

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Bueltmann, Tanja, Gleeson, David and MacRaild, Don (2014) Invisible Diaspora? English Ethnicity in the United States before 1920. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 33 (4). pp. 5-30. ISSN 0278-5927

Published by: University of Illinois Press

URL: <http://www.press.uillinois.edu/journals/jaeh.html>
<<http://www.press.uillinois.edu/journals/jaeh.html>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/17681/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl



Invisible Diaspora? English Ethnicity in the United States before 1920¹

In venturing, therefore, to intrude upon your Majesty with this expression of their gratitude, the committee beg to assure your Majesty that the members of their [St George's] Society, though far from the land of their fathers and their love, can never cease to think of it with tenderness, and that the prayers which they offer to God from their home in this friendly republic, for the long continuance of your Majesty's health and prosperity, *flow from hearts as loyal*, and are uttered by lips as true, as can be found in any part of your Majesty's almost boundless dominions.²

What is most interesting about this loyal address, received by Queen Victoria in the summer of 1852, is that it did not originate within her "boundless dominions," but in the United States, that "great republic in the west". This fact evoked concern. For, as the recorder of the St. George's Society of New York message to the Queen observed: while some of the undersigned, such as the local British Consul, had every right to "reiterate their loyalty and subjection to her most excellent Majesty, even to the kissing of her most excellent Majesty's little toe-nail," others did not. English immigrants who had become American citizens had "solemnly abjured and renounced" Victoria and sworn allegiance to "plain Uncle Sam," and could not continue to express loyalty to a foreign head of state—let alone a monarch. The source of this criticism was the age-old nativist fear about immigrants' divided loyalties, based on the apprehension that it was not

possible to “swear a man out of his home attachments.”³ The English did not respond to such considerations with a simple defense of their Englishness. When Queen Victoria died, in 1901, the Baltimore St George’s Society engaged in a destructive debate about whether to relay their condolences via the American or British authorities, since by their own declaration, some of them were English, some were Americans, and still others were naturalized citizens of the new country. When they decided to go via their local consul to British Embassy in Washington, some members left in protest, including the President, Arthur Robson, whose parting was with the reasoning that “it was impossible for him as an American citizen to remain President of a Society which had just been declared to be an English organization.”⁴ These matters of identity were not, therefore, without problems and, as with other ethnic groups in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century America, English-American views of their own identity changed over time and across generations too. Given that this is so, and in view of layers of tension surrounding expressions of Englishness, it is strange to still see that, as Marcus Lee Hansen once wrote, “the English who have contributed the most to American culture, have been studied the least by students of immigration”.⁵ Oscar Handlin’s classic, *The Uprooted*, makes no mention of the English at all.⁶

While Rowland Berthoff and William Van Vugt have examined the English in their respective works on the British in the United States, exploring the social and economic aspects in detail, English immigrants in America remain under-studied.⁷ Berthoff, for example, writing in the 1950s, captured the richness of English, British, Scots and Welsh cultural and associational forms, though viewed primarily through the lens of working-class urban, industrial workers. He did, however, recognize a degree of English-Irish conflict in shaping the associational formations of the English, as old

world grievances migrated to the new.⁸ But, to date, Charlotte Erikson has written the full-scale survey of English immigrants in the US (along with the Scots). Migration statistics make this lack of attention puzzling. The English were the largest immigrant group in the American colonies in the seventeenth century and constituted 80 per cent of the 2,760,360 people (of specified national origins) who left Britain for the United States between 1820 and 1910.⁹

Despite these large overall number of English arrivals in the US and their importance to the growing American industrial economy, scholars of general immigration to America have done relatively little to recognize an English ethnic presence in the country.¹⁰ Van Vugt ascribes this partly to the failure of the British authorities to collect systematic emigration data.¹¹ Moreover, specialists on the history of ethnicity, such as Kathleen Neils Conzen and others, have largely concurred with this approach. Conzen et al argue that ethnicity in the United States was defined by the immigrants themselves in an attempt to negotiate with “the dominant ethnoculture.” The whole process of American ethnic identity originated therefore in the “interactions” between immigrants and the “Anglo American culture” which could be “competitive, cooperative, or conflictual, and perhaps a combination of all three.” These encounters “are seen as essential components of the process of ethnic group formation and definition.” English culture, immigrant or otherwise, is thus considered integral to, not apart from, that of the hosts’. Ultimately, in the nineteenth century, the main period of ethnic formation in America, the “English had no ethnicity in American eyes.”¹² It is clear that this viewpoint is shaped by similarities between the English and their hosts and is justified in those terms. What we found is that the Anglo-American synergy did not prevent the English expressing ethnicity, but, especially in associational forms,

complicated it—as was the case, described above, with the controversy in Baltimore over how to express condolences over Queen Victoria’s death.

This article explores the hidden or relatively overlooked English ethnicity, and tries establish some of the reasons why this is the case and how we might move on from that position. We recognize that immigrant ethnicity, where it exists, can be found in multiple locations. Not all of it is institutional, structural or formal. As extensive work on British immigrant letters has highlighted, English migrants often expressed feelings of ethnicity just as deep as their Scottish and Welsh compatriots in their letters home. While the English showed little of the public ethnicity associated with the Irish on St Patrick’s Day or the Scots with their marching pipe bands, they did introduce and maintain elements of their culture to the United States. Shrove Tuesday and May Day were celebrated by English immigrants in the nineteenth century before they became part of an Anglo-American culture. Cricket, rugby, pubs, beer and types of food, eaten in particular ways, were part of this outwardly English way of life, the sports for example being played by the English throughout their places of settlement.¹³ Whilst acknowledging these layers and the scope for wide expressions of Englishness, we focus on ethnic associations since they afford the possibility to explore varieties of ethnic behavior through relatively rich records. In so doing, we acknowledge the study of associational culture of the English, building on the pioneering work of Berthoff and Shepperson.¹⁴ The article ascribes more importance to such collectivities than most subsequent scholars of the English have done as a means for developing a “systematic history” of English ethnicization in America—an ethnicization which was prior to and ultimately complementary to an United States “‘ethnicized” Anglo-Americanism.¹⁵ At the same time, ethnicization was different for the English than for the Irish, Italians or

Middle Eastern immigrants.¹⁶ Where religion and homeland politics yield an enclosed ethnicity, the English—travelling no such severe trajectory of rejection—expressed a practical, civic and cultural ethnicity which could, on occasions, turn tribal against American criticism of England, Britain and the Empire. Practical forms of ethnicity allowed some of their number to enjoy help from those wealthy enough to provide it. This occurred significantly through formal ethnic associations.

English associationalism, allied to English cultural pastimes offers important examples of a public form of Englishness. Those who read newspapers were certainly aware of English societies, events and customs. We have located substantial records of English societies in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, which supply rich evidence of the social and philanthropic activities of English associations. Examining these archives and collecting a sample of more than 1,200 separate newspaper articles containing references to the activities of palpably English organizations suggests to us that the English were ethnic in the fullest sense.¹⁷ The ethnicity of the English was active and they were agents in its manufacture, transmission and maintenance far beyond private gripes expressed in union meetings or in personal letters home. With that in mind, our aim is to reignite an interest in the cultural aspect of English immigrant culture and ethnicity in the United States. A fresh analysis of English associational life and cultural activities can give us new insights into the English in America as well the constructions of English and American identity. Before exploring ethnic associationalism among the English, however, we must look at first, the historiographical reasons for the relative oversight of the English; and secondly, some of the historical conditions which made expressions of English identity problematic.

The Roots of English Invisibility

Whereas Irish, Scottish, Italian, African, and many others have their diaspora histories, little countenance is given to the concept of an English diaspora. To a large extent, the most powerful traditions of writing within a diaspora framework focus on the meta-narratives of victimhood, oppression, forced exile and reluctant migration.¹⁸ If these experiences are key elements in the evocation of a diasporic consciousness, the English (oppressors rather than the oppressed, colonists not the colonised) do not fit the typology. Indeed, the English are more likely to be characterized the people against whom diasporas are defined. Moreover, as a recent important contribution demonstrates, English emigrations do not spike as a result of social calamities, technological developments or economic displacement.¹⁹

At home, within the United Kingdom, in comparison to Scottish nationalism, or the Orange and Green traditions of Northern Ireland, Englishness appears inchoate.²⁰ Britishness, whose modern form emerged from Englishness and the expansion of England through the ‘Celtic fringe’, provides the first and most significant block to English ethnicity identity. As a dominant national group, the English simply did not need an open, public ethnicity identity. In fact, in the modern period, such an identity only emerged among neo-English folk in America and the British colonies as they made sense of their own position in a sea of competing ethnicities.²¹

Broader American historiographical traditions, beyond the study of ethnicity in itself, also tempered the idea of the English as ethnic. English distinctiveness was initially played down in the nineteenth century when the “germ theory,” which saw democratic American culture inherited from the forests of ancient Germany via Britain, was ascendant.²² Under such conditions, America was a cultural and biological

extension of England, and thus indivisible from it. When American exceptionalism became vogue, folklorists and others argued that English roots were dissolved in American soil as an entirely new culture emerged.²³ In the early twentieth century there was a coming together of British and US imperial interests and a concomitant renewal of long-dormant concepts of a shared libertarian heritage. With Magna Charta and the American Constitution stressed as organically connected symbols of freedom and justice, it became still more difficult to argue for a distinct Englishness in America. This was the essence of an Anglo-American identity. Indeed, these common values caused members of English ethnic associations to draw together the strands linking English, British and American under the aegis of Anglo-Saxonism.²⁴ In such contexts, the new inter-war stress on the contribution of hyphenated Americans meant that the idea of a distinct English immigrant group lost further purchase.

The invisibility of the English was aided by more prosaic considerations, especially among historians of immigration. Conzen captured it well, noting that “[t]he British, so the standard interpretation goes had a far easier lot than other immigrants.” Quoting Berthoff, she continued: “They were able to assimilate quickly, passing ‘almost unnoticed’ into native society with a minimum of ‘psychological buffeting.’”²⁵ Subsuming Englishness within Britishness is a wider issue, and not one specific to the historiography of the English in the US. As both Adrian Hastings and Krishan Kumar argue, England remained a synonym for Britain.²⁶ Indeed, there was some justification for favoring “British” as a collective noun. Since Britain was partly the product of English imperial expansion through the “Celtic Fringe” of Wales, Scotland and Ireland, there had to be some core associations for the Celtic peoples to be co-opted to and British fitted the bill.²⁷

Historians, as we shall see, have offered some countering views. Conzen, for example, noted ways in which a distinct English identity was resurrected. “Berthoff”, she writes, “who provides the most detailed evidence for this smooth adjustment ... points out that ‘they too clung to old loyalties’ and demanded the support of group institutions in their accommodation to American life.”²⁸ Offering a detailed examination of over two hundred immigrant letters, Erickson highlights that English arrivals were perhaps not so different from other migrants in America: they were affected by many of the same feelings, experiences, and aspirations. Shepperson’s study of English repatriates shows how they, as much as other groups, could struggle in the United States and come to reject it—this notwithstanding their cultural, religious and linguistic advantages over the Irish Catholic or Italian speakers.²⁹ While Erickson generally sought to indicate the English presence in the United States, her work overall provides, and is viewed as, an argument for relatively easy assimilation—a sentiment well received by many scholars.³⁰ To Erickson, the English “nowhere developed the institutional life as the Irish or the Germans.”³¹ Whereas, for Van Vugt, the British (including the English) “were not just another immigrant group. They were essential to the rise of Anglo-American culture.” Though he also declares they “did not generally form ethnic communities or produce ethnic publications as other groups did.”³²

Our research suggests the English were an immigrant people whose ethnic formations dealt with the limits of the Arcadian American dream captured, through literature and personal narratives, in the work of Shepperson and Fender.³³ The middle-class men of the St George’s and other societies expressed their response by helping those poorer countrymen of theirs who were pinched in the United States by the same economic circumstances as had ground them down at home. Where there was working-

class English activity, however, “their orientation was not so much ethnic as class”.

They responded to American urban capitalism as they had responded to its British variant: through collective self-help and protection. While the English failed to have the impact on American politics that the Irish did, and though their involvement in nascent American labor unions “probably weakened rather than strengthened their group ties”, their role in the early labor movements in the United States did display a sense of ethnic identity. Attracted to the mill towns of the northeast and mid-Atlantic regions, English textile workers came with industrial skills and experiences, and expected to prosper in the nascent industries of America. Some too, as with the Irish, may have been attracted by the opportunities to participate in politics denied to them in England. Their political sensitivities undoubtedly were enhanced by the popular British perception that America provided living proof that democracy could be a utopian reality for workingmen; contrasting markedly with class-based political hierarchies in England which many Chartists rejected by journeying to the young Republic.³⁴ When migrating workers realized the practical limitations of a utopian idealism which was so important to this type of English identity, they created an organizational response among the English settlers. In cities such as Fall River and Lowell, Massachusetts, and Manayunk, Pennsylvania, English workers complained of the conditions they faced in what they thought would be a better place.³⁵ As a result, a certain ethnic pride in England and prejudice against America developed. In an investigation by the Pennsylvania State Senate into the conditions in its mills in the 1850s, one English immigrant spinner testified: “I consider the operation of the factory system upon persons employed, is more oppressive in this country than in England. In the first place, they work longer hours here; in the next place, the climate here is not so congenial to health.” Another

Englishman, who was a carder by trade, denigrated the skills of American workers stating that he believed that “the work in England is much better prepared and requires less piecing” than in America.³⁶

This dissatisfaction with American conditions could lead to a more explicit ethnicity, one drawing specifically on regional English roots. In Fall River, for example, in the aftermath of a failed strike and an influx of new workers, some “one hundred men of various occupations”, but most originally from Lancashire, became so nostalgic for the ethnic and class unity they remembered from home that they formed the English American Club in 1876 to endorse the election of candidates sympathetic to their interests.³⁷ The Englishness and regional ethnicity shown here, however, had more to do with the disappointment that Massachusetts was not Lancashire than being a positive affirmation of English culture beyond the workplace. These English-Americans missed the “patriarchal” and “deferential” labor relations of mill towns in their home counties.³⁸ Thus, their grievances, as Erickson correctly pointed out, had a major class element and their ethnicity itself was susceptible to “ethnic fade”, particularly when labor supporters and organizers insisted on politics as purely a “contest of class.”³⁹ For “pragmatic reasons” then ethnic tensions and differences could dissipate and ethnicity itself become “invisible.”⁴⁰ The fact that the English, more than other groups from the British Isles, were likelier to return home to England, or leave for Canada and other parts of the Empire, could have diminished the English ethnic presence even more.⁴¹

What was left of English ethnicity in the United State then was something muted and stunted. As David Gerber, English immigrants, if they ever did express ethnicity, did so “more in terms of difference from others (and strong disapproval of those differences), rather than in terms of affirmations of affiliation or peoplehood, the latter

nonetheless remained implicit in these judgements.” The English and British in America did not develop the sort of politicized, ethnic organization manifest in, for example, the Irish Protestants’ Orange Order.⁴² They did express a sense of “peoplehood” but it was usually a negative rather than a positive ethnicity. Gerber concludes that: “English ethnicity was less an encompassing way of life as it was for latecomers, such as Poles or Italians, who were significantly culturally distinctive from the founding British-Canadian and Anglo-American populations, than a subtle process of difference among peoples and an appreciation of what was one’s own.”⁴³

Consequently, English ethnic culture is downplayed, considered “subtle,” diffuse, and amorphous, with the English unlikely, unwilling, or unable to define clear ethnic roots beyond expressing disdain for the host society and other migrants. Cast as “invisible immigrants,” assimilating more easily than any other group or else contributing to the creation of an Anglo-American culture which obviated the need for ethnic self-expression, English ethnic identity, at times hidden in the amalgam of Britishness, was obscured by its apparent lack of that distinctive panoply of churches, schools, newspapers, clubs and societies, which were such strong features of the ethnic cultures of Germans, Scots, Irish, or Italians. For us, the starting point is a much fuller analysis of the institutional and associational life of these British Isles settlers.

Organized English Ethnicity

English associational life in the United States was partly about demonstrating the migrants’ acceptability to the host populace. To some extent this process was aided by the rising tide of Anglo-Saxonism and the laudation of a shared racial heritage, which in turn marked out southern Europeans and Hispanics as inferior. In the early twentieth century—in the face of mass immigration by non-WASP peoples and in an international

context which presented new challenges to the hegemony of the English-speaking world—Anglo-Saxonism resolutely presented race as a binding connection between British and American worlds.⁴⁴ Also militating against English ethnicity was the fact that the English neither developed the kind of political consciousness of the Irish nor the degree of public, political and cultural nationalism of both the Irish and Scots.⁴⁵ What they did express, moreover, has been played down. Erickson dismissed the annual dinners of the New York St George's Society as "social events of an elite who were not in touch with the larger immigrant community."⁴⁶ The dinners in Baltimore and Philadelphia and other places were not quite so grand, but neither were they proletarian. Yet, while membership was decidedly middle class, the recipients of support most certainly were not. Aside from conviviality, the aim of these societies was "the relief of distressed English subjects."⁴⁷

If overt English ethnic identity really was as non-existent as is imagined, then why did Englishmen do what their Irish and Scots cousins did and laud their ethnoculture and show such concern for their countrymen? From the late eighteenth century, societies carrying the national saint's name, St George, sprung up in numerous towns and cities in the United States at about the same time as St Patrick's and St Andrew's societies also emerged. For the English at home, these expressions of New World Englishness fitted a model of external identity-formation. For the important Victorian imperialist, J.R. Seeley, 'the history of England is not in England, but in America and Asia'.⁴⁸ We therefore can see the broader appeal of the roots of this type of English ethnicity. Though clearly lacking the homeland political identifications of the Irish, the English nevertheless paralleled the Scots in expressing what was primarily a non-threatening civic nationalism based on saints and cultural icons.⁴⁹

English societies emerged early in the American story of migration. Charleston's St George's Society was founded in 1733, New York's in 1770 and Philadelphia's Sons of St George's Society in 1772; equivalent societies appeared in Baltimore (1866), but also in Canada, in Toronto (1834) and Ottawa (1844).⁵⁰ In the United States, English associationalism proliferated quickly, societies and clubs being founded in communities large and small, urban and rural. The initial eighteenth-century clusters of associations on the east coast reflect early settlement and population patterns, but the foundation of dozens of smaller St George's societies soon consolidated English associational culture throughout the country. Spreading across the east, upper south and mid-west, Englishmen gathered under the banner of St George in Cleveland, Little Rock, and Racine.⁵¹ In the following decades, the group spread further west, finding its way to Anaconda, Montana, and southern California at both Los Angeles and Pasadena to name only a few.⁵² In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the English associational scene diversified even more, with several smaller organizations, including the Albion Society and other lodges, being established. On top of these were British societies, Anglo-American confraternities, and others. The geographic spread and numeric proliferation of English associations throughout the US highlights the wide permeation of English ethnic organizations as they became an intrinsic part of English immigrant community life. English societies were present in all major cities, many towns, and across the continent by the 1890s, but were not as numerous—in either membership or type—as their Irish counterparts. Moreover, though they were predominantly elite and bourgeois formations, though this was not true, as we have said, in areas of significant working-class English settlement: Pennsylvania, and in the mill towns of Massachusetts

where considerations of class and ethnic competition with the Irish drove them to form their own ethnic clubs and defense associations.

However, our research reveals a still wider, deeper, series of transnational webs of ethnic Englishness than have been acknowledged. While these associations ensured durability across temporal space, umbrella organizations, chiefly the North American St George's Union, brought the various elements together. The St George's Union meeting at Chicago, in 1884, drew delegates from Washington, Philadelphia and Bridgeport, Connecticut, and also Canada.⁵³ Instituted in 1873, the Union's annual conventions promoted Englishness throughout North America, with the events being hosted by St George's and other English societies in different cities.⁵⁴ Transnational activity such as this, as well as the connections between individual associations across the country in the US, is accepted as evidence of the strong ethnicity displayed by other America ethnic groups. Consequently, similar acknowledgment needs to be given to the English. Durability is suggested by the fact that several St George's societies are still active today.⁵⁵

While there is no denying their middle-class composition, and their increasingly high-society dimensions which took shape in the later nineteenth century, it is questionable whether the comparable societies associated with other immigrant groups were any less elite. Equally, it would be problematic to assume that having a middle-class leadership obviates notions of ethnicity. Bourgeois romantics, for example, dominated the formalization of national identity in nineteenth-century Scotland and Ireland.⁵⁶ They were more likely to express an explicit cultural identity than English workingmen seeking to recreate English working conditions in America through pluralistic labor unions. Organizations such as the Hibernians were also comprised of

well-to-do, successful Irish immigrants and their offspring, who offered charity, guidance to the lowlier people within their ethnic group; the St George's societies were just the same. Charity, employment, care for immigrants, and news about the condition of the labor market each spoke to the idea of a common bond of middle-class leadership within ethnic societies in urban America in the nineteenth century.⁵⁷ Kerby Miller, for example, deploys a Gramscian notion of hegemony to illustrate how the Irish middle-class controlled expressions of ethnic-nationalist culture, utilizing the same culture to enjoy prestige and power within their communities.⁵⁸

Despite the importance of elites in English associations, the beneficiaries were largely working class. The Society of the Sons of St George in Baltimore, in the 1860s and 1870s, was heavily reliant for its charitable work on the benefactions of a few leading lights who worked closely with local orphanages, hospitals, churches and municipal authorities to provide shelter, beds, and final resting places for hard-up English immigrants. Each year, they supported orphans and sent the saddest cases of poverty and dislocation home to England at no small cost. In this regard, they looked more like an extension of the British social state than a mere Anglo-American social club. Furthermore, in Baltimore, unlike New York, there were ordinary members of more modest circumstances, some of whom could not always pay their five-dollar annual dues.⁵⁹ The English formed a variety of smaller orders and lodges following the ritual and ceremony of the fraternities and were more working class in complexion. One such organization was the Order of the Sons of St George (also called the Lodge of the Sons of St George). Attracting British and American, as well as specifically English members, the Sons of St George were said to have been founded in Pennsylvania to resist the infamous Molly Maguires, itself a secret society, run mostly by Irish Catholic

miners.⁶⁰ While it is tempting to put these sectarian tensions down to the peculiar conditions of the economy and labor force in these mining districts, it is interesting that the middle-class officers of the St George's Society in Baltimore also occasionally offered flashes of concern about the attitude the Irish demonstrated towards the English. On hearing of the imprisonment of a number of English immigrants for sleeping rough in the city, the society secretary let go with an intemperate broadside that is worth recounting in detail:

The boast "Britons ever shall be slaves" will be a mockery when any Fenian policeman or Magistrate can incarcerate an Englishman as a felon to "feed fat his ancient grudge" imported from the Emerald Isle, where prejudice and bigotry and religious animosity warp men's minds and bend their reason [...] The acts of the Society have been in a great part to advance the prosperity of the United States by enabling immigrants to turn their skill and labor into profitable channels. The St George's Society is essentially an American society. But it is a Benevolent Society and one important duty is to guard the friendless immigrant from oppression by petty tyrants.⁶¹

In Pennsylvania, the Sons of St George quickly left their shadowy and militant past behind them. By the 1880s, most branches calling themselves the Sons of St George were benign, self-improving collectives with a friendly society ethos and a convivial social form. At about this time the Sons were holding large annual meetings, with their 1884 gathering in New York attracting hundreds of delegates from across the country. Four years later, the Sons hosted a reception for the British Liberal-Unionist

politician, Joseph Chamberlain during his visit to the United States to discuss a fishing treaty.⁶² Gone were the associations with violence and secrecy, though the working-class constituency remained intact. On his return to Britain, Chamberlain praised them “as fine a lot of working men, all of them British with the exception of a few from the North of Ireland, as I have ever seen ... and intensely sympathetic with the old country, while they were also loyal American citizens.”⁶³

Charitable Ethnicity

Benevolence and mutuality were key motivations for ethnic organizations. Charity was given to immigrants of the same nationality by a plethora of ethnic associations. Few nations did not put in place supports of this type. English associations were earliest and strongest in the eastern ports of first landfall: Charleston, New York and Philadelphia, Baltimore. A common thread of concern for their countrymen united them and persisted across the centuries. Wealthy Englishmen, employers and professionals supported transient sailors and temporary sojourners, as well as long-term settlers. Support reflected the trade cycle, with alms given out more extensively when unemployment struck, or when new arrivals made American soil at times when little work was available. There is no sense in the records that a majority of those relieved were transients. Indeed, like the poor law at home, most support went to the sick, old infirm or young. Overall benevolence reflected wider middle-class responsibilities and were as much civic as ethnic, though ethnicity was the fault of qualification for the poor. The British government recognized their role in Canada in particular in helping new arrivals, in sending some of them home, and in providing labor exchanges.⁶⁴ But the same principles applied in the United States.

English charitable pursuits thus focused activities on recently arrived English immigrants who had fallen on hard times. Such interventions date to the earliest moments in these societies' histories. In the 1770s, the founding members of the Philadelphia Sons of St George proudly declared: since it was impossible to assist all in need, "he begins with those to whom the Ties of Blood have more immediately connected him . . . after his particular Relatives and Friends, his Countrymen are his peculiar Care."⁶⁵ Ethnic exclusivity was also the view of the New York St George's Society, which specifically defined its object as the provision of "relief and advice to indigent natives of England and the British Colonies, or to their wives, widows or children in the cities of New York and Brooklyn."⁶⁶ During the nineteenth century further such societies were established elsewhere in the United States to help English immigrants in distress and to promote "brotherly love and charity."⁶⁷ This message from Philadelphia members, first expressed in the eighteenth century, was clearly restated in the society's printed rulebook of the early 1870s: that it existed 'for the ADVICE and assistance of ENGLISHMEN in DISTRESS.'⁶⁸ In the 1866, Baltimore's St George's Society was formed at the instigation of the British Vice Consul "for the relief of destitute English subjects."⁶⁹ In the 1870s, Chicago's Englishmen spawned an organization, the English Benevolent Society, expressly for that purpose.⁷⁰ Beyond their immediate catchment areas, these societies also came together at times of human crisis to support each other. In 1878, St George's societies in New York, Philadelphia and Charleston were reported as having made donations to the St George's Society of New Orleans in answer to their appeal for funds to alleviate the distress caused by Yellow Fever.⁷¹

Few of these societies were as successful as the New York society in putting in place a charitable fund that relieved thousands of immigrants. However, even the smaller organizations, such as the Baltimore St George's Society, which after its inception in the 1860s only had a few hundred dollars in its reserves, reckoned to have responded to all genuine cases of destitution brought before it.⁷² In 1850, the New York society urged new arrivals to seek out its offices to avoid being defrauded by unscrupulous persons who preyed on immigrants.⁷³ Extant society records document the diverse and far reaching activities pursued to aid immigrants in distress. The society rented an office to provide an accessible first point of contact for those in search of aid, and employed an almoner to staff the office. Other officers of the Society would also search out new arrivals at Castle Garden and tried to play an active role in the labor market, helping new arrivals from England to find work.⁷⁴ In line with its constitution, relief was primarily provided for two groups of English migrants: "strangers" or "transients" who received financial assistance, advice on employment matters, money to travel to family or friends elsewhere in North America (in the hope to find better employment opportunities) or, if all else had failed, a reduced or free passage home to England; and pensioners by means of a weekly allowance, as well as coal and food supplies in the winter months. On this basis, in 1877 alone, 2,329 transients and 88 pensioners were aided; at other times transients who received support numbered 3,000-4,000.⁷⁵ While the number of immigrants that benefitted from the aid dispensed is already indicative of the scope of the New York St George's Society's philanthropic pursuits, the extent of relief efforts can be traced further in terms of the Society's overall relief expenditure. In the first instance, the Society's charitable fund was the main fund in place to provide aid for immigrants in distress; however, a contingent fund was also

set up in the 1870s. The purpose of the contingent fund was to avoid special subscriptions for particular relief projects, instead providing a readily available fund for relief in “extraordinary cases beyond the limit of the Constitution.”⁷⁶ With the funds thus divided, the Society’s annual balance sheets, together with the reports of the treasurer, document the amount of aid dispensed.

Previously, scholars have downplayed the aid provided by the New York St George’s Society.⁷⁷ While a substantial \$2,582.00 was allocated in 1869, this figure rose to an average of \$3,674.06 over the ensuing decade, increasing even further, from the 1880s, when the contingent fund was more frequently drawn on. A general rise was still clearly evident in the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1901, for instance, \$6,140.04 was provided through the charitable fund, with an additional \$1,245.50 coming from the contingent fund. In absolute numbers, \$49,351.38 was expended between 1869 and 1881 and \$ 92,342.71 between 1899 and 1911. The money provided was used to allocate cash to deserving pensioners; meal tickets; aid for transients; coal subsidies; aid to return to England; and Christmas gifts for pensioners. Moreover, the expenditure commonly also included the almoner’s salary, and the rent for the Society’s offices, both indispensable for the effective provision of aid. Based on comparative evidence gleaned from newspaper reports of the aid efforts made by other ethnic associations, the St George’s Society’s provisions were well in line with those efforts.

The mechanisms of St George’s benevolence also extended, during economic downturns, to circulating intelligence about the state of the American economy, with adverts appearing in English newspapers prevailing upon immigrants not to make the crossing. The Philadelphia St George’s Society, for instance, contacted the press in England in the 1870s to discourage emigration from England because of the state of

American industries, which had led to the destitution of so many recent arrivals in their city.⁷⁸ The same warning was issued again in 1880, this time through the *Times* of London.⁷⁹ If warnings did not keep the poor English at home, society funds could repatriate those who had not made a success of life beyond the “Golden Door”: the benevolence of English ethnic societies extended to sending down-at-heel migrants home to England. The St George’s Society in Baltimore certainly sent up to five immigrants home each year, like the Sheffield woman who in 1867 wrote to the secretary to express gratitude for a return ticket.⁸⁰

The introduction of a system of relief in tickets, rather than cash, consolidated “the intimate relations established with other charitable Societies.”⁸¹ Many of these groups were, as the St George’s Society, ethnic associations, including the St Andrew’s Society and the German Society. Benevolence, and the desire to effectively aid new arrivals from the homeland, facilitated robust networks between wide varieties of organizations—so much so that the St George’s and St Andrew’s societies jointly rented offices at 3 Broadway, also sharing their Almoner, in the 1870s.⁸² Though catering for particular immigrant groups, these networks highlight that ethnic associationalism could be a potent carrier of civility, extending its reach into wider civic and community life. Further consolidated by the involvement in umbrella organizations that operated within the civic and administrative structures of New York City, such as the Benevolent and Emigrant Societies Board or the Committee of the United Charities of New York, the St George’s Society’s charitable pursuits underpinned the civic-mindedness of these associations’ ethnic activities.⁸³ While in 1914 the Baltimore society cooperated with other ethnic groups—inviting Irish, Scots, French and Germans to their dinners and, in 1914, sub-letting rooms to the Welsh association for \$50 a year.⁸⁴

Societies went still further in assisting emigrants. The New York group sponsored free beds at St Luke's Hospital and offered burial plots at Cypress Hill Cemetery – that “little bit of England” for those who would otherwise have been buried in Potter's Field.⁸⁵ In Baltimore, an equivalent plot was found in the Druid Ridge Cemetery.⁸⁶ The idea for a hospital specifically for English emigrants in New York dates back to 1845, when the Chaplain of the St George's Society, the Revd. Moses Marcus, began collecting funds in New York and in England. Though the degree of involvement of the Society in hospital affairs varied over time, the Society supported the hospital financially and had representatives on the hospital board.⁸⁷ The Society was also one of the places where those in need of medical support could obtain orders for admission, giving the Society some influence on access to hospital care.

Some of the fund-raising undertaken by the more elite groups went beyond the relief of immigrants, extending to England itself. As Irish societies collected money for their compatriots in times of economic and political stress, such as in the “Land War” of the 1880s, during the Boer War (1899-1902), English societies across the locations studied raised money for the Red Cross to relieve wounded soldiers and to make provision for the families of fallen servicemen.⁸⁸ Within a year, the Baltimore St George's raised over \$2000 for the widows and orphans of the Boer War from personal subscriptions, concerts and a lecture by the young war correspondent and soldier, Winston Churchill.⁸⁹ The New York St George's Society had its own War Relief Committee during the First World War, sending “large consignments of supplies to Europe” and merged its own War Fund into the British and Canadian Patriotic Fund for more effective assistance of British soldiers, their wives and children.⁹⁰

This documentary evidence, together with the extensive press reports on the associational activities of St George's societies throughout the US, highlights that the instances of benevolent acts, fund-raisers, and expressions of intention to raise money to support the English poor are far too numerous, deep and enduring, to be dismissed.

Sociability and Celebration

Ethnic formations had these economic motives, but sociability still mattered. To 'promote social intercourse among its members' was a key driver.⁹¹ While social aspects united association members through their get-togethers, providing entertainment and camaraderie, sociability also overstepped internal ethnic boundaries. These were forged on members sharing common English descent. Moving beyond these confines, English associations facilitated contact with other groups, thereby altering the balance between ethnic and civic, exclusive and inclusive, dimensions. Thus, in New York the 1858 grand municipal dinner in celebration of the laying of the Atlantic cable brought together representatives from the city's government and civic elite, the President of the St George's Society surrounded by his counterparts from the St David's, St Andrew's and St Nicholas' societies and many more.⁹² Such prestigious gatherings provided an important platform for the maintenance and extension of networks. While some, like the above celebration, were one-off events, there were also a number of annual gatherings fostering social ties, such as the annual dinner of the New England Society of New York. This was an exclusive event for over 500 society guests, held in the plush surroundings of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in 1899. According to a commentator from the *New York Times*, the event was remarkable for being "made the occasion of a pro-

British demonstration.”⁹³ Given the Boer War had commenced only a few months earlier, it is not surprising that celebrations of Britishness were allied with praise for the Puritan spirit of the early colonists.

Despite this explicit linking of contemporary Englishness to the English roots of America, the English faced a specific difficulty in amalgamating their ethnicity with the American republic. All ethnic groups in the US sought to make their ethnicity compatible with American political tradition; but for the English, the celebration of monarch and empire was problematic in an American political scene dominated by parties who prided themselves on defending the ideal of republican government. To deal with this issue St George’s Day celebrations in the United States rendered devotion jointly to homeland and new land. The queen might be praised, but so was the president. In fact, contributing to an Anglo-American culture was clearly an important feature of English ethnic organizations. Words of unity were carefully chosen; identification with England was usually never designed to conflict with citizenship in the United States. Such was clearly the case in New York, in 1882, when both the Sons of St George Society and the Albion Society met jointly and paraded together: one of four lodges of the former was explicitly called the “Anglo-American.”⁹⁴ In the following year, the theme was developed with the first “Anglo-American picnic” held by the same four lodges of the Sons and the Albion Society.⁹⁵ In Baltimore the private meetings and invitation-only dinners were supplemented in the 1880s by religious services at the Episcopal Ascension Church, where one of their own chaplains, Revd Dr Campbell Fair, was Rector.⁹⁶ Just as Irish immigrants were “inventing Irish America,” it seems the English in New York were creating their own “Anglo-America,” one different from the host culture though sharing common characteristics with it.⁹⁷

In the 1880s, however, there was a blurring of Anglo-American cultures and a political vision of cross-cultural unity in the form of the British-American Association of the State of New York. Despite its broader title the association was founded by a group of Englishmen, whose intention was to bring all naturalized “Britons” together, in order to encourage new immigrants to become American citizens. The British-American Association also desired “to promote good feeling and harmony between the governments of the United States and Great Britain” and, in what looks like an acknowledgement of the political success of the Irish in New York City, “to aid in the election of good men to political offices.”⁹⁸ By “good men” the Association meant generally good “republicans,” but specifically those of English and British stock.⁹⁹ The New York Association soon had branches beyond the City in numerous other towns such as Troy, Ithaca, and Albany. The association then spread out of state to Chicago and Boston.¹⁰⁰

Despite these attempts at creating a national political presence, the twenty-third of April, St George’s Day remained the main focus of public expression of Englishness, as indeed St. Patrick’s Day was for the Irish.¹⁰¹ St George’s Day is also traditionally taken to be the birth date of that most famous Englishman, William Shakespeare. Controversy over the precise date of the Bard’s birth aside, the alignment—often mentioned in the speeches at St George’s day dinners—was too good to pass up.¹⁰² In England itself, St George’s Day was a small-scale and patchy affair; in the United States, remembering the saint became an annual custom of significant magnitude, emerging as it did from the initial benevolent associations.¹⁰³ In this, the English abroad echoed the relative balance of old and new worlds evinced in the activities of their Irish counterparts. Irish literary scholar and cultural critic Declan Kiberd sees Irish America

as the place where Irish identity itself was refined as it was the immigrants who preserved the “idea of Ireland.”¹⁰⁴ The immigration experience heightened the sense of national identity and so it was with English migrants. J.R.C. Young certainly views English ethnicity largely as an invention of and for people born beyond England’s shores.¹⁰⁵ The English in America gathered from the earliest times to express pride in their ethnicity with solid English refreshment. At Baltimore, in 1884, this came in the form of roast sirloin of beef and Yorkshire pudding, plum pudding and brandy sauce, and imported Bass Ale.¹⁰⁶ But the way they celebrated sounded echoes of traditions at home, or were represented by versions of what were perceived to be ancient English rituals, such as parading the boars head (which was said to date to Oxford in the Middle Ages), putting on plays about “Good Queen Bess”, and a dizzying array of variations on the Robin Hood theme. Attendances at English events in the US usually numbered in the hundreds and often saw members of the lodges and various societies coming together.

For the New York St George’s Society, major celebrations were held in some of the city’s best hotels and restaurants: Astor House, frequently at Delmonico’s, and, later, the Waldorf Astoria.¹⁰⁷ A dinner was usually the central component of the celebrations, with a series of toasts providing ample opportunities for the expression of loyal sentiments. Those honored by raised glasses included St George; the Queen or King; the President of the United States; the army and navy; the Empire; the native and adopted lands; sister societies; and the bard, William Shakespeare. Rooms were fittingly decorated with portraits of the Queen and flags, while in Philadelphia, like Baltimore, “a keg of English ale ... graced the table.”¹⁰⁸ Food, toasts and prevalent rituals made the celebrations effective platforms for the expression and negotiation of cultural memory.

A key feature in the transmission of this memory was its global universality. With toasts characterized by repetitive and somewhat standardized themes that could be utilized by St George's societies all over the world, the events offered an effective means of framing acts of collective remembering.¹⁰⁹ St George, the hero and martyr, transmitted "the spirit of the English race."¹¹⁰

Although St George's Day served as an important site of memory, it was neither a purely nostalgic event to express romanticized images of identity nor ethnically exclusive.¹¹¹ By appealing to common Anglo-Saxon origins, associations were building a platform for an amalgamated Anglo-American culture, thus echoing contemporary intellectual debates about the possibilities of transatlantic union. Although, as we saw at the head of this article, expressions of loyalty to the Crown were common, the toast to the Queen being drunk "with all the enthusiasm that loyalty and gallantry could inspire in the breasts of Englishmen," they were made alongside those to the President, showing warm loyalty to both. In New York, in 1853, the flag of St George "floated from the Astor-House," while both Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes were used in the dining hall, hanging side by side.¹¹² The Philadelphia Sons of St George, gathered for their 126th anniversary in 1898, played the "Star Spangled Banner," which was followed by the rendering of "God Save the Queen."¹¹³ Consequently, a standardized ritual form around St George's Day—speechifying, toasts, and food—appealed to dual loyalties and identities, linking to England and America. Moreover, the events were also of chief importance for the active promotion and maintenance of ties between the old world and the new, helping to foster common, fraternal bonds.¹¹⁴

Conclusions

This article suggests then, that English immigrants actively developed and maintained the types of clubs and societies we normally associate with “more ethnic” groups such as the Irish or Scots. If the history of ethnicity in North America is to reach its fullest possible extent, it is vital to recognize that ethnic groups, wherever they come from, expressed national pride below the level of national or state identity. The English in North America cannot be viewed simply as shorthand for Anglo-American relations or as a simple case study in the easy transfer of English culture from one side of the Atlantic to the other. Anglo-Saxonism, Charles Dickens, and William Shakespeare, Morris-men, and May-Poles, St George and the dragon, crossed to the United States and were incorporated into American life, at both elite and popular levels; just as, years later, American popular culture, from minstrelsy to the cinema, travelled in the opposite direction.¹¹⁵ The blurring, blending and exchanging of culture was part of the life experience of ordinary English immigrants. Yet even for the English in the US—speakers of the same tongue as their hosts—the process of settlement and development could be protracted. Moreover, it was complicated by the geopolitical implications of Anglo-Saxonism and episodic tensions between the US and both Britain and Canada, regardless of the idea of shared racial heritage. The English immigrants’ journey undoubtedly was easier than that of the Pole or German, or Irish, but this article has shown that Englishness in America required processes of associating, mutualism and self-expression which were, by any measure, ethnic in character, making the English diaspora clearly visible.

¹ The authors gratefully acknowledge the generosity of the Arts and Humanities Research Council of the UK (project grant AH/I001042/1), which facilitated the research in this article.

² Editor, "What is the Value of the Oath of Allegiance?" *The Republic: A Monthly Magazine of American Literature, Politics & Art* 3 (June 1852): 312.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Maryland Historical Society [MdHS] 1881, Society of the Sons of St George Papers. Minute book III, 9 February, 15 April 1901.

⁵ Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Immigrant in American History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940), 192. For examination of the dynamism of ethnic identity in the United States, see Timothy J. Meagher, *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928* (Notre Dame, IN, 2001).

⁶ Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations That Made the American People* (Boston, 1951).

⁷ Rowland T. Berthoff, *British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950* (Cambridge, MA, 1953); William E. Van Vugt, *Britain to America: Mid-Nineteenth Century Immigrants to the United States* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), *British Buckeyes: The English, Scots, and Welsh in Ohio, 1700-1900* (Kent, OH, 2006).

⁸ Berthoff, *British Immigrants*, 165-84, 186-92.

⁹ The Scots accounted for 488,789 (17.7 per cent) and the Welsh for 59,540 (2.2 per cent). A further 793,801 did not specify origins. 61st Congress, 3d Session, Doc. 756, *Reports of the Emigration Commissioners: Statistical Review of Immigration, 1820-1910*, vol. 3: *Distribution of Immigrants, 1850-1900* (Washington, 1911), [William P.

Dillingham], table 8, 13; Charlotte Erickson, *Invisible Immigrants: The Adaptation of English and Scottish Immigrants in Nineteenth Century America* (London, 1971).

¹⁰ For example, Kraut makes no mention of British or English immigrants and Bodnar mentions English/British immigrants but only in the context of their participation in American industrialization. Alan Kraut, *The Huddled Masses: The Immigrant in American Society, 1880-1920*, 2d ed. (Arlington Heights, Ill, 2002); John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington, 1985), 60-61, 66-67, 111, 151-52, 154-55, 186-89.

¹¹ Van Vugt, *Britain to America*, 4.

¹² Kathleen Neils Conzen, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George E., Pozzetta, and Rudolph J. Vecoli, "The Invention of Ethnicity: A View from the U.S.A.," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12 (Fall 1992): 5- 7.

¹³ Erickson, *Invisible Immigrants*, 261. Erikson pioneered this work and has been succeeded by William Van Vugt and David Gerber in this task. William E. Van Vugt, *British Immigration to the United States, 1776-1914*, 4 vols. (London, 2009); David A. Gerber, *Authors of Their Lives: The Personal Correspondence of British Immigrants to North America in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 2006). See also note 28 below.

¹⁴ Berthoff, *British Immigrants*; Wilbur S. Shepperson, *British Emigration to North America* Emigration (Oxford, 1956) and his *Disenchantment: Portraits of Englishmen Repatriated from the United States* (Norman, OK, 1965). The latter work utilises narratives from the published histories of the St George's Society of New York.

¹⁵ Robin Miskolce, *Women and Children First: Nineteenth-Century Sea Narratives and America Identity* (Lincoln, 2007), 102.

¹⁶ See for example Aminah Mohammed-Arif, *Salaam America: South Asian Muslims in New York* (London, 2002), 259.

¹⁷ Newspaper reportage has been collected from over 100 newspapers of both rural and urban settings. Archives used include, among others, the American Memory newspaper collection; the archives of Chronicling America; America's Historical Newspapers from the World Newspapers Archive; and the archive of the *New York Times*. Searches were conducted primarily by using the "exact phrase" search for instances of conspicuous English festivals, activities, and organizations, such as "St George's Society." Overall, these searches yielded more and 6,000 results, of which a systematic sample of 1,200 separate newspaper articles was then compiled.

¹⁸ See Robin Cohen, *Global Diaspora* (London, 1997) for an introductory typology. See also Kevin Kenny, "Diaspora and Comparison: The Irish as a Case Study," *Journal of American History* 90 (June 2003): 134-62

¹⁹ William Van Vugt, "The Hidden English Diaspora in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Locating the English Diaspora, 1500-2010*, ed. Tanja Bueltmann, David T. Gleason, and Donald M. MacRaild (Liverpool, 2012), 67-83

²⁰ Robert Colls, *The Identity of England* (New York, 2002).

²¹ J.R. Seeley, *The expansion of England* (Chicago, 1971, repr.) 13; Robert J. C. Young, *The idea of English ethnicity* (New York, 2008), 1-2; Tanja Bueltmann and Donald M. MacRaild, "Globalising St George: English Associations in the Anglo-world to the 1930s," *The Journal of Global History* 7 (March 2012): 79-105.

²² David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York, 1989), 4-5.

²³ Such is the argument of William A. Wilson, "Richard M. Dorson's theory for American folklore: a Finnish analogue," *Western Folklore* 41 (Winter 1982): 36-42.

²⁴ See, for example, Charles F. Benjamin's lecture at the North American St George's Union meeting, published as: *The Future Relations of the English-speaking Communities. An Essay Read Before the Eleventh Convention of the North American St George's Union at Chicago, August 20, 1884* (Washington, DC, 1884), 1.

²⁵ Kathleen Neils Conzen, "Self Portraits of the Briton as Immigrant," *Reviews in American History* 1 (June 1973): 226.

²⁶ Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (New York, 1997), 61-65; Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (New York, 2003). Also see, Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, (New Haven, 1992).

²⁷ The classic is Michael J. Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (Berkeley, 1992).

²⁸ Charlotte Erickson, *Invisible Immigrants: The Adaptation of English and Scottish Immigrants in Nineteenth-Century America* (London, 1972), in Conzen, "Self Portraits of the Briton as Immigrant," 226.

²⁹ Shepperson, *Emigration and Disenchantment*.

³⁰ See, for example, Conzen, "Self Portraits," 224-28; and reviews of *Invisible Immigrants: The Adaptation of English and Scottish Immigrants in 19th Century America*, by Maldwyn A. Jones in *Economic History Review* 27 (Aug. 1974): 512-14, and Rowland Berthoff Review in *American Historical Review* 78 (June 1973): 731-32.

³¹ Charlotte Erickson, "English," in Stephan Thernstrom, Ann Orlov, and Oscar Handlin, eds., *Harvard Encyclopaedia of American Ethnic Groups*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA, 1980), 320-39. Quotes on 333 and 335.

³² Van Vugt, *Britain to America*, 4.

³³ Shepperson, *Emigration and Disenchantment*; Stephen Fender, *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature* (Cambridge, 1992).

³⁴ Ray Boston, *British Chartists in America, 1839-1900* (Manchester, UK, 1971), 14.

³⁵ Donald Cole, *Immigrant City: Lawrence, Massachusetts, 1845-1921* (Chapel Hill, 1991 repr); Mary H. Blewett, *Constant Turmoil: The Politics of Industrial Life in Nineteenth-Century New England* (Amherst, 2000).

³⁶ Thomas Moseley and Thomas Siddal, quoted in Philip Scranton, *Proprietary Capitalism: The Textile Manufacture at Philadelphia, 1800-1885* (New York, 1983), 153-54. See also Blewett, *Constant Turmoil*, 228.

³⁷ Blewett, *Constant Turmoil*, 279-80.

³⁸ Classically described for Oldham, Lancashire, in Patrick Joyce, *Work, Society and Politics: The Culture of the Factory in Later Victorian England* (Brighton, 1980).

³⁹ George Gunton, quoted in Blewett, *Constant Turmoil*, 280. See also 177-259.

⁴⁰ John H. M. Laslett, *Colliers Across the Sea: A Comparative Study of Class Formation in Scotland and the American Midwest, 1830-1924* (Urbana, 2000), 137-38.

⁴¹ Walter Nugent, *Crossings: The Great Transatlantic Migrations, 1870-1914* (Bloomington, 1992), 44. See also, Randy William Widdis, *With Scarcely a Ripple: Anglo-Canadian Migration in the United States and Western Canada, 1880-1920* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998), 5, 294-304. Marjory Harper (ed.),

Emigrant Homecomings: The Return Movement of Emigrants, 1600-2000 (Manchester, 2005), especially the essay by Mark Wyman.

⁴² A group Berthoff paid significant attention to, *British Immigrants*, 189-94.

⁴³ David A. Gerber, *Authors of Their Lives: The Personal Correspondence of British Immigrants to, North America in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 2006), 20.

⁴⁴ J. R. Dos Passos, *The Anglo-Saxon Century and the Unification of the English-Speaking People* (New York, 1903); Edward P. Kohn, *This Kindred People: Canadian-American Relations and the Anglo-Saxon Idea, 1895-1903* (Montreal, 2005), 196-205.

⁴⁵ Daryl Adair and Mike Cronin, *The Wearing of the Green: A History of St Patrick's Day* (New York, 2006).

⁴⁶ Erickson, "English," 333.

⁴⁷ MdHS 1881 min I, Jan 1867.

⁴⁸ J.R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England* (New York, 2011, repr), 13.

⁴⁹ See Tanja Bueltmann, Andrew Hinson and Graeme Morton, eds., *Ties of Blood, Kin and Countrie: Scottish Associational Culture in the Diaspora* (Guelph, ON, 2009).

⁵⁰ Robert N. Rosen, *A Short History of Charleston* (Columbia, SC., 1997), 40. The *Charleston Mercury*, 24 Apr. 1858, announced the 125th anniversary of the society in that city. Sons of St. George Collection (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia), minute book vol. 1.

⁵¹ *Daily Cleveland Herald*, 8 Jan. 1864; *Milwaukee Daily Journal*, 21 April 1890; *Little Rock Daily Arkansas Gazette*, 27 December 1874.

⁵² *Salt Lake City Intermountain and Colorado Catholic*, 24 March 1900; *Los Angeles Times*, 24 Apr. 1885, 6 Apr. 1887, 1 Jan. 1891, 25 Apr. 1895, 25 Apr. 1904.

⁵³ *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 20 Aug. 1884.

⁵⁴ See letters from the North America St George's Union to the Society of the Sons of St George, Philadelphia, Minute book vol. 6, 1888, Sons of St. George Collection.

⁵⁵ The St George's Society of New York (<http://www.stgeorgessociety.org/index.php>) and the St George's Society of Toronto (<http://www.stgeorges.to/>) are extant examples.

⁵⁶ Richard P. Davis, *The Young Ireland Movement* (Dublin, 1988); Graeme Morton, *Unionist Nationalism: Governing Urban Scotland, 1830-1860* (East Linton, 1999).

⁵⁷ The Charleston Hibernian Society (founded in 1799 and influenced by the 1798 Rebellion) had prohibitive membership fees and provided the community's ethnic leaders. See David T. Gleeson and Brendan J. Buttimer, "'We are Irish Everywhere': Irish Immigrant Networks in Charleston, South Carolina and Savannah, Georgia," in *Irish Migration, Networks and Ethnic Identities Since 1750*, ed. Enda Delaney and Donald M. MacRaild (New York, 2007), 40-49, 54; Donald M. Williams, *Shamrocks and Pluff Mud: A Glimpse of the Irish in the Southern City of Charleston, South Carolina* (Charleston SC, 2005), 45-51; Arthur Mitchell, *The History of the Hibernian Society, Charleston, South Carolina, 1799-1801* (Charleston, SC., 1982).

⁵⁸ Kerby A. Miller, "Class, Culture, and Immigrant Group Identity in the United States", in Virginia Yans-McLaughlin, ed., *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics* (New York, 1990), 96-129.

⁵⁹ MdHS 1881, minute book I, passim. Each month and year recounted some tale of members in arrears.

⁶⁰ Kevin Kenny, *Making Sense of the Molly Maguires* (New York, 1998).

⁶¹ MdHS 1881, min i, Secretary Report 19 Jan 1874.

⁶² *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 20 Aug. 1884; *New York Times*, 22 Aug. 1888; *Birmingham (UK) Daily Post*, 27 Feb. 1888.

⁶³ *Birmingham (UK) Daily Post*, 12 Mar. 1888.

⁶⁴ E.g. 1872 [C.617] *Reports on the present state of Her Majesty's colonial possessions. Transmitted with the blue books for the year 1870. Part III. North American colonies; African settlements and St. Helena; Australian colonies and New Zealand; and the Mediterranean possessions, &c.*, 50; 1892 [C.6795-XI] *Royal Commission on Labour. Foreign reports. Volume II. The colonies and the Indian Empire. With an appendix on the migration of labour*, 89; 1906 [Cd. 2979] *Departmental Committee on Agricultural Settlements in British Colonies. Minutes of evidence taken before the Departmental Committee [...]*, II, 208, 5490.

⁶⁵ Minute book vol. 1, Society of the Sons of St George of Philadelphia Collection (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia).

⁶⁶ Constitution of the St George's Society of New York, 1877, article 1, included in Annual Report 1877, St George's Society of New York Collection (New York Public Library, New York City).

⁶⁷ Cf. resolution passed in 1815, Minute book vol. 2, Society of the Sons of St George, Philadelphia Collection.

⁶⁸ *Rules and Constitution of the Society of the Sons of St George* (Philadelphia, 1872) in St. George's Society of New York Collection.

⁶⁹ Inaugural meeting, Society of the Sons of St George of Baltimore, MdHS, 1881, minute book I, 3 Dec. 1868, MS 1881.

⁷⁰ *Chicago Tribune*, 3 Jan. 1872.

⁷¹ *New York Times*, 7 Sep. 1878. The St George's societies contributed over \$800 of over \$4000 out-of-town support from late August to late September. *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, 22 Sep. 1878.

⁷² Minute book I, 3 Dec. 1868. MS 1881 (1868-1878), Society of the Sons of St George of Baltimore Collection.

⁷³ Reported in London in *Lloyd's Weekly Register*, 10 Mar. 1850.

⁷⁴ See, for example, New York Public Library [NYPL] *ZAN-8373, St George's Society of New York, Collection, Annual Report for 1869, 4 and for 1874, 8.

⁷⁵ NYPL *ZAN-8373, Annual Report for 1877, 6. See also *New York Times*, 25 April 1853.

⁷⁶ NYPL *ZAN-8373, Annual Report for 1877, 6.

⁷⁷ For example see Robert Ernst, *Immigrant Life in New York City, 1825-1863* (Syracuse, 1994), 32-33.

⁷⁸ Letter to the *Manchester Guardian* reprinted *Dublin (Ire.) Freeman's Journal*, 18 Aug. 1874.

⁷⁹ *The Times* reprinted in *Darlington (UK) Northern Echo*, 8 Jan. 1880.

⁸⁰ MdHS 1881, minutes I, 20 January 1869.

⁸¹ NYPL *ZAN-8373, Annual Report for 1874, 8.

⁸² St George's Society of New York, *History of St George's Society of New York, from 1770-1913* (New York, 1913), 75, 322.

⁸³ *New York Times*, 10 Jan. 1860, 14 Jan. 1875.

⁸⁴ MdHS 1881, min IV, 20 Apr, 20 July 1914.

⁸⁵ NYPL *ZAN-8373, Annual Report for 1943, 33 and 1949, 9; *New York Times*, 1 February 1874.

⁸⁶ MdHS 1881, min III, 15 April 1901. An extraordinary fund was founded to buy the plot. *Sun (Baltimore)*, 11 January 1901.

⁸⁷ St George's Society of New York, *History*, 196.

⁸⁸ See, for example, the efforts of the Sons of St George in Maryland, *Baltimore Sun*, 12 May, 3 Oct. 1900; *Birmingham (UK) Daily Post*, 5 Jan. 1880; *Liverpool Mercury*, 5 Jan. 1880; *Glasgow Herald*, 11 Jan. 1900); and Philadelphia Society *Birmingham (UK) Daily Post*, 26 Mar. 1900).

⁸⁹ MdHS 1881, min III, 15 December 1899, 24 February, 21 December 1900; also handbill to members, dated 21 February 1900; *Sun (Baltimore)*, 12 May, 14 December 1900.

⁹⁰ Annual Report for 1919, 11, St George's Society of New York Collection. For Irish see Kenny, *American Irish*, 176-78 and Thomas N. Brown, *Irish American Nationalism, 1870-1890* (Boston: Lippincott, 1966).

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *New York Times*, 3 Sept. 1858.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 23 Dec. 1899.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 24 Apr. 1882.

⁹⁵ *New York Times*, 19 June 1883.

⁹⁶ MdHS 1881, minutes ii, 2 February 1882.

⁹⁷ For Irish, see Timothy J. Meagher, *Inventing Irish America: Generation, Class, and Ethnic Identity in a New England City, 1880-1928* (Notre Dame, IN, 2000).

⁹⁸ *New York Times*, 30 Sept., 6 Nov. 1887, 13 Jan. 1888, 11 Apr. 1888.

⁹⁹ *Los Angeles Times*, 19 June 1928; *New York Times*, 20 Sept. 1929..

¹⁰⁰ *New York Times*, 29 Mar., 20 June 1889.

¹⁰¹ Adair and Cronin, *Wearing of the Green* accounts for the globalization of St Patrick's Day celebrations.

¹⁰² The issue was raised by the press in connection with the celebrations of the 300th anniversary of the Bard's death. See, for example, *Los Angeles Times*, 4 Feb. 1916.

¹⁰³ See, for example, *Leeds Mercury*, 25 April 1887; *Dublin (Ire) Freeman's Journal*, 1 Dec. 1894, *Bristol (UK) Mercury*, 21 April 1895, *Glasgow Herald*, 24 April 1899.

¹⁰⁴ Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 1-2, 21.

¹⁰⁵ Robert J. C. Young, *The Idea of English Ethnicity* (New York, 2008).

¹⁰⁶ *Baltimore Sun*, 24 April 1884.

¹⁰⁷ See Michael Batterberry and Ariane Batterberry, *On the Town in New York: The Landmark History of Eating, Drinking, and Entertainments from the American Revolution to the Food Revolution*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 71-2. Also St George's Society of New York, *History*, 322.

¹⁰⁸ *New York Times*, 25 Apr. 1854. For the Philadelphia reference, see T.C. Knauff, *A History of the Society of the Sons of Saint George* (Philadelphia: Society of the Sons of St. George, 1923), 59.

¹⁰⁹ See also Bueltmann and MacRaid, "Globalising St George", *passim*.

¹¹⁰ *New York Tribune*, 24 Apr. 1907.

¹¹¹ Sites of memory can in the broadest sense include places or monuments just as much as ritualised or symbolic acts of remembering. Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," *Representations* 26 (Summer 1989): 7-24.

¹¹² *New York Times*, 25 Apr. 1853.

¹¹³ *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 24 Apr. 1898.

¹¹⁴ As much was said in a telegram from the St George's Society of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, to the New York Society: NYPL *ZAN-8373, Annual Report for 1898, 11.

¹¹⁵ For cross-cultural fertilization see, for example, *Waterloo Iowa State Reporter*, 1 May 1878; *Indiana (PA) Democrat*, 23 May 1878; Allison Thompson, *May Day Festivals in America, 1830 to the Present* (Jefferson, NC, 2009); Michael Pickering, *Blackface Minstrelsy in Britain* (Farnham, 2008).