ISSN 1753-2396 (Print)
ISSN 2753-328X (Online)

Journal of
Irish and Scottish Studies

Articles

Celt, Gael or English? British Ethnic Empathy to Indigenes in the Empire from the Records of British Battalions in the Sub-Continent

Author: Peter Karsten

Volume 10, Issue 1
Pp: 50-70
2020
Published on: 1st Jan 2020

1495
ABERDEEN
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Celt, Gael or English? British Ethnic Empathy to Indigenes in the Empire from the Records of British Battalions in the Sub-Continent

Peter Karsten

Many Britons migrated or were dispatched to its colonies over the centuries: Crown officials, paid defenders, settlers and tradesmen, indentured servants, and transported convicts. They were English, Welsh, Scots-Irish, Lowland Scots, Catholic Irish ('Celts'), and Highlanders ('Gaels'). Many encountered indigenous people there. Scholars have debated how Celts interacted with indigenous people in the Empire. Irish Celtic and Scottish Highlander land had been taken by the English and their Lowland Scot and Welsh associates. By the 1750s Irish Catholics, though a distinct majority of those inhabiting Ireland, owned only 5% of the land. In that same era, the Crown stripped Highland chiefs of their authority, and their Highland tenants were steadily displaced by the introduction of more profit-generating Cheviot sheep and deer parks for Lowland Scot and English owners.[1] Did their collective experience and memory of English oppression lead them to identify with the oppression of Indigenes they may have observed in the Empire?

Many such Celts served willingly as military agents of British imperial rule. As a result, 'Irish Catholics [and] Highland Scots were subaltern peoples at home who also took part in imperial ventures abroad: they were both subordinate and dominant.'[2] How did they regard Indigenes when they 'ventured' abroad? The question was raised in an issue of *The Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies* entitled '*Exceptional People? Irish and Scots on the Frontier*' (2009), and at a conference on the subject the next year that led to *Irish and Scottish Encounters*

[1] Eric Richards, *Debating the Highland Clearances* (Edinburgh, 2007), 210–17; Heather Streets, *Martial Races: The Military, Race and Masculinity in British Imperial Culture, 1857-1914* (Manchester, 2004), 196, citing T. M. Devine, 'The Emergence of the New Highland Elite in the Western Highlands and Islands, 1800-1860' in T. M. Devine (ed.), *Improvement and Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1989), 130–43; and Eric Richards, *A History of the Highland Clearances, Vol. 2: Emigration, Protest, Reasons* (London, 1985).

[2] Martin Daunton and Rick Halpern (eds), *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850* (London, 1999), P. Karsten, 'Irish Soldiers in the British Army, 1792–1922: Suborned or Subordinate?' *Journal of Social History*, 17 (1983), 32–64.

with Indigenous Peoples (2013).[3] My review of that volume in *The Journal of British Studies* in 2014 asked how the interactions of Celts and Indigenes compared to the interactions of *non*-Celtic British folk with Indigenes? Were Celts more or less likely than their English counterparts to have been empathetic with the plight of indigenous peoples in the Diaspora?[4]

That question has not been systematically answered. Those who have addressed it disagree on the manner in which Highlander Gaels and Catholic Irish (termed 'Celts' here) interacted with Indigenes. Some writers have pointed to the similarities between the cultures of Highland Gaels and Native Americans, and to their mutual sense that their cultures were in danger of extinction.[5] Other authors have argued that Highlanders and Celtic Irish were *more* compassionate and open towards Indigenes than were their English counterparts. Colin Calloway points to the similarities in the plight of Highlander and Indigenous North American cultures and offers specific examples of Highlander soldiers' empathy and identification with indigenous Americans, and Highlander-Indian marriages.[6] Ann McGrath offers similar observations about Irish interactions with Australian Aborigines, but then adds this key qualifier: "Among the 'good,' downtrodden Irish fathers and humanitarian heroes were also plenty of violent and corrupt police, rapacious frontiersmen, timber getters and boat crew, unscrupulous and murderous squatters, and dubious missionaries."[7] Arthur Herman contends that 'In one colonial setting after another, Scots proved themselves far better able to get along with

---

[3] *Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies*, 3.1 (2009); Graeme Morton and David A. Wilson (eds), *Irish and Scottish Encounters with Indigenous Peoples: Canada, the United States, New Zealand and Australia* (Montreal, 2013).

[4] Peter Karsten, 'Review of Morton and Wilson (eds), *Irish and Scottish Encounters*', *The Journal of British Studies*, 53 (2014), 812–13. Ann McGrath was the only contributor to that volume who suggested this: 'Only by separating the strands of "Anglos" and "Celts" can historical comparisons of colonialism and memory tease out Irish from other influences.' See Ann McGrath, 'Shamrock Aborigines: The Irish, the Australian Aborigines and Their Children' in *Irish and Scottish Encounters*, 116.

[5] Colin Calloway, *White People, Indians and Highlanders: Tribal People and Colonial Encounters in Scotland and America* (Oxford, 2008); Margaret Connell Szasz, *Scottish Highlanders and Native Americans: Indigenous Education in the 18th Century Atlantic World* (Norman, 2007), 15–42; Simon Schama, *A History of Britain, Vol. 3: The Fate of Empire, 1776–2000* (New York, 2002); Arthur Herman, *How the Scots Invented the Modern World* (New York, 2001); Michael Fry, *How the Scots Made America* (New York, 2003), 145–6; Patrick O'Farrell, *The Irish in Australia* (Sydney, 1987), 50–1; Anthony Babington, *The Devil to Pay: The Mutiny of the Connaught Rangers, India, July 1920* (London, 1991)

[6] Calloway, *White People, Indians and Highlanders*, 5, 65, 94, 101, 104, 149, 157, 184, 236–7.

[7] McGrath, 'Shamrock Aborigines', 128.

people of another culture and color than their English counterparts."[8] Michael Fry concurs: 'There was nothing more striking than the affinity of Scots and native Americans … The generosity and freedom of both peoples made a mutual appeal to them across the racial barrier."[9] However neither author identified 'Scots' exclusively as 'Highlanders,' and in their accounts they were clearly not exclusively Highlanders.

Some historians have questioned the generalizing of such claims. Hiram Morgan argued that the Irish, 'far from empathizing with Indigenous people overseas, were as brutal as any other white colonizers.[10] But how did Celts/Gaels in the lands of the British Empire compare to *English* in those same lands with regard to their treatment of Indigenous people? Did either group notably lack empathy towards Indigenes? Were they more empathetic, based on their historical mistreatment by the dominant English, or *less* so, once they were deemed acceptable within the broader British 'white' community? Relative Depravation/Relative Gratification Theory would predict the later: It indicates that those on the bottom of a totem-pole status ladder tend to take pride in their status inclusion and regard themselves as superior to those not so included.[11]

Gaining insight into British interactions with Indigenes requires the ferreting out of information from published recollections, letters home, and unpublished archival manuscript collections. But this sort of evidence of Celtic and English interactions with Indigenes in the Empire are site and circumstance specific.[12] This study does not question any case-specific findings of those who have reported on Celtic/Gael interactions with Indigenes at particular moments of time in specific places in the Empire. But Irish immigrants tended to arrive at later dates than their English and Scottish counterparts, rendering their interactions with Indigenes less comparable. Both English and Scots arrived earlier than the Irish in New Zealand, the Canadian settlements, and the colonies that became the United States. Thus, English and Scots took

---

[8] Herman, *How the Scots*, 323

[9] Fry, *Scots Made America*, 145–6.

[10] Hiram Morgan, 'An Unwelcome Heritage: Ireland's Role in Empire Building', *Journal of History of European Ideas*, 19 (1994), 619.

[11] J. A. Davis, 'A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation', *Sociometry*, 22 (1959), 280–96.

[12] Brad Patterson, '"It is Curious how keenly Allied in Character are the Scotch Highlander and the Mauri": Encounters in a New Zealand Colonial Settlement' in Morton and Wilson (eds), *Irish and Scottish Encounters with Indigenous Peoples*, 144–69 is an example of this site-specific condition.

the lead in displacing the Indigenous people of those lands. How could we then compare them sensibly to the Irish interactions there?

We need to analyze sufficient data collected from a time-specific region where all the subjects of the analyses were present. Our comparisons should be in locations where both Celts and non-Celts were present for identical durations for such comparative purposes. That location is the Indian Subcontinent in the era of British India, where region-specific units of the British Army were stationed in large numbers simultaneously for extended periods of time.

Hypotheses Regarding the Treatment of Indigenous People by Celtic, Gaelic and English Army Personnel in India

There are four hypotheses that might be proven by this study. These, simply stated, are

1. Catholic Irish and Scottish Highlander soldiers, were *more* empathetic and *less* abusive of natives in India than their English counterparts
2. Celtic/Gaelic soldiers were *less* empathic and *more* abusive of natives in India than their English counterparts, due to the role that Relative Deprivation/Relative Gratification Theory played in this situation, wherein a group feeling deprived, identifies another group lower on its totem pole, and experiences satisfaction in being better off than that group, sometimes leading to its taking actions to accent that superiority, and the concept of access to the construct of Whiteness as described in interdisciplinary studies of that phenomenon.[13]
3. There were no differences in the rates that these ethno-religious soldiers treated native Indians.
4. There are no relevant entries found.

Alan Skelley wrote that 'in the colonies' British redcoats 'were the leading edge of British civilization, and [they] left deep and lasting impressions upon those societies with which they came in contact.'[14] Richard Ross-Lewin, a Munster clergyman, rhymed of their role in the conquest of the Indian Subcontinent:

> To Celt & Scot & Saxon

[13] Davis, 'Theory of Relative Deprivation'; Stephen Middleton, David R. Roediger and Donald M. Shaffer (eds), *The Construction of Whiteness: An Interdisciplinary Analysis of Race Formation and the Meaning of White Identity* (Mississippi, 2006).

[14] Alan Skelley, *The Victorian Army at Home: The Recruitment and Terms and Conditions of the British Regular, 1859–1899* (London, 1977), 19.

> That Empire was decreed,
> 'Twas won by Irish soldiers
> Of the grand old fighting breed.[15]

How did Catholic Irish and Highland Scottish soldiers compare to their non-Celtic soldier-counterparts when they encountered Indigenes in colonial India? These soldiers were not permanent sojourners like the indentured servants, transported convicts, and settlers who usually left the British Isles for good. But the soldiers did spend several years there, and they interacted to one extent or another with those 'native' to the Subcontinent.

In 1878 Frank O'Donnell, a leader in Parnell's Home Rule organization, called for a 'coalition with the oppressed natives in India.' In February 1880 an Indian-owned newspaper, *Bengalee*, had expressed a more specific sensitivity: 'Between Ireland and India there ought to exist the closest relations of sympathy and mutual regard.'[16] Alfred Webb (treasurer of the Irish National League and ex–president of the Indian National Congress) articulated a standard for those in the Imperial service in India for Irish civil servants and military personnel bound for India in 1897:

> Heavy responsibility is laid upon us … Irishmen enter the army, are drafted to India, and draw Indian pay. Irishmen in civil life push their fortunes there. Irishmen compete in the Indian examinations, attain the highest positions of usefulness and honour, and retire to spend at home ample pensions drawn from Indian taxpayers … We could not barter the opportunity of influencing for good, in accordance with our various consciences, the future of Hindoostan.[17]

And in the same year that Webb offered his call to Irish deployed to India, a speaker at a 'Parnellite Convention' in Dublin went a bit further when he maintained that 'the Irish people … sympathized with the natives of India fighting against England, and … called for cheers for them.' It is not surprising that Englishman Robert Sterndale's novel *The Afghan Knife* (1879), about the

[15] Frank Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib* (London, 1928), 9.

[16] *Freeman's Journal*, 17 July 1897; Streets, *Martial Races*, 156, 160.

[17] Webb was quoted in *The Freemans' Journal*, 17 July 1897. The remarks of O'Donnell and the *Bengalee* are referred to in Howard Braisted, 'Indian Nationalist Sevelopment and the Influence of Irish Home Rule, 1870–1886', *Modern Asian Studies*, 14 (1980), 47; the speaker at the Parnellite convention is quoted in Streets, *Martial Races*, 156, 160.

threat to British control of the Subcontinent in the northwest, described a dangerous figure in the plot as 'a sort of Mahomedan Fenian.'[18]

Would soldiers in the six predominantly Catholic Irish regiments have been empathetic to the indigenous people of the Subcontinent? And what of their Highlander counterparts, also long suspected by English leaders due to that population's rebellious past? We can subject these questions to systematic analysis, testing these four hypotheses.

Testing the Conflicting Views: The British Army in India, 1878–1912

The test of these hypotheses utilizes court-martial records of British battalions stationed in India from 1878 to 1912. In 1879 Britain's Indian Army consisted of 60,341 British and 123,254 indigenous soldiers. Battalions of some forty-seven different British regiments, constituting most of the British in the Indian Army, were deployed from Britain to the Subcontinent throughout these decades: Six Irish, four Highlander, two Welsh, and thirty-two Lowland Scot and English regiments,[19] as well as three regiments (the Rifle Brigade, the

[18] Robert Sterndale, *The Afghan Knife* (London, 1879), I, 17.

[19] *Celtic Irish*: The Royal Dublin Fusiliers; the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers; the Royal Munster Fusiliers; the Royal Irish Rifles (83rd and 86th Foot); the Royal Irish Fusiliers ('The Faughs'); and the Connaught Rangers. There were many Celtic Irish in the 108th (Madras Infantry) regiment that merged with the 27th Inniskilling Foot in 1881 to form the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, but I checked for distinctive Catholic-Irish surnames when the accused belonged to that regiment to try to verify his ethnicity. Similarly, the Royal Irish Rifles as such, as it was comprised of men from the counties of Antrim, Down and Louth, with elements from Dublin and drew upon many Scotch-Irish as well as Catholic Irish; hence I have counted only those with distinctive Catholic-Irish surnames in this comparison with English soldiers.
Highlander: The Black Watch; the Gordon Highlanders; the Seaford Highlanders; and the Argyll & Sutherland Highlanders. (I have not included the King's Own Scottish Borderers; the Royal Scots Fusiliers; the Highland Light Infantry; or the Scottish Rifles in this analysis, as units of several were originally created to contain or combat Highlanders and all were recruited chiefly from Lowland Scots.)
Welsh: The Royal Welsh Fusiliers and the South Wales Borderers.
English/Lowland Scot: The Worcestershire; the Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry; the Royal Sussex; the Essexshire; the East Lancashire; the North Lancashire; the King's Shropshire Light Infantry; the Yorkshire; the East Yorkshire; the West Yorkshire; the Bedfordshire; the Northumberland; the Middlesex; the Royal West Kent; the South Staffordshire; the Norfolkshire; the Cheshire; the Manchester; the Dorsetshire; the Derbyshire; the Oxford Light Infantry; the Wiltshire; the East Surrey; the East Suffolk; the Durhamshire; the Berkshire; the Cambridgeshire; the Liverpool; the Glostershire; the King's Royal Rifle Corps (later renamed the Green Jackets); the Border Regiment (comprised of the former Cumberland & Westmoreland regiments); the York and Lancaster regiment; and the 7th Royal Fusiliers (later City of London regiment); as well as the aforementioned Highland

Royal Regiment of Artillery and the Royal Horse Artillery) comprised of men recruited from throughout the British Isles.

Those personnel detected in the act of ill-treating 'natives' in a manner violating Army regulations were subjected to disciplinary action. Such measures resulted in well over 400 District Courts-Martial trials and several General Courts-Martial in the various posts throughout the Subcontinent where Army regimental units were stationed in the years from 1878 to 1912. The names and ratings of such defendants, their units and unit locations, the offense(s) under which they were tried, and the court's decisions, were recorded chronologically in large volumes by the British Army Judge Advocate General's clerks, and are held in the National Archives at Kew, as War Office Record Groups WO 88/1-5 (District Courts-Martial, 1878–1897), and WO 90/7 (General Courts-Martial, 1879–1920).[20]

These records prove to be the most complete and, fortuitously, the most appropriate ones available to answer the questions posed here. They also cover ideal years for the sort of analysis required, inasmuch as they occurred after the adoption of the reforms secured by Secretaries of State for War Edward Cardwell and Hugh Childers. Cardwell secured legislation in 1872 reducing the duration of service for regimental service in colonial posts *outside* of India, thus increasing the future numbers and duration of units *within* India. Childers adopted Cardwell's plan to merge regular regiments with home volunteer and militia units, basing them, and localizing their recruiting to their home counties. Under this localization scheme, England was divided into sixty-six Regimental Districts, based on county boundaries and population density. The county militia battalions of the district were linked to these regular infantry regiments, which were comprised of two battalions sharing a depot and associated recruiting area, with one remaining in the British Isles to recruit and train; the other (numbering about 800 rank and file personnel) was deployed overseas.[21] In 1881 the War Office began localized recruitment

Light Infantry; the Scottish Rifles; and the Royal Scots Fusiliers. Arthur Swinson (ed.) *A Register of the Regiments and Corps of the British Army* (London, 1972) 189, 203, 204, 210.

[20] The vast majority of the five volumes (WO 88/1–5) of courts-martial (approximately 23,000) were District Courts-Martial in India (a few in Rangoon) from 1878 through 1897. A separate volume of General Courts-Martial (WO 90/7) contained a much smaller number of recorded charges against British Army officers and men in the Subcontinent from 1877 to 1914 (as well as about eighty additional General Courts-martial charges from 1917 to 1920 for men in units in the Middle East).

[21] E. M. Spiers, *The Army and Society, 1815–1914* (London, 1980), 180–9; Swinson, *Register of the Regiments*, xl–xli.) Some regiments that saw frequent service in India

advertising in high circulation newspapers. Seventy-five of these papers were provincial English ones, twenty-five Scottish, twenty-seven Irish and ten Welsh.[22]

The Irish, Welsh, and Highlander regiments were already essentially 'localized' for our purposes; the Cardwell reforms meant that most of the English regiments would have many such 'local' characteristics too. This increased the likelihood in the years covered in this analysis that the men belonging to the battalions deployed in India who were charged with 'assaulting (or 'stealing') from 'a native' had a significant likelihood of being either Celtic Irish, Scottish Highlander, Welsh, or English depending on the regiment they were affiliated with.[23]

By the 1850s the quality of the East India Company's army officers had declined; their treatment of their indigenous troops was uneven. Consequently, after the suppression of the Indian Mutiny of 1857-8, the EIC forces were transferred and amalgamated with existing British units under British command. Military personnel abusing 'natives' was not as tolerated in the Army as it had been under the EIC, or was to be in the late nineteenth century in the Crown's Indian courts. And in this same time period, British military courts imposed heavier punishments for interracial attacks than did its civilian courts in colonial India.[24]

---

may have been linked often enough in an Indian community to form enough of an attachment to it to warrant later recognition of one kind or another. For example, for some time the 13th (1st Somersetshire Prince Albert's Light Infantry) Regiment of Foot had been stationed in Jellalabad, India. When that regiment was made one of the 66 localized such English regiments in 1878, its new home in Taunton, built between 1879 and 1881, was given the name Jellalabad Barracks.

[22] Streets, *Martial Races*, 103, 106–08.

[23] Alan Skelley's compilations of the rosters of regiments located in Scotland in these years detected a number of men not as clearly recruited from these locales, some from the very regions I sought to distinguish from my two comparative populations. So I checked the surname of the accused against the battalion he belonged to in the WO Courts-Martial records. Skelley, *The Victorian Army at Home*, 329–33. The 'localization' of recruiting in England was not a perfect indication of a recruit's regional residence, in part due to the merger of English units from different areas, and in part due to fact that the initial disproportionate number of barracks were located in the South of England, while many recruits came from the more industrial center. See Brian Bond, 'The Effect of the Cardwell Reforms in Army Organization, 1874–1904', *Royal United Services Institution Journal*, 515–24; Keegan, 'British Regimental Organization' in Swinson (ed.), *Register of the Regiments*, xlix, 1. But this would not significantly matter with regard to the recruit's ethnic membership so long as his surname was not clearly of a Celtic/Gael character.

[24] Jordanna Bailkin, 'The Boot and the Spleen: When was Murder Possible in British

So it is not surprising that 424 soldiers in British Army battalions were charged with crimes of assaulting or stealing from 'natives' in these years.[25] There is also evidence that this reduced officer mistreatment of indigenous soldiers: Captain I. Monay Simons, serving in the 24th Bengal Light Infantry, was tried by General Court-Martial and Reprimanded in 1881 for 'having a Sepoy flogged without sufficient authority on his posterior instead of his back, thus disgracing him in the eyes of his comrades.'[26]

In some thirty-one cases involving soldier assaults upon or thefts from 'natives' the court returned 'not guilty' verdicts – over 8 per cent of *all* such types of courts-martial detected. This was a slightly higher rate than those involving *non*-Indigenous-related charges. Both this fact, and the relatively low percentage of charges involving ill treatment of those referred to in the records as 'natives,' (only about 2 per cent of all such offenses charged in these records) can be explained: Most of the charges against soldiers in India involved issues of military discipline, most of them occurring within the confines of army barracks. These included such things as 'failure to report for parade', 'feigning disease', 'creating a disturbance in the barracks' (often accompanied by the charge 'drunk'), 'theft from a comrade', assaulting a comrade', 'insubordination', 'insolent language to a superior', 'refusal to obey order', 'asleep on sentry duty', 'absence from duty', 'desertion', 'theft from regimental funds', 'escaping confinement', 'losing/selling/damaging one's rifle/equipment', 'embezzlement', and 'attempting suicide.'

The propensity of such on-the-post charges and the infrequency of off-post ones against 'natives' are understandable. As Alan Skelley observed of this Victorian Army, 'the potential for enforcement [of military laws] in the army was greater [than it would have been in the civilian world outside of the domain of military discipline] since every soldier movement was monitored by his superiors and powers of arrest were formidable … Logically, therefore, for many [on-base] disciplinary offenses there is no possibility of unreported crime.'[27] Ian Stuart Kelly made the same point with regard to the Highland regiments when he noted that their officers exercised 'controls over their men which civilian employers or authorities never could.'[28]

India?' *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 48 (2006), 464.

[25] Nile Green, *Islam and the Army of Colonial India* (Cambridge, 2009), 101, 140–3; E. M. Spiers, 'The Late Victorian Army, 1868–1914' in Ian Beckett and David G. Chandler (eds), *The Oxford Illustrated History of the British Army* (Oxford, 1994), 192.

[26] WO 90/7,10, January 1881.

[27] Skelley, *The Victorian Army at Home*, 103

[28] Ian Stuart Kelly, *Echoes of Success: Identity and the Highland Regiments* (Leiden, 2015),

In this analysis of charges leveled in India, an additional complicating element would have been present – the possible inability of the victims and witnesses to speak or write in English, and the possible inadequacy of good translators to be utilized throughout the Subcontinent. This would have led to fewer actual courts-martial, as well as the slightly higher percentage of acquittals involving offenses against 'natives.' However this did not necessarily skew the results presented here which are based on the ethnic identity of the assailant as this propensity towards the innocent verdict would be relatively evenly distributed across all the surveyed court cases.

There were forty-four area-specific battalions of the British Army that saw service on the Subcontinent in these late nineteenth-century decades: ten Celtic Irish and Highlander; two Welsh; and thirty-two English and Lowland Scots. Put in percentages, some 22.7 per cent of these units were Celtic Irish or Highlander, 4.5 per cent were Welsh, and 72.7 per cent were English or Lowland Scots. (See Table 1)

Between 1876 and 1898 figures from the General Annual Returns of the British Army indicate that the percentage of 'Roman Catholics' in the Army averaged 19.5 per cent of all personnel, the percentage of 'Irish' averaged 16.5 per cent, those of 'Scots' 8.1 per cent, and those of 'English,' 74.2 per cent. Since some 'Roman Catholic' soldiers were Highlanders or English, some 'Irish' soldiers were not Catholics, and some Scots in Highland regiments were not Highlanders, I estimated that the percentage of Celtic Irish and Highlanders in the Army in these years was somewhere between 21 and 23 per cent of the Army; those who were non-Catholic Lowland Scots or non-Catholic Scots-Irish or English to be about 76-78 per cent [29] (See Tables

103. See also Table 4.3 at ibid., 112, on 'Major crimes within Highland battalions, 1882, 1898, 1904, showing 'on-duty' related offenses like absence-without-leave, drunkenness on duty, fraud, and insubordination, to have constituted all but about 6 per cent of all courts-martials, leaving only 'theft' (many of which would have occurred 'in barracks,' as were clearly many 'theft' offenses I noticed in my analysis of the CM records utilized).

[29] Skelley, *The Victorian Army at Home*, 315; *General Annual Return of the British Army for the Year 1889: Parliamentary Papers: 1890*, XLIII (Accounts and Papers), Vol. 1111), 84, 115.

Religions of the Groups: The westernmost parts of the Highlands had been proselytized by Catholic priests from Ireland in the seventeenth century, and Highland priests were trained in the eighteenth century. The Established Presbyterian Church in Scotland did not support the Highlander cause during 'the Forty-Five,' and lost what little it had acquired by then of Highland parishioners. But itinerant evangelical missionaries regained many of those losses in the early 19th century. See D. Canon MacLean, 'Catholicism in the Highlands and Isles, 1560–1680', *Innes Review*, 3 (1952),

2 & 3) The rest were Welsh, whom I am treating as a separate group from the two main subject populations, both because their numbers are small, and as that ethic group had not suffered in the same centuries as had the Catholic Irish and Highland Scots. And by the nineteenth century, the Welsh were overwhelmingly Methodists.

The 'Highland' regiments by the mid-ninteenth century had inadequate volunteers from their traditional recruiting region, but by the early 1880s, the public praise of their unit's performances in the Subcontinent wars by the Commander-in-Chief of her Majesty's army in India, Sir Frederick Roberts, led to a rise in recruiting successes. As one observer noted in the 1880s: 'there is a mighty strength-giving power in the traditions of a crack regiment … which must never be dishonoured … On every recruit who joins a Highland regiment is thrown the honour of the corps.'[30] Volunteer for a fabled regiment; adopt the traditions and mannerisms of that regiment.

In March 1903 the Indian newspaper *Hitavadi* complained of the treatment of subcontinent Indigenes by British soldiers: 'Will no steps be taken to protect the people of this country from these brute-like European soldiers?' Lord Curzon, the British Governor-General of India, agreed, writing to Secretary of State George Hamilton in February 1904: 'You can scarcely imagine what a terror the British soldier has made of himself to natives, both in the neighborhood of cantonments and when on the march …'[31] John Pearman, a veteran of thirteen years of service in India in the King's Own Light Dragoons, later observed 'India was to the White man a free Country we Could go where we liked no Trespass out there.'[32] Those who felt this way may have regarded themselves as armed with a kind of license to act in ways they would not have regarded as acceptable in the British Isles. And so it was, and had been for

5–13; Mary McHugh, 'The Religious Condition of the Highlands and Islands in the Mid-Eighteenth Century', *Innes Review*, 35 (1984), 12–20; Christine Johnson, *Developments in the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland*, 1789–1829 (Edinburgh, 1983); George Robb, 'Popular Religion and the Christianization of the Scottish Highlands in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', *The Journal of Religious History*, 16 (1990), 18–34.

30 James Cromb, *The Highland Brigade: Its Battles and Its Heroes* (1886), 137–45; Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983); Matthew P. Dziennik, *The Fatal Land: War, Empire, and the Highland Soldier in British America* (New Haven, 2015).

31 Elizabeth Kolsky, 'The Colonial Rule of Law and the Legal Regime of Exception: Frontier "Fanaticism" and State Violence in Colonial India', *American Historical Review*, 120 (2015), 199.

32 Carolyn Steedman, *The Radical Soldier's Tale: John Pearman, 1819–1908* (London 1988), 208–9

some time: Some 424 men belonging to one or another of these forty-seven battalions in the years from 1878 to the early twentieth century were charged with offenses against natives – 268 charged with assaulting natives; fifty-three charged with both assaulting and robbing natives; and 103 charged solely with stealing from or destroying a native's property.

If 'the native'[33] was 'assaulted', he/she was 'forcibly' or 'violently' robbed, 'maliciously wounded', or 'ill-treated', at times by 'kicking',[34] 'throwing a boot' at him, hitting her 'with a stone', 'inciting a dog to bite' him, 'beating him with a stick', 'firing at him with a rifle', 'striking him with a fork', 'indecently assaulting',[35] 'feloniously killing', or 'committing rape upon' a native girl or woman. In two instances soldiers were charged with 'standing in' or 'striding down' a public road 'with drawn sword, using threatening language', and the implication was that those being threatened were 'natives.'[36] In some seventeen of these theft or assault charges the accused was also charged with having been 'drunk'.

A further distinction: Several long-established British regular regiments were the ones whose battalions were deployed in combat-related crises in in these decades. For example, four Cavalry units (the 9th Queen's Royal Lancers;[37] the 19th Prince of Wales' Own Hussars; the 6th Inniskilling Dragoons; and the 5th Royal Irish Lancers) were present in India in 1878-9 solely to fight in the 2nd

---

[33] The 'native' was sometimes more specifically identified further as a Parsee, Sikh, hamildar (native police inspector), havildar or sepoy (terms for Indian soldiers), sukha (cook), coolie, servant, shopkeeper, policeman, constable, soldier, driver, baker, sweeper, hawker, bearer, woman, girl, boy, or railway worker.

[34] Bailkin, 'The Boot and the Spleen', 462–93

[35] WO/88/3/1893, J. Proctor, West Yorkshires; WO/2/1886, J. Priestley, West Riding; WO88/2/1887, S. Shandley, Middlesex; WO88/4/1896,W. Nightingale, Shropshire L I. (All from English battalions.)

[36] The charge of 'inciting a dog to bite him' against Private Thomas Conner of the Seaforth Highlanders, in 1887, National Archives, WO 88/2, 44. The sole charge of having killed a native was against Private Joseph Bowen, of the King's Own Borderers, 16 Jan. 1882, in Umballa. WO 90/7. The sole rape charge of a 'native woman' detected was leveled against Private William Sullivan of the Royal Scots in 1880, in Secunderabad. WO 88/1, p. 106. Those charged with having drawn a sword and threatened 'natives' were Bugler Michael Ray, Somerset Light Infantry, 1883, WO 88/1, 239; and Piper John Lawrie, 25th Foot (King's Own Scottish Borderers), 1880, WO 88/1, 88.

[37] This was the regiment, some of whose men were later accused in 1902 of having severely beaten its Indian cook, causing his death. Lord Curzon, Governor-General, treated the 9th Lancers punitively for the unit's having collectively dismissed the criminality of the act. Michael Edwardes, *High Noon of Empire: India under Curzon* (London, 1965), 178; Bailkin, 'The Boot and the Spleen', 484–5.

Anglo-Afghan War (1878-80). For the most part, these units were soon withdrawn thereafter and consequently contributed only one accused personnel to the numbers in this analysis. The battalions whose members were charged with crimes against Indigines were those stationed in safer roles. They were less 'seasoned' than the older regiments and could best be deployed abroad as garrison forces in the more placid areas of the Subcontinent.[38] Those stationed units closer to the potential combat zone in that era, eleven on the Afghan frontier at the Khyber Pass (at Peshawar), and one within the frontier itself during the 2nd Afghan War (at Jellalabad) accounted for only twelve of the 424 charges made against British soldiers in these decades, less than 3 per cent of the total.

Comparisons Controlling for Durations of Stay

In order to compare properly these courts-martial charges against Celtic and non-Celtic individuals in battalions some of which had been stationed in the Subcontinent at different periods of time, the data needs to correlate to the duration of each battalion's stay.[39] Three of the non-Celtic regiments deployed battalions were assigned to India for over twenty years: The King's Own Scottish Borderers; The Bedfordshires; and The Somersetshires. Several other regiments deployed battalions for over ten years: The Connaught Rangers; The Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers; The King's Own Liverpool; The Cheshires; The Duke of Cambridge's Own Middlesex; The Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry; The Durham Light Infantry; and The York and Lancasters.[40] The results of the average duration-of-stay in the Subcontinent of the various ethnic battalions appear in Table 4**.** In as much as English units served for somewhat longer periods of time per capita than Celtic ones, the Celtic offenses against 'natives' are weighted proportionately (by about 13 per cent) in any comparisons to the non-Celtic ones.

There were 327 men in the 'localized' battalions that I was reasonably confident in identifying as either Celtic/Gael or otherwise. Some 110 (36 per

---

[38] The sources drawn on here are Swinson's *Register of the Regiments*; the annual courts–martial records themselves; websites of the various regimental museums, and their Wikipedia websites.

[39] Among the sources of such information were Swinson's *Register of the Regiments*; the annual courts-martial records themselves; the websites of the various regimental museums, and their Wikipedia websites.

[40] The website of the South Wales Borderers explains with regard to the 1st battalion's deployment in India in the late nineteenth century, 'as with most British battalions posted to India, it was a lengthy stay.'

cent of the total) were attached to one or another of the ten Celtic Irish and Highlander units in India, charged with crimes of assaulting or stealing from 'a native.' Some 10½ individuals[41] (3.4 per cent of the total) belonged to the two Welsh battalions, and the final 187 (61 per cent of the total) so charged belonged to the thirty English or two Lowland Scots battalions (see Table 5). These forty-four battalions had distinctly localized recruiting areas, but men attached to battalions of the Rifle Brigade, the Royal Horse Artillery, and the Royal Artillery were drawn from throughout the British Isles. As ninety-six men from these units were court-martialed for 'assaults on natives' or 'theft from natives', comparisons between those whose surnames suggested either Celtic or English heritage can provide a rough check on our larger comparative analysis of the regiments with distinctly localized populations. Of those whose ethnicity could be identified, thirty-one accused men in the three artillery and rifle brigades (33 per cent of the total) had Celtic Irish or Highlander

[41] Some charges were ambiguous: How was one to interpret the several charges of 'housebreaking', 'burglary', 'stealing from a dwelling', 'theft from a merchant', or 'robbery with violence' without the additional term 'of a native?' Most of the locations where these units were stationed and the man's offense recorded were towns or cities: Agra, Allalabad (also recorded as Allahmabad), Bangalore, Barrackpore, Benares, Bareilly, Baroda, Bombay, Cawnpore, Candahar, Chakrata, Cherat, Calcutta, Decca, Dehli, Deesa, Dinapore, Dum Dum (near Calcutta), Ferozepore, Fyzabad, Ghansi, Intagh, Jalandhar, Jubbulpore, Jullundur, Jellalabad, Kailaina, Karachi (also recorded as Kurrachee), Kirkee, Kuldara (also recorded as Kuldana), Kamplice, Ludhiana, Lucknow, Madras, Meerat, Mooltan, Mandalay, Mhow, Murnee, Nasirabad, Nowgong, Pondicherry, Peshawar, Quetta, Ranikhet, Rangoon, Rawalpindi, Rookee, Rutlam, Satara, Serinagapatan, Sialkot, Subatha, Secunderabad, Sitapura, and Umballa. Soldiers may have had occasion to 'break and enter' shops or homes of 'natives' in such cities and towns, whereas they would not have been likely to do so if stationed in Army cantonments, or hill fortifications where other units were located (such as at Belgaum, Bellary, Cheral, Simla, Solan, Dagshai, Sabathina, Fort St Thomas, Ft Mount, Ft Attack, Camp Malakand, Kamptee, Khyra Gully, Kohat, Murree, Nowshera, Poona, Subathu, and Thayetmyo). I gave half-point weight to ambiguous charges like these in town and cities, but no weight to those recorded as having occurred in Army cantonments, or garrison fortifications. One useful source on these differences in battalion locations is Diana M. Henderson, *Highland Soldier: A Social Study of Highland Regiments, 1820-1920* (Edinburgh, 1989), 183–9. Similarly, I discounted (counting them as ½) the sixteen instances where I was less than certain of whether the offense of 'housebreaking' or 'burglary' had targeted on a 'native.' And when the individual charged was a Celtic soldiers, or a Scots-Irish or Lowland Scot with a surname that could be mistaken as Celtic (a question I faced when coding men belonging to one of the three regiments not 'localized' in the British Isles), I coded such individuals charged with either assaulting or stealing from a 'native,' with only a 'one-half' weight. I half-weighted thirty of those as 'Celtic,' five as 'Welsh,' and fifty-six as 'English.

surnames; four (4.5 per cent of the total) had Welsh surnames; and fifty-eight (62.5 per cent of the total) had English surnames. To compare these two ethnically identifiable and 'British-Isles-wide populations I produced a common denominator for the figures derived from the ethnically-identified offenses data. When we compare 109.5/10 and 184/32, we convert the former: to 350.4/32 versus 184/32, and then to calculate the ratio of the two numerator-offenses: 350.4/184 or 1.9.

The next step was to produce a similar common denominator for the Celtic and English surname offense data in the three British-wide battalions (33/22 per cent Celtic versus 62.5/76 per cent English, which becomes 75.9/76 versus 62.5/76, a difference of 75.9/62.5, or 1.214). Blending the two results, a 90 per cent difference in the forty-two ethnically-identified battalions and 21.4 per cent difference in the three British-wide ones (or 90/42 compared to 21.4/3, the former being fourteen times larger than as the latter), we find that Celts were overrepresented in the offenses against 'natives' data by 85.4 per cent (90 x 42 = 3780, 21.4 x 3 = 64.2; the sum of these two numerators (3844.2), divided by the total-battalions denominator (45).

The percentage of Catholic Irish and Highland Scottish belonging to both the forty-four battalions distinctly identified by specific regions of the British Isles and the three Artillery and Rifle Brigade units, accused of assaulting or stealing from 'native' inhabitants of the Subcontinent, can be seen to have been *larger* (by about 85 per cent) than the presence of these groups in the Army units in India throughout the years studied would predict. And when we weight these data by the average time each ethnic group's battalions spent in India, the margin between the Celtic offenses and the non-Celtic ones is widened by another 13 per cent, to nearly 100 per cent.

Could the officers of the distinctly Catholic-Irish and Scottish Highlander battalions have been more inclined to charge their men with such crimes than officers in distinctly English battalions? Such suspicions regarding the officers of these units would face contrary evidence provided in two studies (of the relationship between Highlander and Irish officers commanding Catholic Irish and their men) on this question. And most charges were made, not by their regimental officers, but by provost-marshal officers acting on the reports of their members in the field.[42]

Thus the *second* hypothesis clearly fits the data – *Celtic soldiers were more abusive towards the Indigenous people of the Subcontinent than were English (and Lowland*

[42] Diana M. Henderson, *Highland Soldier: A Social Study of the Highland Regiments, 1820–1920* (Edinburgh, 1989), 270–1; Karsten, 'Irish Soldiers in the British Army', 44–7.

Scot) soldiers. This seeming anomaly is virtually unmentioned as a likely possibility in the literature on this subject.[43]

Explanations in the Domain of Social Psychology

How might we account for these findings? Studies of those subjected to significant physical punishment as children indicate that they were prone to subjecting animals to cruelty, and, in adulthood, to committing violent acts and subjecting their own children to such corporal punishment.[44] Those who regard the ill treatment meted out to Celtic/Gaelic populations by the English and by United Kingdom governments as grounds for expecting Celtic/Gaelic empathy with Indigenes suffering similar treatment will find no support for such a hypothesis in these particular social science findings.

But our other concept is more likely: Relative Deprivation. Davis describes a variant of 'relative deprivation' – 'relative gratification' – the feeling that one in a preferred category possesses with regard to one in a non-preferred category, and feels 'relative superiority' toward those in that non-preferred category. Such a group identifies another group lower on its totem pole, and experiences satisfaction in being better off than that group, sometimes leading to it taking actions to accent that superiority.[45] Irish and Highlander soldiers in India felt themselves to be both 'British' and 'White.' This may well have empowered them to feel superior to the 'natives' in the empire.

Colin Calloway has described the tradition of Englishmen to refuse to treat Highlanders as 'white,' and Geoffrey Plank notes that Georgia's Proprietor James Oglethorpe 'declined to count' his Highland immigrants to Georgia in the 1730s as 'white people.' This may have prompted these Highlanders in Oglethorpe's Georgia in 1739 to craft a petition in supporting the continuation of the Proprietor's ban on the introduction of African slaves in the colony. It read: 'We are laborious and know a white man may be, by the year, more usefully employed than a Negro.'[46]

---

[43] But, again, Ann McGrath is an exception, as noted in footnote four above.

[44] C. P. Flynn, 'Exploring the Link between Corporal Punishment and Children's Cruelty to Animals', *The Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61 (1999), 971-81; Robin Malinosky-Rummel, and David J. Hansen, 'Long-term Consequences of Childhood Physical Abuse', *Psychological Bulletin*, 114 (1993), 68-79.

[45] Davis, 'The Theory of Relative Deprivation'.

[46] Calloway, *White People, Indians and Highlanders*; Geoffrey Plank, 'Deploying Tribes and Clans: Mohawks in Nova Scotia and Scottish Highlanders in Georgia' in Wayne Lee (ed.), *Empires and Indigenes: Intercultural Alliance, Imperial Expansion, and Warfare in the Early Modern World* (New York, 2011), 221–50.

Similarly, Irish immigrants in antebellum America often despised and abused blacks.[47] Two British visitors (in 1843 and 1865) noted: 'the poorer class of Irish immigrants are greater enemies of the negro population…than any [other] portion … of the free states.'[48] Many Irish immigrants who arrived as a consequence of the potato famine of the late 1840s found little more than poor housing and servile employment in lower-class areas of eastern cities. But many felt empowered by being treated as fellow 'whites' by the vote-hungry Democratic Party. And they recognized that the free black population lacked such empowerment to withstand discrimination and abuse.

When Protestant weavers took actions to remove Irish Catholics from handloom jobs in Philadelphia, the Irish took no violent measures to retaliate. Instead they attacked black workers infiltrating the Irish dockworkers' domain there. Irish workers acted and organized themselves in ways that eventually made them acceptable to other white workers. Their Longshoremen's United Benevolent Society in New York, formed in 1852, reached out to other white longshoremen by proclaiming that 'work upon the docks … shall be attended to solely and absolutely by members of the 'Longshoremen's Association,' and such white laborers as they see fit to permit upon the premises.' The banner

---

[47] David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (Brooklyn, 1991), 133-63; Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York, 1995). Blacks were not indigenous to America, but were there before Irish immigrants began arriving in significant numbers in the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth centuries. Hence their interactions with Irish immigrants are relevant to a Relative Depravation explanation. Also relevant is how the lynching of blacks in the South rose in the late nineteenth century in the cotton-producing regions. Stewart Tolnay and E. M. Beck hypothesized a number of explanations for this phenomenon, and found that this propensity for murderous violence was particularly prominent during periods of 'worsening economic conditions for poor whites' in those regions: Blacks in the cotton producing areas experienced less economic losses than poor whites. Farm ownership for whites declined at a 'more precipitous' rate than that for black ownership in these years, leading to 'some erosion in the apparent status of being white.' As they put it, 'white landlessness and mob violence directed towards blacks' were linked. A 'decline in the relative position of southern whites and the narrowing of the racial gap … created conditions where some whites competed more directly with blacks … Every time white mobs were able to kill offending blacks with impunity … reinforced the dominance of the white caste … thus emphasizing the status differences.' Stewart E. Tolnay and E. M. Beck, *A Festival of Violence: An Analysis of Southern Lynchings, 1882–1930* (Urbana, 1995), 120–4, 151, 153, 156–7. For a good example of the Relative Deprivation theory in a single lynching, see Durward Pruden, 'A Sociological Study of a Texas Lynching', *Studies in Sociology*, 1 (1936), 3–9.

[48] John R. Commons (ed.), *A Documentary History of American Industrial Society* (New York, 1958), VII, 60; Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness*, 135–6.

of this Society displayed the symbols of Ireland and seven European nations beneath the flag of the United States and the word 'Unity.'[49]

A literary sort of 'confirmation' of these findings can be found in 'The Mutiny of the Mavericks,'[50] a short story probably penned in 1889 or 1890 by Rudyard Kipling, the British author who lived and wrote in Bombay in the 1880s.[51] The story concerns the effort of a Fenian cell in New York to place one of their members, 'Mulcahy,' in 'The Mavericks,' an Irish regiment in India (which may resemble the Connaught Rangers). 'Mulcahy,' was to foment a rising by this unit against their British superiors and persuade them to the aid the Indian Indigenes. His 'Maverick' comrades played along with him, in as much as he was regularly plying them with beer, but privately they mocked his efforts to get them to attack their admired Anglo-Irish and English superiors, and to assist the Indigenes, whom Kipling clearly indicates his 'Mavericks' looked upon with contempt, using very derogatory language.[52]

A final piece of evidence: Consider the remarks of Frank Richards, a soldier whose unit of the Welch Fusiliers had been garrisoned near the Celtic Connaught Rangers in 1920. Richards noted that the Rangers had become 'notorious for their attitude towards the Indian population.' When the Rangers 'arrived at a new station they soon expounded their views of the race-question,' and 'by the time they left, there were not many natives around that place who even thought privately that they were the equals of white men … They used their boots and fists to such purpose that they were more respected and feared by the natives than any other British unit in India.' He did add that 'every British unit I came across ... handled the natives in the same [racist] manner,' but were 'perhaps not as brutal' as the Rangers.'[53] Richards' remarks would count for little by themselves, but they certainly align with the findings presented here.

Japanese peasantry in their nation's Army: But the closest relevant

---

[49] Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 110–11.

[50] Rudyard Kipling, 'Mutiny of the Mavericks,' in *Mine Own People* (New York, 1891), 95-130.

[51] Kipling was born in Bombay in 1865. He was sent to England for his education at the age of six, but returned to Bombay in 1882 and wrote for the *Civil & Military Gazette*. He left India in 1889.

[52] Kipling, 'Mutiny of the Mavericks,' 106, 120.

[53] Richards, *Old Solider*, 142–3. See also Thomas Bartlett, 'The Irish Soldier in India,' in Michael Holmes and Denis Holmes (eds), *Ireland and India: Connections, Comparisons, Contrasts* (Dublin, 1997), 322, and Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600–1850* (New York, 2002), 344, for similar critiques of the Rangers who struck out 'physically, verbally, or only in their minds at those they presumed to call 'natives'.

comparison to our British soldiers on the Subcontinent of India in the late 19th and early 20th centuries involves the behavior of conscripted Japanese peasants in the Russo-Japanese War, 1904-05. These peasants were new to this samurai-led army and appreciated their lower-caste status within it. But they were trained by their samurai officers to embrace samurai bushido values [54]of self-sacrifice and devotion to the Emperor and "the people." This appeared to have empowered them to behave with brutality toward those Japanese regarded as inferior "Others," evident in their abusing prostitutes and "sometimes drawing swords on people," as well as their contempt for their peasant counterparts in Korea and Manchuria. These Japanese peasant subaltern segments of the imperial army in the Far East were doing almost simultaneously what their White counterparts were doing in the Subcontinent. White imperialists were thus not alone in such behavior. As the leading historian of this Japanese subaltern phenomenon put it (Shimazu, 2009, p. 332):

The soldiers' preoccupation with wanting to exaggerate differences between themselves, as Japanese, and the Chinese and Koreans as the "Other," was symptomatic of their sense of superiority, whilst as the same time betraying their insecurity, having to fight and fend for themselves in the 'hostile environment' as a visible minority.

Conclusion

First: Relative Gratification may have been what was at play in the actions of Celtic/Gaelic soldiers on the Subcontinent in the late nineteenth century. And the evidence of the attitudes and behavior of colonial Georgia Highlander and antebellum American Irish in the presence of 'the Other' fit with that concept and offer supports to this interpretation of the Celtic/Gaelic soldiers' treatment of 'native' Indians.

Second: theoretically, one would want to ask if these same Celtic/Gaelic soldiers in India would have behaved differently than English ones towards the Aborigines while serving in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Australia. But the only regiment serving in Australia, the 4th Foot, deployed in New South Wales, Van Diemen's Land and Victoria, was comprised overwhelmingly of English soldiers. Moreover, that single regiment would not provide

[54] The contemporary Japanese scholar-diplomat Nitobe Inazo (1862–1933) described the bushido code as encompassing Righteousness, Heroic Courage, Benevolence, Compassion, Respect, Honesty, and Honor in Bushido: The Soul of Japan (1900). If all of these were taught to these peasant conscripts, it seems clear that their message was only partially pursued by them.

us with anything like the mistreatment numbers for comparisons to be made to those detected in the Indian Subcontinent, which, after all, was the single largest location of deployed British Army personnel at any time in the nineteenth century. Similarly, British Army units deployed in North America, Africa and New Zealand were largely utilized in combat with aggressive indigenous forces, not in garrison service in peaceful towns and cities where the kinds of offenses against non-combatant Indigenes by the subjects of this study occurred.

Third: others may wish to make similar comparisons of Celtic and English colonial governors over specific time periods. However, those Catholic Irish and Scottish Highlanders who were appointed as colonial governors would not have experienced the same sense of deprivation as had Irish and Highlander tenants and landless laborers, some of whom thereupon became soldiers, indentured servants, or transported convicts. Hence comparisons of any of those populations with British Imperial Governors would suffer from a lack of mutuality.[55] Similarly, many of those Highlanders who immigrated to the Antipodes with capital and created profitable sheep stations at the expense of Aborigines, were members or descendants of those who had populated the Highlands with Cheviot sheep at the expense of the displaced tenants, some of whom thereupon turned to the Army for their livelihoods. The treatment of the Indigenes by these migrant Highlander sheep station owners was thus not likely to have been due to the same impulses as had motivated these temporarily sojourning soldiers in the Subcontinent. But one might find results similar to this one in comparisons of Celtic and English indentured servants or transported convicts. Like those who volunteered to be British soldiers, such men and women included many landless agricultural laborers and unskilled or semi-skilled workers.[56] These populations might well have treated Indigenes in ways similar to those of the soldiers in the Subcontinent.

---

[55] Thus while Andrew Mackillop ventured the hunch that 'Scots differed little, if at all, from their British colleagues in their willingness to associate with [subcontinent] Indians,' his focus was on those in India as East India officials or factors for British firms, rather than those in the ranks of the late 19th century Highlander army units. The findings reported in this study may differ from those of Mackillop but should not be read as in conflict with his. Andrew Mackillop, 'Europeans, Britons, and Scots: Scottish Sojourning Networks and Identities in Asia, c. 1700–1815' in Angela MacCarthy (ed.), *A Global Clan: Scottish Migrant Networks and Identities since the Eighteenth Century* (London, 2006), 24.

[56] Karsten, 'Irish Soldiers in the British Army', 39–47.

Table 1
Nos. (%) of Irish, Highlander, Welsh & English Battalions in India, 1878–98

Irish	Highlander	Welsh	Lowland Scot/English	British-Wide
6 (12.75 %)	4 (8.5%)	2 (4.25%)	32 (68.4%)	3 (6.4%)

Table 2
Overall British Army Religious and Ethnic Averages, 1876–1898

"Roman Catholics"	"Irish"	"Scots"	"English"
19.5%	16.5%	8.1%	74.2%

Table 3
Estimated Celtic Irish, Highlander, Welsh, & Other Percentages in the Army

Celtic Irish/Highlander	Welsh	English/Scots-Irish/Lowland Scots
21–23%	1–2%	76–7

Table 4
Average Duration of Stay in Subcontinent of Ethnic Battalions

10 Celtic Irish/Highlander	2 Welsh	32 English/Lowland Scot/Scots-Irish
Total years (average)	Total years (average)	Total years (average)
41 (6.8)	17 (8.4)	282 (7.9)

Table 5
Nos. (%) of Ethnically Identified Charged with Offenses Against "Natives"

Celtic Irish/Highlander	Welsh	Scots-Irish/ English
110 (36%)	10½ (3.4%)	187 (61%)