly of middle and upper class girls spinning on Boston Common, an initiative which was, as Gary Nash has noted, clearly modelled on Cox's May Day review.<sup>60</sup>

The Boston factory failed but the economic problems of Boston continued and in the late 1760s, the idea of reopening the factory was considered. Potential financial backers were unenthusiastic but Boston merchant William Molyneux agreed at a town meeting in 1769 to manage a project to teach large numbers of women to spin in their own homes. The proposal coincided with the launch of the more politically motivated non-importation movement in colonial America.<sup>61</sup> Molyneux's spinning project was assisted by ministers who encouraged women to engage in spinning for charity reasons. Women also began to assemble in spinning groups in ministers' homes. As Linda Kerber has noted, the women who participated in these semi-religious meetings often left "blurred the distinction between what they did politically and what they did in the name of religion," a characteristic that they shared with Irish women engaged in activities that could also be interpreted as both philanthropic and political.<sup>62</sup>

Outside of Boston and Massachusetts, the influence of the Dublin Society can also be documented. In New York, the Society for the Promotion of Arts, Agriculture and Economy was formed in 1764. Its major project was the opening of a linen manufacturing factory and the provision of premiums for women spinners, an approach also favoured by the Dublin Society.<sup>63</sup> In its first public announcement, Benjamin Kissam, noted that the founding of the Society had been encouraged by the "happy effects of the several societies nearly of a similar nature, established in London, Dublin and Edinburgh."<sup>64</sup>

As Kissam's comments suggest, following the prototype of the Dublin Society may not always have been direct or explicit. The ideological trail may have come via the societies in London or Edinburgh, both of which, as noted already, imitated the activities of the Dublin Society. A revealing demonstration of the exchange of ideas from one side of the Atlantic to the other can be found in the circulation of Richard Cox's pamphlet. First published in Dublin in 1749, the letter to Thomas Prior was reprinted in London later the same year. It was in London that the botanist, Peter Collinson first came across it and sent it to his American correspondent, Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia. Franklin, aware of the endeavour of

the Society for Encouraging Industry and Employing the Poor in Boston sent the pamphlet to "some ingenious publick spirited friends" there who subsequently reprinted it.<sup>65</sup>

Direct and indirect Irish influences can also be traced in Philadelphia. In 1743, when Franklin drew up proposals for "Promoting Useful Knowledge," the precursor of the American Philosophical Society, he noted that some of the intended members were already in correspondence with the Dublin Society as well as with the Royal Society in London.<sup>66</sup> Subsequently, in 1766, the opening of the publicly funded Bettering House in Philadelphia was strongly influenced by the work of the Boston Society.<sup>67</sup> In the following decade, the United Company of Philadelphia for Promoting American Manufactures was established based on the model of the New York Society. Among its first tasks was the opening of a linen factory that would employ poor women.<sup>68</sup> Jennifer Ann Moon's analysis suggests that the United Company shared similar aims to the Dublin Society as it "encompassed the employment of the industrious poor within a model of political economy grounded upon the advance of American manufactures."<sup>69</sup> In a specific reference to its Irish model, the managers of the Philadelphia project announced in 1776 that they had devised a system of premium awards "after the manner of the Dublin Society, the happy effects of which have been experienced in the extensive establishment of a very beneficial Manufacture through the Kingdom of Ireland."<sup>70</sup> The esteem in which the Dublin Society was held at this time might also be gauged by advertisements in New York and Philadelphia newspapers by craftsmen boasting of their links to it.<sup>71</sup> In other colonies, the Irish example of prizes and bounties for linen production was also followed.<sup>72</sup>

In both the American and the Irish colony the societies for the promotion of local manufactures shared a common recognition of the economic contribution of the woman consumer. There was also a similarity in the political rhetoric concerning the patriotic women. The image of the patriotic woman that emerges in public discourse of the American colony in the 1760s bears striking similarities to that of the patriotic Irish woman to be found in the earlier Irish discourse. Both were encouraged to shun fashion and vanity as represented by British imported cloth and to don coarser, home spun cloth.<sup>73</sup> In both countries, too, spinning was promoted as a virtuous as well as "a patriotic activity and as a symbol of defiance against England."<sup>74</sup> As Gary Nash noted of North America but which was equally true of Ireland, "the manufacture of cloth took on a political character and became a part of the self-denying zeal and reaffirmation of community."<sup>75</sup> In colonial America as in Ireland, British goods represented "luxury" while home produce became its antithesis and the means to "a moral regeneration of the American people."<sup>76</sup>



Jennifer Ann Moon has also suggested that projects such as the American Manufactory sponsored by the United Society in Philadelphia defined a new innovative role for poor women in economic development. "Through their labor, the Managers proclaimed women might maintain their families while advancing the political and economic independence essential to republic government."<sup>77</sup> As noted already, Irish patriotic writers also identified the employment of poor women as an essential element in advancing the country's economy.

Historians of the American Revolution have noted the difficulty of determining when the notion of a non-importation campaign was first promoted as a political tool. Clearly, there was no explicit imitation of the Irish experience but the fact that consumer boycotts, the promotion of home manufacture and a discourse that encouraged patriotism as a female sentiment were a central part of Irish political thought throughout the eighteenth century must surely have formed part of, what Bernard Bailyn has described as the "complex heritage of political thought" that shaped the American Revolution.<sup>78</sup> Rather than being a "brilliantly original American invention," as Breen has argued, the political exploitation of a consumer boycott and the advancement of local industry were among the "set of ideas, already in scattered ways familiar" to the revolutionary leaders.<sup>79</sup>

## Women Patriots in Colonial America and Ireland

As is well known, the American boycott campaign expanded the political or public space for women by popularising the concept of the politically active woman. In Boston, New York and Philadelphia, the non-importation pacts were signed by the "people" that "included everyone regardless of age, sex or rank."<sup>80</sup> Large numbers of men, as well as women, attended public meetings in support of the non-importation campaigns.<sup>81</sup> Once the military conflict began in North America, women were given new opportunities to demonstrate their patriotic commitment through fund raising, recruitment, nursing and keeping the domestic economy going while the men were away fighting.<sup>82</sup> The victory of the revolutionaries also led to a recognition and a celebration of women's role in the conflict. From this emerged the positive, if limited, socio-political role for women as wives and mothers of loyal citizens.<sup>83</sup>

Ireland during the 1770s witnessed an expansion of the involvement of women in public affairs, partly as a consequence of developments in colonial America. The formation of a local militia in 1778 to defend the island while British troops were engaged in the American war rapidly widened into a political campaign led by the Volunteer militia to lift the restrictions on Irish trade. The emergence of the Irish Free Trade movement received widespread

popular support, partly because it coincided with a sharp decline in the Irish textile market provoked by the restrictions on Irish trade due to the American conflict. If Irish philanthropic activity provided a prototype for American projects in the 1750s and 1760s, by the 1770s, Irish patriots, were looking across the Atlantic for ideas on how to popularize their own political campaign. In explicit imitation of the American colonists, non-importation associations were formed throughout the country. The transition from a consumer boycott to a non-importation campaign, strengthened the anti-English tone of Irish patriotism.<sup>84</sup>

Irish women were also urged to follow the example of their American sisters and boycott British imports and support the Irish textile industry through the purchase of Irish cloth. And they responded to this call in an active manner. In Dublin, a non-importation association was formed by a group of women following a public meeting in April 1779. The members of the association resolved that "we will not wear any article that is not the product or manufacture of this country."<sup>85</sup> In the autumn of that year, the women associated with the Silk Warehouse also formed a non-importation association and a "Ladies Agreement" was left at the warehouse and signed by "a great number of respectable names."<sup>86</sup>

And, as in North America, the distinction between a political act undertaken by women and one motivated by charity continued to be deliberately unclear. In 1778 Charlotte Fitzgerald described for her mother, a meeting at which a group of mainly aristocratic men and women resolved to assist the economic distress of cloth manufacturers in Dublin. There is no reference to the political consequences of their actions although these were implicit in the meeting described. The emphasis is on a public gesture for charitable rather than political reasons.

There never was anything equal to the distress there has been in Dublin from the want of trade. Everybody has entered into a resolution of buying nothing but Irish manufactures.... It was therefore settled that everybody should buy a piece of linen for a gown and to make a pleasant thing of it, the following scheme was proposed. Colonel Burton the promoter of it all gave a breakfast to a large party of gentlemen and ladies; out of whom there was a committee of ladies chosen ... Lady Charlotte Fitzgerald in the chair. They were to determine upon a uniform. ... The colour green was not liked by anybody as not becoming, but as everybody could not have exactly the same coloured printed linen, it was agreed that green would suit with everybody's linen. It was fixed that we should all go to the Gardens upon such a day in our uniform that the mob might see that the nobility and gentry were inclined to favour the Irish manufactures.<sup>87</sup>

Apart from supporting the buy Irish campaign of the late 1770s, women attended Volunteer reviews in large numbers, either as participants in the crowd or as wives and relatives of the men in the regiment. Aristocratic and middle-class women also crowded into the public gallery of the House of Commons of the Irish parliament to listen to debates; and they were admitted to the Volunteer Conventions when they met in Dublin.<sup>88</sup> Thus the crisis of the 1770s expanded the public space available to women.<sup>89</sup> Unlike, in north America, however, the impact was short-lived. When the Irish political debate moved on to focus on parliamentary reform in the 1780s, the woman patriot was no longer required in the public sphere and, consequently, she disappeared from the political rhetoric.

## Conclusion

England and Scotland experienced the same consumer revolution as North America and Ireland. The colonial context of the latter two countries, however, made the marketplace a potential location for political agitation in ways that did not exist in the former. In both north America and Ireland, the private act of a woman in her selection or purchase of clothes was exploited for its political significance in ways that did not occur in Britain. Prior to the anti-slavery movement of the 1790s, consumerism was not associated with public virtue in England and Scotland in the same way as it was in Ireland and north America; and English and Scottish philanthropic projects that aimed to provide employment for poor families were not imbued with the same patriotic zeal as they were in the colonies.

This is not to suggest that, prior to 1780, there were not politically active women in England and Scotland but rather that patriotism was not the same motivating factor for them as it was for their Irish and American counterparts. The socio-political world of the court, urban government and local election contests appear to have provided women in England and, to a lesser extent in Scotland, with more opportunities for engagement in politics than public expressions of patriotism.<sup>90</sup> It might also be argued that eighteenth-century English and Scottish politicians had a more ambiguous attitude to female patriotism and often viewed it as a source of anxiety rather than as a useful political asset.<sup>91</sup> The construction of a positive image of the female patriot was, therefore, a later development in Britain than it was in its Irish and American colonies.

## NOTES

I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers of this article for their comments and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup>*Freeman's Journal*, 7 September 1779, 4.

<sup>2</sup>The word "boycott" derives from the social and commercial isolation of land agent Charles Boycott during the Irish Land War in 1880. It is here used in its modern sense of withdrawing "from commercial or social interaction with (a group, nation, person, etc.) as a protest or punishment" (*Oxford English Dictionary*).

<sup>3</sup>T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution. How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), xvi.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>5</sup>Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty Daughters. The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750–1800* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980); Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill, NC: North Carolina University Press, 1980); *Towards an Intellectual History of Women. Essays by Linda K. Kerber* (Chapel Hill, NC: North Carolina University Press, 1997).

<sup>6</sup>Jennifer Ann Moon, "The Best Poor Man's Industry: Politics and the Political Economy of Poor Relief in Revolutionary Philadelphia" (PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1995), 4. See also 3, 155–7.

<sup>7</sup>Joep Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor Ghael. Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, Its Development and Literary Expression Prior to the Nineteenth Century* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), 294–300.

<sup>8</sup>On Swift's promotion of Irish manufactures see Charlotte Sussman, *Consuming Anxieties Consumer Protest, Gender, and British Slavery, 1713–1833* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 31–32, 49–80; James Kelly, "Jonathan Swift and the Irish Economy in the 1720s" in *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an Dá Chultúr*, vol 6 (1991): 7–36.

<sup>9</sup>Conrad Gill, *The Rise of the Irish Linen Industry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 17–18, 75–76.

<sup>10</sup>Richard Lawrence, *The Interest of Ireland in its Trade and Wealth Stated* (2 vol. London, printed by Joseph Ray for Joseph Howes, 1682), preface to the reader, no pagination.

<sup>11</sup>F. Elrington Ball, Introduction to *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of the Duke of Ormonde, Preserved at Kilkenny Castle* (11 vols, London: Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1895–1920), vol 8.

<sup>12</sup>Toby Barnard, *Irish Protestant Ascents and Descents, 1641–1779* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2002).

<sup>13</sup>Mary O'Dowd, *A History of Women in Ireland, 1500–1800* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005), 56. See also Powell, *The Politics of Consumption in Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 157–61.

<sup>14</sup>James Livesly, "The Dublin Society in Eighteenth-Century Irish Political Thought" in *Historical Journal*, vol. 47 (2004): 615–640.

<sup>15</sup>Joep Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael*, 301–2, 300.

<sup>16</sup>Cited in Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael*, 300.

<sup>17</sup>*The Querist Containing Several Queries Proposed to the Consideration of the Public* (ed), J M Hone (Dublin: Talbot Press, 1935), 35, 39.

<sup>18</sup>Angelique Day (Ed.), *Letters from Georgian Ireland. The Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1731–68* (Belfast: Friar's Bush Press, 1991), 239.

<sup>19</sup>David Hempton and Myrtle Hill, *Evangelical Protestantism in Ulster Society, 1740–1890* (London: Routledge, 1992), 3–19; O'Dowd, *A History of Women in Ireland*, 55–61.

<sup>20</sup>Samuel Madden, *Reflections and Resolution Proper for the Gentleman of Ireland, As to their Conduct for the Service of their Country* (Dublin: Printed by R. Reilly, 1746), 37.

<sup>21</sup>Patrick Kelly, "The Politics of Political Economy in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Ireland" in *Political Ideas in Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, ed. S.J. Connolly (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), 120–21. See also Powell, *The Politics of Consumption in Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 43–74.

<sup>22</sup>See, for example, an editorial in the *Dublin Weekly Journal*, 11 December 1725, that asserted that the purchasers of imported cloth demonstrated their "luxurious and profuse course of living."

<sup>23</sup>Ruth H. Bloch, "The Gendered Meanings of Virtue in Revolutionary America" in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (1987), vol. 13, no 1: 38, 52. See also Jan Lewis, "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic" in *William and Mary Quarterly* (1987), 3<sup>rd</sup> series, xlv, no 1: 689–21.

<sup>24</sup>*The Irish Manufacturer's Plea, in a Letter From a Gentleman of the Country, to a Merchant of the City of Corke* (Cork: printed by G. Harrison, 1732), 18–19.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>26</sup>*Letters from Georgian Ireland. The Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1731–68*, 240–2.

<sup>27</sup>*Freeman's Journal*, December 1779.

<sup>28</sup>Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution. How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence*, 264.

<sup>29</sup>See, for example, the unmarried clergyman, Philip Skelton who noted that even nursing mothers could spin as "a new born child sleeps most of the first three months, and it is the practice of their [i.e the poor Irish] mothers to hold the child on the left knee, while they spin with their right hand." Philip Skelton, *The Necessity of Tillage and Granaries. In a Letter to a Member of Parliament Living in the County of \_\_\_\_\_* (Dublin: 1741), 12–13.

<sup>30</sup>Davis D. McIlroy, *Scotland's Age of Improvement* (Washington: Washington State University Press, 1969).

<sup>31</sup>D. G. C. Allan, "The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce. Organisation, Membership and Objectives in the First Three Decades (1755–84)" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1979), 35–36; James Meenan and Desmond Clarke (Eds), *RDS: The Royal Dublin Society 1731–1981* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1981); Terence De Vere White, *The Story of the Royal Dublin Society* (Dublin: Kerryman, 1955); Powell, *The Politics of Consumption in Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 75–78.

<sup>32</sup>The projects sponsored by the Dublin Society can be followed in *The Dublin Society's Weekly Observations* which was first published in 1739.

<sup>33</sup>*Proceedings of the Dublin Society*, 25 April 1765, 19 December 1765.

<sup>34</sup>*Ibid.*, 31 July 1766, 5 May 1768.

<sup>35</sup>O'Dowd, *A History of Women in Ireland, 1500–1800*, 56, 131–2. See also Beatrice Bayley Butler, "Lady Arbella Denny, 1707–1792" in *Dublin Historical Record*, (1946–7), vol. 9, no 1, 1–20; Angela Bourke, et al. (eds.), *Field Day Anthology of Irish Writing*, vols 4–5 (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), v, 737–40.

<sup>36</sup>See *Proceedings of the Dublin Society*, 29 January 1767, 12 February 1767. The setting up and management of both warehouses can be traced in the *Proceedings of the Dublin Society, 1764–1781*. See also J. J. Webb, *Industrial Dublin Since 1698 and the Silk Industry in Dublin: Two Essays* (Dublin: Maunsel, 1913).

<sup>37</sup>*Dublin Weekly Journal*, 8 October 1726; Samuel Madden, *Reflections and Resolutions*, 66; Berkeley, *The Querist*, 36.

<sup>38</sup>See, for example, the papers of Lady Moira in the Public Record Office of Northern Ireland.

<sup>39</sup>*Freeman's Journal*, 19–23 February 1765.

<sup>40</sup>See in particular, the Volunteer newspaper, *Hibernian Journal*.

<sup>41</sup>Alastair J. Durie, *The Scottish Linen Industry in the Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Donald Press, 1979), 11–21, 29, 38; Introduction to *The British Linen Company 1745–1775*. Edited by Alastair J. Durie (Edinburgh: Scottish Historical Society, 1996); *Select Transactions of the Honourable the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Printed by Sands, Brymer, Murray and Cochran, 1743).

<sup>42</sup>For acknowledgement of the influence of Ireland see, in particular, *ibid.*, 311, 380, 384, 452; [Patrick Lindsay], *The Interest of Scotland Considered ...* (London: printed for T Woodward and J. Peele, 1733), xxv–xxviii, 136, 139–40. For women's involvement in the work of the Board see [Anonymous], *The Case of Miss Leslie, and her Three Sisters. The Manufacture of Thread for Lace, Equal to any Foreign* (London: printed by D. Wilson et al, 1767).

<sup>43</sup>*The Interest of Scotland Considered ...*, xx.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, 6–7. See also Durie, *The Scottish Linen Industry in the Eighteenth Century*, 13; T. C. Smout, “the Landowner and the Planned Village in Scotland, 1730–1830” in N. T. Phillipson and Rosalind Mitchison (Eds), *Scotland in the Age of Improvement. Essays in Scottish History in the Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1970), 75–81; A. J. Youngson, *After the Forty-Five. The Economic Impact of the Scottish Highlands* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973), 25–66.

<sup>45</sup>See for example, *Select Transactions of the Honourable the Society of Improvers in the Knowledge of Agriculture ...*, 321–2, 377–8.

<sup>46</sup>Kathryn Sutherland, “The New Economics of Enlightenment” in Martin Fitzpatrick et al (Eds), *The Enlightenment World* (London: Routledge, 2004), 475–80; John Robertson, “The Scottish Enlightenment and the Civic Tradition” in Hont and Ignatieff (Eds), *Wealth and Virtue*, 157; Berry, *The Idea of Luxury*, 142–52.

<sup>47</sup>See Sutherland, *op. cit.*, pp 480–1; Rosemary Zagarrri, “Morals, Manners, and the Republican Mother” in *American Quarterly*, vol. 44, 2 (1992): 192–202; Michael Brown, “The 18th-century Scottish Enlightenment” in Christine Meek and Catherine Lawless (Eds), *Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women: 4. Victims or Viragos?* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005). See also Jane Rendall, “Feminizing the Enlightenment. The Problem of Sensibility” in Fitzpatrick et al (Eds), *The Enlightenment World*, 253–271.

<sup>48</sup>D.G.C. Allan, “The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce,” 35–36, 41; *William Shipley: Founder of the Royal Society of Arts* (London: Scholar Press, 1979), 16–17, 47–48.

<sup>49</sup>Linda Colley, *Britons. Forging the Nations, 1707–1837* (Vintage: London, 1992), 95–105; Nicola Pullin, “Gender, Trade and Nationalism in Eighteenth-Century Britain” in *Women's History Magazine*, 42 (October 2002): 14–20. See also Alicia C. Percival, “Women and the Society of Arts in its Early Days” in *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, vol. cxxv (April, May 1977): 266–9, 330–333.

<sup>50</sup>D. G. C. Allan, “The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufacture and Commerce”, 110, 114–5, 265–7.

<sup>51</sup>See, for example, Ingrid H. Tague, *Women of Quality. Accepting and Contesting Ideals of Femininity in England, 1690–1760* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2002), 142–50.

<sup>52</sup>Christopher J. Berry, *The Idea of Luxury. A Conceptual and Historical Investigation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 126–38; Gareth Stedman Jones, *An End to Poverty? A Historical Debate* (London: Profile, 2004), 44–6.

<sup>53</sup>Edward Hundert, “Mandeville, Rousseau and the Political Economy of Fantasy” in Martin Fitzpatrick et al (Eds), *The Enlightenment World* (London: Routledge, 2004), 30.

<sup>54</sup>See Kathryn Sutherland, “The New Economics of Enlightenment” in Fitzpatrick et al (Eds), *The Enlightenment World*, 475.

<sup>55</sup>Based on a search of the database, "Early American Newspapers, Series 1, 1690–1876" (Readex Archive of America). See, for example, *Boston Post Boy*, 13 February 1744, 4 May 1752; *Boston Gazette*, 15 September 1735, 30 January 1750; *Boston Evening Post*, 30 April 1750, 18 June 1750, 23 July 1750, 30 July 1750, 13 November 1753; *Boston Weekly News-Letter*, 20–27 December 1739; 30 May 1754; *American Weekly Mercury*, 1–8 August 1745; *New York Evening Post*, 25 June 1750; *New York Gazette*, 9 July 1750, 30 July 1750, 6 February 1758; *New York Weekly Journal*, 23 September 1735, 23 September 1735, 18 January 1741, 6 February 1743, 30 May 1748, 3 September 1750; *New England Weekly Journal*, 22 July 1734; *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 17–24 January 1737. See also Laura Thatcher Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun. Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth* (New York: Knopf, 2001), 159–60.

<sup>56</sup>See Lawrence A. Peskin, *Manufacturing revolution. The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2003), 13–59.

<sup>57</sup>Gary B. Nash, "The Failure of Female Factory Labor in Colonial Boston" in *Labor History*, 20 (1970): 172–3. William R. Bagnall. *The Textile Industries of the United States* (Cambridge: the Riverside Press, 1893; reprinted New York, 1971), 16–36 links the expansion of the domestic linen industry in the Boston region to the settlement of a community of northern Irish Protestants in Londonderry.

<sup>58</sup>Richard Cox, *A Letter from Sir Richard Cox, Bart. To Thomas Prior, Esq. Shewing, from Experience, A Sure Method to Establish the Linen-Manufactures; and the Beneficial Effects, It Will Immediately Produce* (Dublin, 1749; Boston edition, 1750); Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible: Social Change, Political Consciousness, and the Origins of the American Revolution* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 190–1, 474, note 136, 190–1.

<sup>59</sup>Richard Cox, *A Letter from Sir Richard Cox, Bart. To Thomas Prior, Esq.* See also Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, "'Daughters of Liberty': Religious Women in Revolutionary New England" in Ronald Hoffmann and Peter J Albert (Eds), *Women in the Age of the American Revolution* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989), 221, note 16.

<sup>60</sup>Gary B. Nash, "The Failure of Female Factory Labor in Colonial America": 165–88; Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 190–1; Laura Thatcher Ulrich, "Sheep in the Parlor, Wheels on the Common: Pastoralism and Poverty in Eighteenth-Century Boston" in Carla Gardina Pestana and Sharon V. Salinger (Eds), *Inequality in Early America* (Hanover, New Haven: University of New England Press, 1999), 182–200; Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun. Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth*, 159–166.

<sup>61</sup>Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 321–336.

<sup>62</sup>Linda K. Kerber, "'History Can Do It No Justice': Women and the Reinterpretation of the American Revolution" in *Towards an Intellectual History of Women*, 76.

<sup>63</sup>*New York Mercury*, 3 November 1765. See also Benjamin A. Guttrman, "The 'Ancient' Freemen of New York City: Artisans and the Development of Urban Society, 1664–1776" (unpublished Ph D thesis, The University of Maryland, 1994), 346–49.

<sup>64</sup>*New York Mercury*, 10 December 1764.



<sup>65</sup>Gary B. Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 474n, 190–1; Leonard W. Labaree (Ed.), *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin, Volume 5 July 1, 1753, through March 31, 1755* (Yale University Press: New Haven, 1962), 232.

<sup>66</sup>“A Proposal for Promoting Useful Knowledge, 14 May 1743” (*The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Online Digital Edition*). In 1756 Franklin was made a corresponding member of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures & Commerce in London. See letter from William Shipley to Franklin, 1 September 1756 (*The Papers of Benjamin Franklin. Online Digital Edition*).

<sup>67</sup>Jennifer Ann Moon, “The Best Poor Man’s Industry: Politics and the Political Economy of Poor Relief in Revolutionary Philadelphia,” 67

<sup>68</sup>Ibid.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., 8.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., 192.

<sup>71</sup>See for example, *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, 25 March –1 April 1771; *New York Gazette and the Weekly Mercury*, 17 July 1769, 25 February 1771.

<sup>72</sup>Michael Zakim, “Sartorial Ideologies: From Homespun to Ready-Made” in *American Historical Review*, vol 106, 5 (2001). Consulted on <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/ahr/106.5/ah0501001553.html>.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid.

<sup>74</sup>Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 335. See also Mary Beth Norton, *Liberty Daughters. The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750–1800*, 155–177; Alfred Young, “The Women of Boston: ‘Persons of Consequence’ in the Making of the American Revolution, 1765–76”, 181–226; Laura Thatcher Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun*, 175–84; Linda Kerber, *Women of the Republic. Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*.

<sup>75</sup>Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 335–6.

<sup>76</sup>Jan E. Lewis, “A Revolution for Whom? Women in the Era of the American Revolution” in Nancy A. Hewitt (Ed.), *A Companion to American Women’s History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 84–5.

<sup>77</sup>Jennifer Ann Moon, “The Best Poor Man’s Industry: Politics and the Political Economy of Poor Relief in Revolutionary Philadelphia”, 157.

<sup>78</sup>Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Enlarged edition, Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press for Harvard University Press, 1992), 323.

<sup>79</sup>T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution. How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence*, xvi; Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, 323.

<sup>80</sup>Nash, *The Urban Crucible*, 360.

<sup>81</sup>Kerber, *Towards an Intellectual History of Women*, 76–7.

<sup>82</sup>Norton, *Liberty Daughters. The Revolutionary Experience of American Women, 1750–1800*; Linda K. Kerber, *Women of the Republic. Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid.; Kerber, *Towards an Intellectual History of Women*, 123–156; Jan Lewis, “The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic”: 689–721; Rosemary Zagari, “Morals, Manners, and the Republican Mother”: 192–215.

<sup>84</sup>Joep Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor Ghael*, 350–57.

<sup>85</sup>Alice E. Murray, *A History of the Commercial and Financial Relations Between England and Ireland from the Period of the Restoration* (London: P. S. King, 1903), 203–4.

<sup>86</sup>O’Dowd, *A History of Women in Ireland*, 59.

<sup>87</sup>Charlotte Fitzgerald to Emily Fitzgerald, 3 June 1778 (NLI, Leinster Papers, folder 14).

<sup>88</sup>Mary O’Dowd, “The Women in the Gallery: Women and Politics in 18<sup>th</sup> Century Ireland” in S. Wichert (ed), *From the United Irishmen to the Act of Union* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), See also O’Dowd, *A History Women in Ireland*, 55–61.

<sup>89</sup>See also Padhraig Higgins, *A Nation of Politicians. Gender, Patriotism and Political Culture in Late Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, 2010), 178–201.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid. See also Elaine Chalus, *Elite Women in English Political Life, c. 1754–1790* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Judith S. Lewis, *Sacred to Female patriotism. Gender, class and politics in late Georgian Britain* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

<sup>91</sup>See for example, Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People. Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 51–2, 195, 223., 235; Nicholas Rogers, *Crowds, Culture and Politics in Georgian Britain* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1998), 216, 228.