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Notes on Contributors
A field of developing scholarly interest from the 1970s, Irish-Scottish Studies have thrived over the past decade. The immediate catalysts have been a subject of some debate, but there is general agreement that influences beyond the academy have been critical. Political and economic events have begun to radically reshape the cultural identities of Ireland and Scotland. In Ireland the transient dynamism of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ economy helped transform one of Europe’s poorest countries to one of its most advanced. In Northern Ireland the peace process has reconfigured not only future relations between religious communities, but also the cultural landscapes of those communities. And in Scotland, devolution has been accompanied by what has been described as a cultural renaissance. At the hub of the emerging discipline since 1999 has been the University of Aberdeen’s Research Institute of Irish and Scottish Studies, also since 2001 host of the AHRC Centre for Irish and Scottish Studies. First under the direction of Professor Tom Devine, then Professor Cairns Craig, Aberdeen, in close association with other institutions and individuals, has stimulated and fostered vital new research.

While arguably the initial focus was on historical and literary/language questions, and the concern largely with interactions in and between Ireland and Scotland, welcome developments over the past decade have been a widening of disciplinary interests and a major extension of the geographic reach of Irish-Scottish Studies. The latter is of considerable significance. Paralleling, in some instances almost certainly stimulated by, cultural initiatives in the home countries, many people throughout the world have become increasingly conscious, and assertive, of their Irish and Scottish antecedents and identities—as evidenced by Tartan Day celebrations in the United States and Canada, or by St. Patrick’s Day commemorations in Australia and New Zealand. This should not surprise. A case can be made that people comprised the most substantial export of Ireland and Scotland in the long nineteenth century, they being consistently among the top three European countries contributing to the unprecedented migration flows to the New Worlds. Possibly reflecting, in some instances endeavouring to tap, the popular enthusiasm,
tertiary institutions in a number of recipient countries have exhibited a growing willingness to develop relevant study and research programmes, nowhere more so than in New Zealand, the most distant destination for Irish and Scots. Hence the establishment of the Irish-Scottish Studies Programme at Victoria University of Wellington’s Stout Research Centre (2003) and the University of Otago’s Centre for Irish and Scottish Studies (2008). When it was resolved in 2006 that a major international conference should be held focusing on the relationships between the home countries and their diasporas, and that it should be held in a recipient country, New Zealand was thus a logical choice of venue.

Organised by Victoria University’s Irish-Scottish Studies Programme in association with Aberdeen’s AHRC Centre for Irish and Scottish Studies, the conference, under the rubric ‘Nations: Diasporas: Identities’, was held in Wellington over 27–30 March 2008. In total forty-four papers were presented, and the occasion attracted nearly 100 delegates. The chosen theme was indicative of a number of issues currently exercising the minds of researchers. For instance, do identifiable diasporic groups have any continuing relationship with the identities of the nations to which they are attached? Are national identities themselves being transformed, being effected in any significant way, by feedback from their diasporas? Are alternative ‘national’ identities developing which may claim to express the same national past but in fact envisage it in quite different ways? Should the notion of the ‘nation’ be extended to encompass its diasporas? What is a national history, for that matter a national culture, in a world of highly mobile populations? Just who qualifies as Irish or Scottish? It would be going too far to suggest that any of these questions were conclusively answered; indeed the debates threw up even more questions and conundrums. Even so, a range of constructive viewpoints were expressed, with new lines of inquiry being suggested. An important outcome was a proposal that the conference be the first of series, the next being scheduled for Toronto in 2010.

The papers included in this issue are offered as a sampler of the kinds of issues and topics addressed. There are contributions from both leading scholars and several new faces; the contributions are drawn from at least five disciplines; in approach the contributions range from the reflective and theoretical to the manifestly empirical. Several ‘old campaigners’ lead off. Stressing the need for caution in employing the concept of diaspora, Donald Harman Akenson traces how it has evolved and achieved wide currency as an idea over the past half century. While conceding the concept has been ‘a
useful one for Irish and Scottish historians, and for historians of the neo-Europes where migrants from Ireland and Scotland settled’, he points to some of the ways it can, and sometimes has, been misappropriated or twisted by special interest groups. Cairns Craig, while in part covering similar ground, adopts a different tack. In a wide-ranging think-piece he subjects traditional conceptions of the nation to scrutiny. He suggests that by bringing theories of the nation together with the analysis of diaspora it may be possible to reformulate our conceptions of both: ‘in the experience of exchanging cultures which characterizes the experience of the migrant, there may be an alternative way of understanding the fundamental processes of the nation itself’. Lindsay Proudfoot and Dianne Hall also ponder the often contested and ambiguous meanings of diaspora. Marrying theory with empirical research in rural Australia, they make a case that the dichotomy between territorialized and de-territorialized understandings of diaspora might be resolved via place-based analysis, concluding that ‘while diasporic identities are necessarily framed in the landscapes of past experience, these are as much imaginary as material, connecting roots with routes’.

Drawing from the writings of mid-twentieth century Scottish and New Zealand poets, specifically Hugh MacDiarmid and Allan Curnow, Andrew Blaikie also explores place, memory and the imagination, concluding that both engaged in ‘imaginative projects of decolonization. In both instances nascent cultural nationalism ‘depended strategically upon essentialized conceptions of place, re-imagined histories and representations of forgetting’. Also concerned with the foundations of nationalism, Graeme Morton examines how non-authentic ‘national memories’ were sustained in the flows between Scotland and the diaspora, citing the influential writings of Jane Porter, principal promoter of the heroic image of medieval patriot William Wallace. He notes that the ‘feminization’ of Scotland’s national images is a matter that has been largely overlooked. Rounding out the literary contributions, Peter Kuch points to the importance of theatre troupes as mechanisms for the diasporic transfer of Irish culture. He charts the performance history of selected plays, players and companies, paying particular attention to the ways in which ‘text, intertext and context’ bear on representations of Irishness on the New Zealand stage in the 1880s and the World War One years.

Investigating the linkages between migration, identity and skills transfer, David Finkelstein and Sydney Shep document the New Zealand experiences of Edinburgh-born and raised print and papermaking industrialist Sir David Henry, who in the 1950s established New Zealand’s Kinleith mill. They
analyze the results of his efforts to impose a Scottish-inflected version of town planning and industrial operations – his version of New Lanark – in an antipodean setting. In contrast, Malcolm Campbell addresses the ways in which experiences in the New Worlds could be transmitted back to the Old, what might be termed feedback loops, taking as his example Irish nationalist Michael Davitt, who travelled extensively through the Pacific rim countries, including New Zealand and Australia, in the mid 1890s. Davitt’s later ideas on such matters as labour legislation and land reform were profoundly influenced by his ‘exposure to Irish diasporic communities and the ideas he encountered’.

The role of the frontier in diffusing the Old World ties and loyalties of nineteenth-century New Zealand immigrants is assessed by Gerard Horn, his case-study featuring a small group of Irish settlers who made homes in the lower North Island Wanganui district. He pays particular attention to the tensions between settlers and Maori, settlers and the landscape, and between the settlers themselves and their transplanted culture(s), concluding that while they were being incorporated into an emerging pan-British identity transplanted identities and allegiances persisted, certainly into the second generation. This contrasts significantly with my own study of Scottish-Highlander and Maori relations in Turakina. Also addressing aspects of Northern Ireland identity, but nearer the present Ewan Morris recounts the puzzled New Zealand media coverage of an early 2008 plan to remove the statue of former New Zealand Prime Minister William Massey from a public precinct in his birthplace, Limavady, County Londonderry, on account of his membership of the Orange Order. As a background to the controversy, some past Northern Ireland conflicts over symbols, especially flags, are considered, their power as indicators of competing communities and identities being underlined. Rebecca Lenihan switches attention from the nation as unit to one distinctive fragment of Scotland, the Shetland Islands, querying to what extent the personal profiles and experiences of nineteenth-century migrants to New Zealand from this source mirrored those of their contemporaries from the mainland. Is it possible for there to be multiple diasporas within nations? To what extent was the Shetlanders sense of separateness maintained? Her tentative answers are largely drawn from innovative use of genealogical sources.

It is appropriate to here acknowledge instances of assistance which have helped to bring this issue of the journal to print. Foremost, my thanks to Cairns Craig, without whose support neither the publication nor the conference upon which it is based would have become realities. I am especially grateful for his patience as the project extended over many more months than could have been
envisaged in March 2008. It is no less essential to note the logistical assistance afforded by my sometime associates at Victoria University’s Irish-Scottish Studies Programme: Tanja Bueltmann, Gerard Horn, Rebecca Lenihan, Judy McKoy, and Megan Simpson. Those whose papers have been included have invariably been helpful, as were the anonymous readers who offered comment. Finally, my thanks, as always, to Kathryn Patterson for unstinting support and assistance well beyond even the unwritten terms of the marriage contract.

Brad Patterson
Massey University, Wellington
Seemingly, discussing ‘diaspora’ in New Zealand should either be unnecessary or such an easy sell that a conference on the topic could only be an assemblage of the obvious. If the term diaspora is used in its denotative sense as derived from classic Greek, it means dispersion or, slightly more poetically, the dispersion of seeds—things that grow, prosper and multiply. Here we are—and so what? New Zealand, taken as a whole, has been the destination site of two extraordinary diasporas: one the heroic, virtually Arthurian, quest of segments of the Polynesian peoples, the other the later globe-bisecting migration of European peoples, most notably those stemming from the British Archipelago from the mid-nineteenth century. There have been, of course, immense and fascinating, sometimes frightening, interactions between these two major diaspora groups, also some fairly yeasty intra-group developments, as well as complex alliances and frictions with later arrivals.

When in the mid-1990s ‘diaspora’ became one of the terms-du-jour it did not register sharply with scholars of New Zealand society, nor should it have. Most of the early work was by sociologists, refugee advocates, and filio-pietistic promoters of ethno-national groups that have had little presence and less purchase in this culture. Nevertheless, as the term ‘diaspora’ migrated into standard historical work, historians of New Zealand were introduced to the term in some of the most sensible of the deployments and assessments of the concept. I refer particularly to the work of Enda Delaney, Donald MacRaild and Kevin Kenny.1 A reasonable summary of the situation from

---

the viewpoint of New Zealand’s historiography might be as follows: firstly, diaspora could conceivably be useful as a tool in helping to understand the historical base of this particular society; secondly it almost certainly would help place New Zealand’s history into a larger international literature, from which there might be wider lessons; thirdly, conversely, the world might notice that the history of this society has some salient things to say to ‘the Big Boys’. Nothing revolutionary here, nothing hard to cope with.

Except, be warned: Here Be Landmines. Hence, as a sensitizer to possible problems, let us look briefly at a very non-Kiwi source. There is a very testy article on diaspora to be found in the Encyclopaedia Judaica. This is not an otiose exercise, because I think it is widely recognized that until the past generation, diaspora has been a concept that, if not quite a proprietary Jewish brand, was one in which the Jewish community worldwide was the dominant shareholder. The Encyclopaedia Judaica, first published in 1972 with the support of Israel’s government, is a massive enterprise. (It reaches twenty-two volumes in its second edition of 2007.) The effort combines front-line scholarship with the semi-official line on certain sensitive matters. One of these is the Jewish Diaspora. In a breathtakingly apodictic ruling, the editors preface the article on diaspora with two paragraphs of proper-think:

The word Diaspora, from the Greek … (‘dispersion’), is used in the present context for the voluntary dispersion of the Jewish people as distinct from their forced dispersion, which is treated under Galut [Exile]. As such it confines itself to Jewish settlement outside Eretz Israel during the period of Jewish independence or compact settlement in their own land.2

Under this secular halachah, the historical boundaries of the Jewish Diaspora are three-fold. First, the settlement in Egypt referred to by the prophet Jeremiah (see Jeremiah, chapter 44) in the late First Temple period (c. 600 BCE). How large this population was, and how long its predecessors


had been in Egypt is unknown. Secondly, and at the other end of the time-line, the Jewish Diaspora is accepted as existing after 1948, when the state of Israel was created. Thirdly, in the long medial period between the world of Jeremiah and 1948 (!), matters are contested. The Jewish Diaspora begins in a fuzzily defined period that runs from the beginning of the Second Temple era (say, 450 BCE) to either the Destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, or to the end of the Palestinian patriarchate (roughly 430 CE). During this medial period, Diaspora Jews spread all over the Roman-Hellenic world, with large numbers in Egypt, Syria, Rome, and what is present-day Iraq.

The pivotal point for present purposes, however, concerns the post-1948 period. We are here listening to an authoritative judgment directed at the Jewish population outside of Israel, and especially at that of the United States of America. At least in the English-speaking world, by the 1960s it had become common as part of Jewish identity to apply the term diaspora not just to persons living outside of Israel post-1948, but also to long sweeps of earlier Jewish history. Such employment of the concept asserts an historical continuity between present-day dispersed Jews and all those dispersed in the past. The state of Israel will have none of that. Members of the present-day Jewish Diaspora (a ‘voluntary dispersion’ remember) are not to think themselves equal to those who suffered forced Exile—Galut—before 1948. Those who formed modern Israel had suffered Exile and their suffering was nobler and their redemptive heroism greater than those who remain outside Eretz Israel. One here catches a faint whiff of the old Soviet Encyclopaedia which pretty much set the world right on every big issue and most small ones as well. The implied delation of the non-Israeli Jews for conceiving of themselves as a noble and historically contiguous diaspora is not for a full-blown thought-crime, but it is for a thought-misdemeanor.3

3 Three textual points are here revealing. (1) The fiat that prefaces the ‘Diaspora’ article in the 1972 edition is marked as being by the editors. The much longer scholarly article is by Menahem Stern, Professor of Jewish History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and one can only speculate why he would permit the editorial dicta to sit over his name. (2) The fact that the introductory halachah was not by Professor Stern is erased from the second edition of 2007. The entire article is ascribed to him. (3) Everything else in the two editions is the same: which is to say that the necessity of having a semi-official rebuke to the Jewish Diaspora still was operative. Incidentally, the blurred character of the time-line when diaspora is an approved descriptor—essentially it is here used as a residual category to refer to eras in which galut was not operative—is underlined by the definition of ‘galut’ in the same encyclopedia. The article by Haim Hillel Ben-Sasson, Israeli supreme court justice, bows before the semi-state definition that ‘the residence of a great number of
Clearly, if the ethno-religious group that is usually recognized as the entity to which diaspora was most often applied has to police the usage of the idea, then manifestly it is a contested concept. How did we come to be engaged with it today?

The short answer is that the idea of the diaspora of the Jews (and, also in some authors, of the early Christians) was found in the writings of certain ancient classical and patristic writers: Philo of Alexandria on the Jews, for example, and Eusebius, third–and fourth-century bishop of Caesarea, on the Christians. With what is vaguely referred to as the ‘humanistic revolution’, scores of ancient writers were rediscovered, and among them was Eusebius, the first historian of the Christian church whose works survived virtually intact. Eusebius was especially popular.4

Then, in the nineteenth century, ‘diaspora’ evolved into a naturalized English word when English biblical scholars became enamoured of the German higher criticism of the nineteenth century, wherein diaspora was an accepted concept that had a general scholarly usage.5 The formal acceptance of diaspora as a standard term in educated English is found in the article by the great Julius Wellhausen in the ‘Israel’ entry in the 1881 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.6 Thus, it required no special explanation when ‘diaspora’ was employed in an article on Philo of Alexandria in the 1885 edition of the standard English reference work.7

members of a nation, even the majority, outside their homeland is not definable as galut so long as the homeland remains in that nation’s possession’. He defines the galut as lasting from the Destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE to the founding of the modern Jewish state.

4 The early English Books has six separate sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions of Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History* available, this is in addition to ancient language versions. Philo was well enough known to be a stage figure in a 1645 fable, *Sad Condition of a Distracted Kingdom*.

5 *The Oxford English Dictionary of the Christian Church* credits William Robertson Smith’s *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (Edinburgh, 1881) with making ‘higher criticism’ a current term among the educated class. Smith’s volume, however, merely ratified an admiration for the German biblical critics that ecclesiastical adepts had harboured since the late eighteenth century.

6 This, according to *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989 edn) entry on ‘Diaspora’. The Wellhausen article was translated from German as he did not write fluent English. His high prestige in English scholarly circles at the time was largely the product of the publication of the second volume of *Die Geschichte Israels* in 1878.

7 Per *OED* (1989). The famous eleventh edition (1911) of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*
Confirmation that by the late 1880s, well-educated persons were expected to know how to employ diaspora as a useful concept is found in a very smooth, very worldly essay in the most widely read of High Victorian intellectual periodicals, *The Edinburgh Review*. There, in January 1889, in an extended review of a recently published commentary by Anglican scholars on the ‘Apocrypha’ (usually called the ‘Deutero-Canon’ by Roman Catholics), ‘diaspora’ was used to explain why Jewish religious culture expanded and spilled outside of the limits of the canonical scriptures. Physical diaspora enlarged Jewish mental horizons, it was argued, and the cultural richness that ran from the stories in the books of Tobit and of Judith, to the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach, to the heroics in the various Maccabean volumes, was the product of ancient Jewish culture being rubbed against ‘Oriental’ societies. ‘The growth in this direction is not only demonstrable, it is rendered *a priori* natural and reasonable by the very existence and large area of the Diaspora.’

Significantly, in this review essay no distinction was made between the Babylonian Exile (Galut) and other Jewish scatterings in antiquity. They all are said to have had the same culturally enriching effect.

Thus, unlike so many old words drawn from the early Common Era, diaspora was not undergoing linguistic entropy. Quite the opposite: from the High Victorian era onwards, it became a more and more familiar term within the field of biblical studies, and this at a time when knowledge of that field was an essential part of the education of any gentleman, agnostics and atheists included. Then, in the cultural equivalent of welder’s blowback, many (not all) of the Christian-based interpretations and usages of the concept of diaspora returned to influence Jewish studies. The precondition for this retro-invasion was the complex cultural phenomenon usually called the Jewish Enlightenment. The iconic figure in this process was Moses Mendelssohn (1729–86), an heroic polymath who, as Paul Johnson has mischievously observed, ‘laid no claim to a specific Jewish stake in the Enlightenment; he simply wanted to enjoy it’. Mendelssohn and his colleagues brought Jewish culture into the German mainstream (he produced in German an up-to-date
translation of the Pentateuch) introducing aspects of European high culture into the cultural ghetto of middle class German Jewry, all the while fighting against the anti-Semitism of the time.

The form of ‘liberal Judaism’ (the term is descriptive and does not refer to the Jewish denomination of that name) that Mendelssson and his successors developed had little impact on the shtetl Rabbinism of the Pale of Settlement, but its cumulative effect from the later eighteenth century onwards meant that in the cultural hubs of Europe educated and still-observant Jews participated in front-edge cultural developments. To take the course of events into the twentieth century, as the academic field of religious studies increasingly broke away from Christian apologetics, Jewish scholars were intimately involved: at first in ‘Old Testament’ studies, but soon afterwards in scholarship on the New Testament and in interpretations of the kaleidoscope of religious material produced in the late Second Temple era.

Inevitably, the word diaspora—reintroduced into Jewish scholarly vocabulary after an absence of a millennium-and-a-half—found its way into the political and social conversation of the laity. So, within the Jewish community, fierce debates about the nature of diaspora flamed, and in many ways these muddied the waters even more than had Christian usage (which often talked about a Christian diaspora): was there a real difference between Exile [Galut] and the Jewish Diaspora? (most persons in the Jewish Diaspora would have said no.); was the Jewish Diaspora ever ‘a Good Thing’? (liberal American Jews tended to say yes); was the Jewish Diaspora the only possible diaspora, or could the concept be shared with other religious or ethnic or national groups? And, if the concept was to be shared with other groups, was there a requirement that a certain degree of victimization was necessary before admission to the club was granted?

The truth is that by the later decades of the twentieth century, Jewish commentators on diaspora were as muddy in its employment, and as indeterminate in its definition, as when the term was used by non-Jews.\footnote{For an excellent \textit{longue durée} essay, see Denise Eileen McCoskey, ‘Diaspora in the Reading of Jewish History, Identity, and Difference’, \textit{Diaspora}, 12 (Winter 2003), 387–418.} Like so many words that become more and more fashionable, mushiness in meaning was a prerequisite for popularity.
Why, then, would any student of human behaviour employ the term diaspora, save for the dubious pleasure of riding the same crowded wave as a lot of other sharp-elbowed people? Granted, a term that is argued about has some sensible attraction. At least the dialectics might spark off a conversation that metamorphoses into rigour, empathy, narrative, good things like that. Yet, there must be suspicion that when, in the later twentieth century, diaspora was grabbed at by so many scholars, in a wide range of disciplines, their choice was not a positive embracing of diaspora as an indication of their being dead-sick of the old and lifeless alternatives.

Take the field of Irish studies. By the early 1990s some scholars had begun to believe that emigration, as the concept was then used in Irish historiography, was mined out. It was almost impossible to talk about emigration in the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries without immediately invoking the ochone-ochone threnody of alleged Irish exile. (In the vocabulary of our present discussion, when about the question of Irish diaspora was raised, most responses were couched in the vocabulary of Galut.) Equally important, although not invalid as a descriptive reference, in the Irish historical literature emigration as a higher-level concept had become almost useless, being used both to denominate a set of events (a set of effects in other words) and also the cause of those events. ‘Emigration’ had become a going-nowhere omnibus construct.

There were two other problems. One of these was that emigration in the then existing historical literature of Irish emigration was, with some honourable exceptions, overwhelmingly defined on a sectarian level, and this at a time when the Troubles were still in train. (Crudely, no Prods need apply; or if admitted to the narrative of Irish emigration, they were segregated.) And, secondly, the concept of Irish emigration was limited by the chaffing spancel of the cultural imperialism of the United States. Overwhelmingly, the story of ‘Irish emigration’ had been centred on a voyage by ship, usually with Liverpool on one side and New York, Boston, or Philadelphia on the American side, a journey as predetermined as a train ride. In fact, Irish people of all sorts—Catholics and Protestants, well-off, poor—migrated all over the world. Indeed, in most years of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries more Irish emigrants went to destinations in the homeland or the empire of the old-enemy than to the United States. The histories written under the American imperium had kept this multiplicity of migration outcomes as far off-stage as
possible. So, ‘diaspora’ seemed like the intellectual equivalent of a ‘Get Out of Jail Free’ card.

That noted, it would be unfair and inaccurate to suggest that the push to employ ‘diaspora’ in Irish studies in the 1990s was solely a negative reaction to the flaccidity of the then prevailing ways of talking about the richly complex pattern of worldwide Irish migration. There were also independent positive reasons to consider diaspora, namely a transition of usage of the term from theological monographs to secular historical and policy studies. For the secular academy of the English-speaking world, one of several foundation-moments was John A. Armstrong’s ‘Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas’.11 This nimble essay, which well repays reading today, is part of a causal chain that flows right into the present cascade of diaspora-studies. Armstrong’s work was referenced several times by the authors who contributed to Gabriel Scheffer’s Modern Diasporas in International Perspective, published in 1986.12 In turn, Scheffer’s collection was one of the several threads that was woven together by Kachig Tololyan when he founded the journal Diaspora in 1991.

A related, and ultimately contributory, chain of secular scholarship introduced diaspora from the viewpoint of what was then called Black Studies, a field that had much more force within the academy than did the fragmented sub-specialties that initially were drawn into diaspora studies. The first book to use the term ‘African diaspora’ in its title was published in 1976. The editors of that volume, Martin Kilson and Robert Rotberg, noted:

The application of the Greek word for dispersion, diaspora, to this process of Jewish migration from their homeland into all parts of the world not only created a term which could be applied to any other substantial and significant groups of migrants, but also provided a concept which could be used to interpret the experiences (often very bitter experiences) of other peoples who had been driven out of their native countries by forces similar to those which had dispersed the Jews: in particular, slavery and imperialism.13

This idea, that there were parallels between the Jews and Black Africans had been suggested as early as 1802, Kilson and Rotberg noted, by the English author William Movor, in a volume entitled The History of the Dispersion of the Jews, of Modern Egypt, and of the other African Nations, and it had been taken up

---

12 Gabriel Scheffer (ed.), Modern Diasporas in International Perspective (New York, 1986), passim.
several times during the nineteenth century by writers on Africa.\textsuperscript{14} It was only during the 1960s, however, that the word ‘diaspora’ began to enter the working vocabulary of Africanists and of historians of Black history worldwide. At the International Congress of African Historians, held at University College, Dar-as-Salaam, in 1965, Joseph E. Harris and George Shepperson each delivered papers in various aspects of the African diaspora. Shepperson’s ‘The African Abroad or the African Diaspora’ was especially important, attempting simultaneously to indicate the breadth of the topic and to impose a significant limitation. The breadth came from an estimate Shepperson cited for the year 1946: that in the western hemisphere alone there were 41 million people of African descent. The limitation was this: ‘it must be emphasized that not all migration from Africa comes within the bounds of the concept of the African diaspora which is the study of a series of reactions to coercion, to the imposition of the economic and political rule of alien peoples in Africa, to slavery and imperialism.’\textsuperscript{15}

That limitation introduced a major problem into the study of the African diaspora and, proleptically, into all diaspora studies: should this involve only the study of those persons, and their descendants, who were forcibly moved from their African homeland? Research undertaken in the 1970s and early 1980s emphasized the duality of the concept to the African diaspora and, though it focused overwhelmingly on forced migration and the results, it left open the theoretical possibility of non-forced voluntary migration being of some consequence.\textsuperscript{16} The irony at this point is that just at the time Israeli’s authorities were trying to define the Jewish Diaspora as being entirely voluntary, most Africanists were using the term to denominate involuntary dispersion.

In global African studies, things changed sharply in the late 1980s, with the introduction of a strong feminist perspective\textsuperscript{17} and increasing recognition of the magnitude of pre-slavery mobility of the African population and the degree of voluntary migration since slave times. As was noted in the introduction to an influential collection: ‘A balanced appreciation of the [African] Diaspora must note that many Africans were dispersed globally by choice, through adventure, long before Columbus went to the New World and inaugurated

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Rosalyn Terborg-Penn, Sharon Harley and Andrea Rushing (eds), \textit{Women in Africa and the African Diaspora} (Washington, 1987).
the trade in human cargo. An immense amount of voluntary migration by Africans and persons of African descent had occurred since the ending of most forms of slavery. As Roy Bryce-Laporte forcibly argued: ‘With regard to Blacks, the term “diaspora” too often operates against the background of a yet pervasive but incorrect present-day orientation which presents them as a dominated, confined and immobile people in closed, segregated conditions. But, in fact, an important and understudied aspect of the Black Experience is the historical and ongoing mobility of its people, which indeed carries us back to the very genesis.’

If the concept of diaspora could be applied to the dispersal, both voluntary and involuntary, of the African peoples, it could also be employed to white groups, at least those whose cultural history included an epochal tragedy comparable to slavery. Thus, the Armenian Genocide of 1915 becomes a fulcrum upon which the idea of an Armenian diaspora pivots. The exact extent of the displacement and slaughter of the Armenians during the last days of the Ottoman Empire is a matter of some controversy, but in the two decades before the First World War perhaps 200,000 Armenians were killed and, beginning in the spring of 1915, as many as a million were later killed, deported, or scattered. The United States and Canada became the chief new homelands, but Armenians and their descendants are found all over the Middle East and Europe, as well as sub-Saharan Africa. The Armenians have maintained a strong cultural identity. As one generation has folded into another and yet another, the single motif that more than any other elicits loyalty is the genocide of 1915. Scholars who belonged to the Armenian community formed a third leading strand in the evolution of diaspora studies. Not accidentally, Diaspora was founded with the aid of Armenian philanthropy.

IV

That diaspora had become one of the most fashionable concepts within the scholarly academy by the 1990s was confirmed by the 1995 meeting in

---

19 Roy S. Bryce-Laporte, quoted ibid., xiii.
Montreal of the International Committee of Historical Sciences. There, the world’s leading historians were asked to focus their attention upon three major topics. These were advanced as being the most important issues for historians of the world to address at the dawn of the twenty-first century: Peoples and State-Forms; Gender; and Peoples in Diaspora. In an echo of affirmation, in 1999 the American Historical Association embraced ‘Diasporas and Migrations in History’ as its primary theme. Springtime for diaspora, apparently. The only difficulty was that suddenly almost every ethnic group, tribe, and religious community was being described as a diaspora. Certainly any construct that covered in a single breath the overseas Chinese and the underground Cornish, the Coptic Church and the Hutterites, the descendants of African slaves and the princely clan of the Rothschilds, had very porous borders indeed.

To reduce the danger of ‘diaspora’ becoming the intellectual equivalent of an oil spill in a marine nature preserve, heroic efforts were made to develop definitions and taxonomies. For example, in the first volume of *Diaspora*, William Safran bravely put forward a set of criteria which were admirable for their clarity. Members of any specific diaspora community, he suggested, would share most, if not necessarily all, of the following characteristics:

1. they, or their ancestors, have been dispersed from a specific original ‘centre’ to two or more ‘peripheral’, or foreign, regions;
2. they retain a collective memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland in terms of its physical location, history, and achievements;
3. they believe that they are not—and perhaps cannot be—fully accepted by their host society and therefore feel partly alienated and insulated from it;
4. they regard their ancestral homeland as their true, ideal home and as the place to which they or their descendants would (or should) eventually return—when conditions are appropriate;
5. they believe that they should, collectively, be committed to the maintenance or restoration of their original homeland and to its safety and prosperity; and
6. they continue to relate, personally or vicariously, to that ancestral homeland in one way or another, and their ethno-communal consciousness

---

21 In order to focus the International Committee’s deliberations on the central topics, the *Canadian Historical Review* commissioned a special issue that included one plenary piece on each of the three main topics. Some of the matters I discussed at that time inform the present examination of diaspora. See ‘The Historiography of English-Speaking Canada and the Concept of Diaspora: A Sceptical Appreciation’, *Canadian Historical Review*, 76 (September 1995), 377–409.
and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such an ongoing relationship.\textsuperscript{22}

Constructive as this attempt was, it raises some obvious problems. The use of the passive voice in Safran’s first point (‘they or their ancestors, have been dispersed’) seems to exclude the cases, such as the Chinese, wherein the dispersal was volitional and active. The third point, which postulates some form of perpetual alienation from new homelands, places \textit{a priori} restrictions on the historical process by precluding the possibility that a diaspora community may evolve from a feeling of alienation towards one of affiliation with the host society. The fourth and fifth points, concerning diaspora communities having an ideal homeland to which they wish to return, excludes the African diaspora, most of whose members have not the slightest inclination to return to their ancestral continent.

In an attempt to expand William Safran’s work into an operational mode of distinguishing a diaspora from a non-diaspora (whatever that may be), Robin Cohen, developed nine metering criteria. They are enumerated in his \textit{Global Diasporas. An Introduction} (1997). Here, in abridged form, are the indicators of a diaspora:

(i) Persons are dispersed, ‘often traumatically’ from the homeland to two or more foreign regions;

(ii) \textit{Alternately} [emphasis mine], persons leave their homeland in search of work, trade or colonial ambitions;

(iii) \textit{A} [note the singular] collective memory of the homeland exists among those who leave;

(iv) \textit{An} [again, note the singular] idealization of the homeland develops, as well as \textit{a} [singular] commitment to the maintenance, restoration, safety and prosperity of that homeland, ‘even to its creation’;

(v) A return-to-the-homeland movement gains ‘collective approbation’;

(vi) A strong ethnic group consciousness and sense of shared history is sustained over a long time;

(vii) A troubled relationship with host societies occurs;

(viii) A sense of solidarity either continues or develops between ‘co-ethnic’ members of the diaspora group in several countries;

(ix) There is a possibility of a ‘distinctive, creative, enriching life in those countries that have a tolerance for pluralism’.\textsuperscript{23}


This is a sincere effort, but it is so valueless that a wandering cynic might wonder if it were actually intended as a parody. Firstly, the schema makes several palpably false historical assertions, not least that diasporas of necessity are triggered by traumatic events, apparently of seismic magnitude, and also that a return-to-the-homeland movement has been historically normative among diaspora groups. (Again, the African slave case illustrates the point.) Secondly, some of the criteria for diaspora status are completely non-operational, such as items 1 and 2, when placed side-by-side. Cohen’s schema in essence proposes that people leave either involuntarily or voluntarily. Indeed, what other possibilities are there? Thirdly, his employment of the singular, rather than the plural, as normative in defining diasporas (‘an idealization of the homeland’; ‘a strong group consciousness’; ‘a sense of solidarity’) flies in the face of the evidence that most diaspora groups have several rival views of their own history, group consciousness, and political-moral commitments, and these certainly are not standard-issue for individual global groups around the globe. Fourthly, Cohen’s final point about creative pluralism in new homelands as a possibility is a piety that is unassailable, but its being a statement of future possibility makes it useless for adjudging a set of historical conditions—and each diaspora is an historical set of events.

V

As will be apparent, I am somewhat ambiguous about how historians should feel about the concept of diaspora. It is a very prickly cactus, one not easily embraced. And you can infer that I feel a touch guilty about having written several books that either directly or indirectly propelled forward the idea of the Irish diaspora, and did so without including a warning label on the first page of each. Should we simply forget the idea of diaspora, dismissing it as undefinable and thus unemployable except as a term of atmospherics, a bit of St. Elmo’s fire glowing romantically in dark and exotic foreign forests? Perhaps. But ‘dispersal’ is not such a bad synonym for ‘diaspora’, and in that sense diaspora can be employed because it really is nothing new and certainly not understudied. ‘Diaspora’ as a term may force us to look afresh at things we already have studied intensively in the academy, at least since the mid-twentieth century: concepts of ethnicity; definitions of population

movements; reckonings of in- and out-migration; assessments of social mobility; multiple cultural identities; popular culture; religious affiliations and ideological constructs. There is nothing new here, but these are all matters that need to be dealt with in a much broader context than previously.24

However, if diaspora is to fulfill its promise as a vivifying modality, we must change its voice, and not just in a single, simple way. First, the dominant habit of using the passive voice when talking about diasporas must be dropped. Almost all histories of diasporas describe them as happening to people. Individuals in these stories become flotsam on some poorly defined and simplistically explained historical tide. This robs the participants in a diaspora of their greatest human characteristic, their human agency. My own observation of diaspora participants is that they are active, vital, often heroic, and the habit of using the passive voice turns these individuals into characterless rag dolls. Secondly, the whingeing tone has to cease. If diaspora studies follow the present trajectory, it will be self-discredited within two decades, having degenerated into a competition of complaint held against a wailing wall located beyond earshot of anyone who cares. Thirdly, the implicit self-righteousness that sits in the back of the throat of so many diaspora scholars, making them sound like the hot-potato voice of a Harvard-educated eighteenth-century Unitarian divine, has to cease. The refusal to face the fact that diaspora minorities must often be seen as victimizers as well as victims has led to a good deal of moral side-stepping. In fact, diaspora groups often have displaced, oppressed, or in the not-so-distant past, enslaved, indigenous populations. They continue to do so to the present day. Fourthly, excessive
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24 Although I obviously favour a descriptive rather than a prescriptive interpretation of ‘diaspora’, if it makes the reader uncomfortable to contemplate employing ‘diaspora’ without framing his or her own normative definition, then here is the task. (1) One must decide to what degree ‘diaspora’ is a metaphorical term. Of course almost all words are in some sense metaphors, but when should ‘diaspora’ be used purely as a taxonomic device and when, if ever, should it be applied to group phenomena, the way one does ask of a literary metaphor? (2) Can diaspora as a concept ever be considered without implying a reference to the Jewish Diaspora—and even if possible, is that desirable? And if one developed a definition of diaspora not based on the bedrock of the Jewish experience where would the Jewish Diaspora be fitted? (3) Must diaspora always imply victimization? (4) Is diaspora applicable only to minority groups or to majority groups as well? (5) Should one confine diaspora to physical dispersal, or are there forms of cultural dispersion that would qualify? (6) And are you really defining diasporas as real-world entities or only as ideal types in the Weberian sense? These and several other questions will require answers and if the normative approach is to be effective, then it must be agreed upon (or forced upon) practitioners of diaspora studies.
presentism in our conversation on diaspora is intellectually lobotomizing. Yes, we must care ardently about present-day problems, but we will handle them slightly better if we understand that most cases of the diaspora have already run their full course, or nearly so. Hence, we would do well to stack side-by-side the several dozen cases there are of almost-completed diasporas. (I say almost-completed because the residual effects of any diaspora, like the rock dropped into the ocean, is never done, merely less easily documented.) The historical menu of actual events well may be of more practical value in determining the range of policy possibilities than all the think-tank vapourizing of the privileged. Fifthly, and finally, if we are at all serious about diasporas as a real-world set of variant causes and divergent effects, then we must clear our throats, try not to stammer, and talk aloud about the Big Ugly Fact. This is that the largest and most consequential diasporas in the last 500 years have comprised what used to be called—with baleful accuracy—the Expansion of Europe. The multiple diaspora that stemmed from European soil changed utterly the social geography of the human species. These diasporas were of people both victimized by ‘imperialism’ (let us resurrect that word) and who were themselves, in their new homelands, imperializers, whether intentionally or accidentally.

Diaspora as a concept has been with us a very long time. It should not be thrown away casually. But if we are to employ it, it is essential to find ways that are intellectually robust, fecund, and collectively understandable. Otherwise, stop using the concept. Completely.

Queen’s University, Ontario
The term diaspora, as recent accounts of the nature of diaspora rarely fail to inform us, derives from the Greek verb *speirein*, meaning ‘to scatter’ and *dia*, ‘through’ or ‘across’, used originally of seed—a diaspora is a people scattered like seeds through the world. This agricultural derivation should remind us that the diasporas of early modern and modern times, that casting abroad of peoples brought about by the discovery of the Americas and Australasia, by the exploration of Africa and the colonisation of large portions of Asia, was preceded by a diaspora that travelled in the opposite direction—the diaspora of seeds sent back from those newly explored parts of the world. These seeds that were to be sown and cultivated, becoming—like the potato that allowed the Irish population to increase so rapidly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and whose blighting produced the Famine of the 1840s—integral parts of the culture and the agriculture of the Old World.¹ The migration that followed on the Famine in Ireland is emblematic of how a vegetable diaspora could provide the impetus for a human diaspora. As, indeed, was the surreptitious acquisition of the cinchona plant from South America by the Dutch and the British in the mid-nineteenth-century. The quinine that it produced in plantations in India and Java allowed Europeans to explore and to settle in areas of Asia and Africa which would otherwise have been made deadly by malaria.

In the Anglophone world that plant diaspora was, from the 1760s, organised and inspired by the botanic zeal of the scientists and gardeners of the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, presided over from the mid-1770s till 1820 by Sir Joseph Banks, who had made his reputation as a botanist when on Captain Cook’s *Endeavour* expedition to Australia (1768–71). From Kew, seeds and plants would be gathered from and then redistributed to the botanic gardens that became a key part of the British imperial establishment throughout the

world, there to be tested for their usefulness in ‘alien’ climates. Kew is often presented as an icon of English culture, but it was in fact a Scottish creation, established as a consequence of the interest in botany of John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute (1713–92), a favourite of George III and first Scottish Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in 1762–3. Bute was a keen plant collector and turned what had been a private royal garden at Kew into a major botanic garden. In 1759 he appointed as head gardener William Aiton (1731–93), who was not only a Scot (from Hamilton) but had been trained in London by another Scot, Philip Miller (1691–1771), who, as superintendent of the Chelsea Physic Garden and author of a famous *Gardener’s Dictionary* (1731), was a dominant figure in horticulture in London, in part because of the number of new plants which he introduced for British cultivation. Miller’s herbarium was bought by Banks in 1774 and became the basis of what was later to be the British Museum’s collection. William Aiton’s son, William Townsend Aiton (1766–1849), took over as Director of Kew on Banks’s death and was succeeded by William Jackson Hooker (1785–1865), who had previously held the Chair of Botany at Glasgow University. In 1865, Hooker would in turn be followed in the post of Director by his son, Joseph Dalton Hooker (1817–1911), who, like his father, was English by birth, but had been brought up and educated in Glasgow, attending Glasgow High School and graduating in medicine from Glasgow University in 1839. Father and son applied to Kew the lessons that they had learned in establishing Glasgow University’s gardens as among the first rank of the world’s botanic gardens.

From its foundation to its dominant role among botanic gardens in the latter part of the nineteenth century, Kew had thus been profoundly shaped by Scots and by Scottish influences. This was the result of a unique intersection between the demands of medical training, the practical development of gardening, and the emerging science of botany in the Scottish universities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The importance of herbs to seventeenth-century medicine was signalled in the development of ‘physic gardens’ attached to medical schools. As it happened, the most noted herbalist in France in the mid-seventeenth century was a Scotsman, Robert Morison (1620–83), who had been forced into exile after fighting in the royalist cause in the 1640s. In France Morison trained in medicine with such success that he became physician to the French nobility and developed a herbal garden at the Chateau of Blois in the Loire valley, home to many of the kings and queens
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of France. Morison returned to Britain with Charles II at the Restoration in 1660 and was subsequently appointed the first Professor of Botany at the University of Oxford. At Blois, however, he had been visited by other Scots training in medicine on the Continent, among whom was Andrew Balfour (1630–94), born at Denmylne, near Newburgh in Fife, in 1630 and educated at St Andrews. Balfour later studied at Paris and Caen and, after setting up practice in Edinburgh, he and Robert Sibbald (1641–1722) established in 1670 what was to become Edinburgh’s botanical garden, on which Glasgow University’s was modelled in 1704.

These botanic gardens were to become a meeting point for medical students, who were expected to have a practical knowledge of the nurturing of the plants they would prescribe to their patients; gardeners, who were able to attend the lectures in botany that formed part of the medical degree; and botanists, exploring the potential of the new plants imported from across the world. The open nature of the Scottish university system, that allowed students to pay for a course without necessarily taking a degree, meant that many who would never have had access to the new sciences at Oxford and Cambridge were able to train in botany at the Scottish universities. Equally the practical emphasis of Scottish medical training—in terms of anatomy as well as botany—produced physicians who had more than a merely theoretical knowledge of both biological and botanic life forms. The most significant figure in this context was John Hope (1725–86), Professor of Botany in Edinburgh from 1761 to 1786, who made the study of plants an essential component of the medical degree. He worked closely with Banks at Kew and established Edinburgh as a centre for the exchange of plants from around the world.

The consequence was a steady stream of gardeners with a sophisticated knowledge of botany, individuals like John Claudius Loudon (1783–1843), whose Gardener’s Magazine and various encyclopaedias of gardening and building design exerted such a powerful influence over public taste in Victorian Britain that his biographer entitled the work Mr Loudon’s England. And there were also physicians with a practical knowledge of plants—like Archibald Menzies (1754–1842), who is credited with introducing the monkey puzzle tree to Britain, and William Roxburgh (1751–1815), superintendent of the Calcutta Botanic Garden for twenty years from 1793—that made them ideal

4 Ibid., 27.
ship’s surgeons on voyages of exploration. At sea, they were doctors; on land, they were plant hunters. The same training also produced the founders and developers of many of the world’s botanic gardens, the first British imperial garden being established on the island of St Vincent in the West Indies by General Robert Melville (1723–1809), a graduate of both Glasgow and Edinburgh universities. In India, Robert Kyd (1746–93), from Forfar, proposed to the East India Company the development of a botanic garden to provide the navy with teak timber. Kyd died shortly after the founding of the Calcutta Botanic Garden in 1787, and was succeeded by Roxburgh, who not only produced the first account of Indian plants (the first volume of his *Flora Indica* was published five years after his death in 1820), but also proved the properties of jute that were to provide the basis for Dundee’s industrial development after 1840.

The international role that Scots played in the development of botanic gardens is underlined by the network that grew from the appointment of Ninian Niven (1799–1879) as curator of the Botanic Gardens in Dublin in 1834. Niven, born in Glasgow, was one of the earliest to use seeds sown ‘broadcast’ rather than in strict lines, and, as Keith Lamb and Patrick Bowe point out in their *History of Gardening in Ireland*, ‘such was Ninian Niven’s genius that in 1993 two gardens designed by him were chosen as worthy of restoration by the European Union under the “Gardens of Historic Interest” scheme. These were the Iveagh Gardens, Dublin, laid out for the Great Exhibition of 1865, and that at Hilton Park, County Monaghan’. Niven’s successor at Glasnevin was David Moore (1808–79), who had been apprenticed to the Earl of Camperdown’s gardener and worked at James Cunningham’s nurseries at Comely Bank in Edinburgh. Moore had arrived in Ireland as assistant to another Scot, James Townsend Mackay (1775–1862) from Kirkcaldy, who was the first manager of Trinity College’s botanic gardens and who documented the plant life of Ireland in his *Flora Hibernica* (1836). The global reach of these Scottish networks is indicated by the fact that Moore’s brother, Charles (1820–1905), was responsible for the development of the Botanic Gardens in Sydney, Australia, which had started as the garden of the Governor’s demesne, and was the product of two remarkable Scottish gardeners and botanists. One was Charles Fraser (1792–1831), from Blair-Atholl in Perthshire, who arrived in Australia in 1816 at the age of twenty-four as a soldier guarding
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convicts. He had, however, trained as a gardener and was quickly identified as the man to take charge of the governor’s garden. The other was Alan Cunningham (1791–1839), whose family was from Renfrewshire, and who, after explorations in South America, was sent by Banks to Australia in 1816 as the King’s Botanist. Fraser took charge of the practical development of the botanic garden, while Cunningham not only searched the unexplored Australian interior for plants but drew up an agenda for the botanic garden as an experimental test bed for the development and transfer of Australian plants to other parts of the world, as well as for the importation of plants which might be of advantage to the Australian economy.

On Fraser’s death, Cunningham, who had returned to Britain because of ill-health, arranged for his brother Richard (1793–1835) to be appointed Superintendent in 1833—an appointment which proved disastrous for both. In 1835, on an expedition along the Bogan river, Richard strayed from the rest of the expedition in search of plants, became ill and delirious and was killed by a group of Aborigines into whose camp he had wandered. When the news reached Britain, Allan Cunningham decided to return to take up the role of Colonial Botanist, but he quickly came into conflict with the local Governor over the role of convicts in the garden, resigning in 1837 to undertake an expedition to New Zealand. Already suffering from tuberculosis, Allan himself died shortly after his return to Sydney in June 1839.8 Through some turbulent years of short-lived Superintendents, the garden’s progress was maintained by James Kidd, a gardener from Fife who had arrived as a convict in 1830. He retired as an ‘overseer’ in 1866. The fortunes of the Sydney botanic garden were transformed, however, with the arrival of Charles Moore in 1848 at the age of twenty-seven. Despite much local opposition, Moore organised the garden both as a centre for scientific research and as means of public education through his popular lectures on botany. During his forty-eight-year tenure, the structure of the garden as it now exists was established, and Moore oversaw the development of Hyde, Victoria and Wentworth Parks as well as a succession of major international exhibitions.9 British-founded botanic gardens exchanged plants with each other on a massive scale. Sydney, for instance, sent out annually over 3000 packets of seeds and 500 plants.10
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also tested imported plants for their ability to thrive in local conditions, which is how James Hector (1834–1907), originally from Edinburgh and responsible for establishing the botanic garden in Wellington, New Zealand, discovered that the Monterey pine, normally a stunted tree in its native California, grew with impressive speed in New Zealand and provided an ideal way of reversing the country’s rapid deforestation.

These networks of botanic gardens were supplemented locally by the development of nurseries devoted to providing plants for commercial growers and for domestic use. In Britain, Scots were again in the forefront. The most important nursery in eighteenth-century London was that of Lee and Kennedy at Fulham, established in 1745. Both were Scots and Lee (1715–95), who was from Selkirk, became a personal friend of Banks, and Banks's assistant, Jonas Dryander (1748–1810), made weekly visits to the Lee and Kennedy nursery to inspect Lee’s latest acquisitions. Lee was responsible for employing many Scottish gardeners and for recommending them to Sir Joseph Banks as plant explorers, as in the case of Thomas Blaikie (1750–1838) who, after an expedition to collect plants in the Alps, settled in France and became the leading garden designer of the period. He introduced the *jardin anglais*, which would become the fashion of the French aristocracy through the Revolution and into the Restoration, both of which Blaikie witnessed. In London, Lee was responsible for introducing over 130 plants to cultivation in Britain, including the *fuchsia coccinea*, while his compatriot, James Gordon (1710–80), from Aberdeenshire, was introducing camellias and azaleas from his nursery at Mile End, also in London. Both were to be overshadowed, however, by the success of the Veitch Nurseries at King’s Road, Chelsea, in the early nineteenth century. John Veitch (1752–1839), born in Jedburgh in 1752, set up his first business at Killarton in Devon, but then opened his premises in London which were to be the foundation for five generations of the Veitch family to contribute to the development of British horticulture.

The consequence of these naturalisations of plants from across the globe was the transformation of the British landscape, whether by the
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planting of new garden species, such as the geraniums and gladioli sent back by Aberdonian Francis Masson (1741–1805) from South Africa, or by the exploitation of the new landscaping opportunities made possible by trees such as the Douglas Fir and Sitka Spruce sent back from British Columbia by David Douglas (1799–1834), one of Hooker’s students from Glasgow. This diaspora of plants reshaped ecosystems across the globe, producing landscapes in which the native and the exotic were mingled in defiance of ‘natural’ ecological development. Indeed, John Claudius Loudon inspired a fashion for what he described as the ‘gardenesque’—the imitation in the domestic garden of the juxtaposition of plants from diverse climatic regions and geographical backgrounds that had become typical of the layout of the botanic garden.

Whatever the rigours of the Scottish climate, Scottish gardeners, plant-collectors and botanists had been key contributors to this transformation, with the botanic gardens at Edinburgh and Glasgow, along with the Scottish-dominated gardens at Kew, central to the distribution system which made it possible. The sense of the continuity of this Scottish tradition was marked in August 1828, when Robert Brown (1773–1858), who had been a student at Marischal College, Aberdeen in the 1780s, paid a visit to the Chateau at Blois. By 1828 Brown was the most famous botanist in Europe, a result not only of his botanic discoveries in Australia during the Flinders expedition of 1802–5 (another of Banks’s suggestions) but also from his discovery, during his microscopic investigation of plant structure, of what came to be known as ‘Brownian motion’—the apparently random movement of particles in liquid which was satisfactorily explained only by Einstein in the early 1900s. Brown was no mere tourist at Blois: he had made the visit specifically to inspect the garden established by Robert Morison, graduate of his own university, and to pay homage to the work of his great predecessor, coming away surprised at how small the garden was and disappointed that none of its original trees remained. Morison’s achievement in introducing a wide range of new herbs into French and then into British medicine had, however, provided the model on which Scottish medicine and Scottish gardening had developed to make possible Brown’s emergence as the leading theorist in the science of botany, theories on which Brown’s friend Charles Darwin was to draw in developing his account of the origin of species.

17 See Ann Lindsay, Seeds of Blood and Beauty: Scottish Plant Explorers (Edinburgh, 2005), chs 3 and 9.
II

It is ironic that it was in the very period of this vast plant diaspora that nations began to describe themselves in what they thought of as ‘organic’ terms, and to conceive of themselves as single, plant-like, unified entities. As Anthony D. Smith describes it, the nineteenth-century conception of the nation was based on the idea of a cultural community which was immemorial, rooted, organic and seamless, characterised, in other words, by a unity which was at once spatial, social and temporal. In this national unity ‘a stratified national population’, as Liah Greenfeld describes it, ‘is perceived as essentially homogeneous, and the lines of status of class as superficial’. It is a notion associated with German romanticism and with the emergence of an historicism which saw each nation as a unique contributor to the history of humanity, a uniqueness which could only be maintained if it was defended from external corruption. ‘Romantics’, according to John Hutchinson, ‘prescribed a duty to recover and sustain all such cultures, for the loss of one was a loss to humanity’.

It was against such ‘organic’ conceptions of the nation that the so-called ‘modernist’ version of the nation was developed in the 1960s and 70s by theorists and historians such as Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm. For them, the ‘immemorial’ roots of nationalism were simply ideology: nations were the product of modernisation, specifically resulting from the consequences of the French Revolution. Nations’ constant appeals to their ancient lineages were no more than a means of co-opting the passive masses to the purposes of an elite which could only maintain its local power by resisting the developmental pressure coming from the more advanced European economies. The political unification of linguistically distinct areas provided closed economies that could be developed and exploited to the advantage of a local bourgeoisie that would otherwise have been overwhelmed by the economic advances and the cultural achievements of its more powerful neighbours. Nations did not perennially exist and were not natural unities but were created—‘invented’ became the key term—from above, with the mass of the people then provided with a national historical justification for their ‘identity’ which was little more
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21 John Hutchinson, Nations as Zones of Conflict (London, 2005), 47.
than a fabrication. The ‘nation’ and the ‘nationalism’ which justified it was no more than the ‘false consciousness’ necessary in the economic drive towards modernisation: nations claimed to be ancient only to provide themselves with the resources to catch up with their neighbours and so become truly modern (or, from the perspective of the masses, truly but happily exploited).  

For modernists, however, the nation still retains, no matter how fictional its origin or how arbitrary its creation, an instrumental unity. As Gellner puts it, ‘modern loyalties are centred on political units whose boundaries are defined by the language (in the wider or in the literal sense) of an educational system: and that when these boundaries are made rather than given, they must be large enough to create a unit capable of sustaining an educational system’. The nation unifies itself (through its educational system) in order to produce the appearance of precisely that ‘immemorial, rooted, organic and seamless’ identity which is assumed to be the characteristic of nations. This theory of the modern creation of an apparently ancient unity found its ultimate expression in Benedict Anderson’s influential conception of the nation as an ‘imagined community’: the nation, according to Anderson, is ‘imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members’, and what is imagined is the notion of ‘community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship’, and that sense of community is evidenced by the fact that ‘in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’, a communion made manifest in moments of what Anderson describes as ‘unisonance’:

…there is a special kind of contemporaneous community which language alone suggests—above all in the form of poetry and song. Take national anthems, for example, sung on national holidays. No matter how banal the words and mediocre the tunes, there is in this singing an experience of simultaneity. At precisely such moments,
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people wholly unknown to each other utter the same verse to the same melody. The image: unisonance … How selfless this unisonance feels! If we are aware that others are singing these songs precisely when and as we are, we have no idea who they may be, or even where, out of earshot, they are singing. Nothing connects us but imagined sound.  

‘Unisonance’ is a condition of linguistically-produced unity, even though it is no more than ‘imagined sound’.

Anderson’s concept had an enormous influence on cultural analysis in the period of recrudescent nationalisms that followed the collapse of communism in 1989, its success based on providing a new version of the ‘modernist’ thesis to explain why nationalism had survived when Marxism had expired. Anderson offered an historical explanation of nationalism as the secular successor to the salvific religion that had united Europe until the Reformation. Despite his own scepticism about the value of nations, Anderson’s concept invoked the positive connotations associated with the concept of the imagination as the source of creativity, implying a fundamental parallel between the workings of the nation and the workings of the creative imagination—as described, for instance, in Coleridge’s famous account of how it ‘dissolves, diffuses, dissipates in order to recreate; or where this process is rendered impossible, yet still, at all events, it struggles to idealize and to unify’. The nation exists only in the process of idealization and unification: its fulfilment is, in a word which implies how resistant it has proved to the supposedly rational history of Marxism, ‘communion’ rather than ‘communism’. The nation is not a place of conflict but of the dissolution of conflict, which is perhaps why Anderson quickly dropped the middle term in his initial definition of the nation as an ‘imagined political community’. A ‘political’ community would be a community of potential conflict: Anderson’s ‘imagined’ community is one in which conflict is transcended into ‘unisonance’.

It is of the very nature of diasporas, however, that they disrupt the unity of the nation—both the unity of the homeland from which the migrant is severed, leaving behind the ghost of a lost potential, and the unity of the nation s/he joins, in which s/he remains an alien, an incomer, one who is not rooted there. Diasporic migrants may be fully citizens of their host country,
but they remain attached, in their own or in their neighbours’ eyes, to the ancestral territory they have left behind, thereby rupturing the ‘organic unity’ of both homeland and hostland. A diaspora which continues to see itself as part of the nation from which it originated extends the boundaries of that nation beyond the territorial integrity on which the modern nation-as-a-state is based; a diaspora which exists within the body of another nation negates the integrity of the nation-as-cultural-whole on which twentieth-century notions of the self-determination of peoples are based. A diaspora brings into conflict notions of the nation as a unified cultural community and notions of the nation as a bounded political territory. For some, this has always represented an ambiguity that reveals the slippery ways in which nationalists invoke what are, in fact, contradictory conceptions of the nation. As John Breuilly has put it, ‘what happens is that nationalist ideology operates with three notions which are mutually incompatible but, if not properly examined can seem powerfully persuasive’:

First, there is the notion of the unique national community. Second, there is the idea of the nation as a society which should have its own state. But in this understanding the basic distinction between state and society is accepted in a way that contradicts the historicist view of community as a whole. Finally the nation is thought of as the body of citizens—that is, a wholly political conception—and self-determination justified in terms of universal political principles. Nationalist ideology never makes a rational connection between the cultural and the political concept of the nation because no such connection is possible. Instead, by a sort of sleight of hand dependant on using the same term, ‘nation’, in different ways, it appears to demonstrate the proposition that each nation should have its nation state. In this way it can superficially appear to have provided an answer to the problem of the relationship between state and society.30

Here, I suggest, the ‘sleight of hand’ is on the part of the modern commentator who attributes to nationalists the notion of a ‘unique national community’, as though that were identical with, in Anderson’s terms, a ‘unique national communion’, a seamless and unbroken unity. Community, however, does not need to be taken in this sense.

---

First, almost all modern nations are the products of, or the survivors of, civil wars: the ‘community’ which they enclose and which they claim to represent is a community divided by alternative, competing and often antagonistic cultural traditions. The divided nature of national cultures is clear in ‘new’ nations such as New Zealand, however much they may be meliorated by institutional commitments to bilingualism and to an acceptance of the equality between Pākehā and Maori cultures. But in the oldest nations, like France and Britain, the national polity has been no less fractured: in France the conflict between the secular republican state and the inheritors of hierarchical Catholic traditions has amounted to an ideological civil war throughout much of the Republic’s history; in Britain, Protestantism may have been, as Linda Colley has argued, what bound the archipelago’s peoples into a new, British ‘national’ community, but the conflict between its ‘established’ religions and their dissenting opponents was deep enough to amount, on occasion, almost to civil war. It was, after all, a sermon by ‘a non-conforming minister of eminence’, that provoked Edmund Burke’s *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, a sermon which recalled, for Burke, precisely the days of civil war: ‘That sermon is in a strain which I believe has not been heard in this kingdom, in any of the pulpits which are tolerated or encouraged in it, since the year 1648’. And what were the events of 1843, when the Scottish Church split into competing confessions, each claiming descent from the true principles of the Reformation, but a spiritual civil war? Nations which survive do not dissolve conflicts. They institutionalise them, and allow competing traditions to claim that each of them is an authentic voice of the nation. The success of a nation lies not in its ability to produce harmony—this is the illusion of totalitarianism—but in its ability to maintain dialogue between opposing conceptions of the national past and the national future. It was because of those dialogues that nineteenth-century nationalisms were so often the foundation for, or the prologue to, democratic political systems.

Second, the conception of the nation as a ‘community’ does not need to invoke notions of ‘organic unity’, as something singular and resistant to outside influence: it did not do so for Herder, often cited as the source of romantic nationalism. For Herder nations developed by a process of ‘grafting’ and cross-fertilisation, and therefore by the same kind of cultivation that produces new forms of life in nature. What he rejected was the political
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imposition of the ‘alien’ forms of culture—such as French liberté—which had no natural relationship with, and no natural interaction with, local—in this case, German—culture. The nation, for Herder, develops by organic interaction; what it resists is mechanical imposition. Nor, indeed, did ‘community’ imply ‘organic unity’ within Scottish traditions of thought. Robert Morrison MacIver, first exponent of sociology in a Scottish university (at Aberdeen, before the First World War), and later, after a period at the University of Toronto, Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, devoted his first book, published in 1915, to a study of ‘community’. The basis of his argument, however, was the rejection of any notion of a transcendent ‘unity’ over and above the individuals who participated in a community:

There is one essential difference between a community and an organism which destroys all real analogy. An organism is or has—according as we interpret it—a single centre, a unity of life, a purpose or a consciousness which is no purpose or consciousness of the several parts but only of the whole. A community consists of myriad centres of life and consciousness, of true autonomous individuals who are merged in no such corporate unity, whose purposes are lost in no such corporate purpose.33

For MacIver, unity is the product of human beings’ dependence upon one another and of the interdependence within a society which makes it possible for the individual to develop as a distinct personality. Personality, however, requires difference, because difference is the ontological foundation of our world—‘we cannot reject difference without rejecting also the common in the universe’—and difference is what makes democracy superior to totalitarianism, because ‘for all its defects democracy does accept the fact that we live in a complex world that teems with difference’.34 The ultimate unity of the nation, therefore, can be discovered only in and through the recognition of opposition and conflict: ‘It will appear as the result of our investigation that while oppositions of interests are necessary and ubiquitous they are yet subsidiary to a still more universal unity of interests. The deepest antagonisms between interests are not so deep as the foundations of community.’35 For MacIver, the
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index of the development of community is its ability to produce and sustain individual personality, not as the common expression of a shared identity, but as an increasing degree of diversity. The test of a community’s real unity will be the degree of its internal differentiation, the level of its internal debate.

Accounts of the nation as the generator of ‘unity’ respond to only one dimension of certain stages of certain kinds of nationalism—those which seek unification, either territorial (Italy) or spiritual (Ireland), in order to recover a lost national heritage—ignoring the fact that even within such nationalist movements there will always be discord, amounting often to conflict, about the ends to be achieved. More importantly, those accounts ignore the fact that nationalisms are often the product of the diasporic imagination: it was in London, on Primrose Hill in 1792, that Iolo Morganwg (Edward Williams) and his friends in the Gwyneddigion Society held a bardic ritual, a Gorsedd, which would eventually be integrated into and set the pattern for the Welsh national eisteddfod—and so for Welsh national self-consciousness—in 1819. It was in London—a fact which his Irish opponents did not hesitate to point out—that W.B.Yeats developed in the 1890s the cultural nationalism which would inform the Irish Revival movement. It was in Oxford in the mid-1960s that Scottish philosopher H.J.Paton wrote *The Claim of Scotland*, the first serious defence of modern Scottish nationalism. The dreams of diaspora become the lived realities of the nation. Modern nationalisms are as often the product of the memories of the displaced, seeking ways of reshaping a homeland they may not even intend to revisit, as they are the ‘expression’ of an underlying national unity awaiting its moment to achieve independent statehood.

It is an irony inscribed in the work of Benedict Anderson through the figure of José Rizal, whose first novel, *Noli Me Tangere* (1887), established him as the ‘Father of Filipino Nationalism’, and whose execution at the order of the Spanish governor of the Philippines in 1896 was prologue to the collapse of Spanish power in the Pacific. Within two years of his execution, the nationalist government which briefly controlled the Philippines—before the country was sold by the Spanish to the United States—declared the date of Rizal’s execution to be a day of mourning for the country’s National Hero.

---

Readers of *Imagined Communities* or of Anderson’s next book, *The Spectre of Comparisons* (1998), became familiar with Rizal, since in the former he is one of several novelists whose work Anderson invokes to illustrate what he means by describing the nation as an ‘imagined community’; and in the latter the title itself derives from a phrase in Chapter 8 of *Noli Me Tangere—el demonio de las comparaciones*. Rizal, whose final poem of farewell before his execution is also quoted in *Imagined Communities*, has hauntedAnderson’s work since the 1980s and his changing presentation seems to mark Anderson’s evolving conception of nationalism and its imaginations.

In *Imagined Communities* we are told that *Noli Me Tangere* is typical of ‘many other nationalist novels’ in its geography, for although ‘some of the Filipino characters have been to Spain (off the novel’s stage), the circumambience of travel by any of the characters is confined to what, eleven years after its publication and two years after its author’s execution, would become the Republic of the Philippines’. From this we might deduce that Rizal, an indigenous writer whose characters are limited in their journeys to the boundaries of an emergent nation, was himself not only a nationalist writer but one whose life is circumscribed by the geography of what would eventually become his nation. What we learn from Anderson’s later book, *Under Three Flags* (2005), however, is that far from being a writer limited by national geography, Rizal wrote his major works during nearly ten years when he was travelling and living in France, Germany and England, with briefer forays to Japan and the United States. His biography is an example of what Anderson calls ‘The Age of Early Globalisation’. And his execution, too, was a consequence of global forces, since it was ordered in the fear of a nationalist uprising in the Philippines to take advantage of the fact that the Spanish were already engaged in suppressing resistance to their rule in faraway Cuba.

In *Under Three Flags* Rizal the nationalist is also Rizal the globalist—corresponding in several languages, influenced by French and German
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literature, working with other Filipinos and Philippine specialists who are resident in Spain, France, Germany or Belgium. The Rizal of *Under Three Flags* is very different indeed from the Rizal to whom we thought we had been introduced in *Imagined Communities*: his nationalism is not the product of the circumscribed life of someone bounded by the territory, both physical and intellectual, of the nation whose freedom he demands, but the outcome of the experience of migration, of becoming part of what, in the course of time, would become a Philippine diaspora. Nationalism is not, in Rizal’s case, or in the case of many nationalist movements, the result of an upsurge of emotion ‘rooted’ in its own national territory or the ‘expression’ of an underlying reality which has only been awaiting its historical moment to assert itself: it is the product, instead, of migration, of cultural boundary crossing, of the experience of precisely those cultural environments which, in many accounts of nationalism, represent the ‘cosmopolitan’ antithesis to the parochial introversions of national self-consciousness.

Nationalism, in other words, is not the ‘organic’ product of the fundamental ‘nature’ of the national territory and national history: it is, instead, the product of those who have encountered and rejected its antithesis—a metropole which assumes its own values to be universal. It was not by accident that the shaping presences in the development of the Irish Republic were London-based W. B. Yeats and New York-born Eamon de Valera, or that those involved in the establishment of the National Party of Scotland in 1928 included Robert Bontine Cunnighame Graham, known as Don Roberto in the Argentina in which he made his fortune, a traveller in North Africa, Spain and the American South before becoming a Liberal MP and then Britain’s first socialist MP in the 1880s, and Compton Mackenzie, born in London as mere Edward Montague Compton, whose ancestral links to the clan Mackenzie were of dubious provenance. A homeland can only be recognised as an end to be strived after by those, like Rizal, for whom ‘nostos’ has become ‘nostalgia’—a place left behind, a place usurped by an alien culture, a place that can only be returned to when it is itself turned back to what it was or might have been.

Diaspora, in other words, is not an accidental adjunct to a homeland history in which nationalism flourishes as a native product: diaspora is the extreme version of the displacements—the internal displacements of population from country to city, and the external displacements produced by encounters with ‘developed’ cultures and metropolitan centres—on which nationalism is founded. If Anderson is right in seeing the American Revolution and its
Declaration of Independence as a key historical model for later nationalisms, then it is so not because it represents an ‘organic’, ‘native’ society reclaiming its rights, but because it is a diasporic society coming to terms with its displacement and transforming its New England—a mere copy of a homeland left behind—into a new, American homeland.

III

Anderson’s version of the nation as imagined community comes into existence, he argues, with print capitalism, which produces new ‘vernacular’ communities to replace the old ‘universal’ communities defined by a sacred language which, like medieval Latin, belonged to no particular place. It is the boundaries of these new vernacular language systems that then shape the territory of the new social formations we call nations, which is why language has been such a crucial element both to the cohesion of established nations and to the demands of incipient nations. A distinctive language is the sign of a possible nation which can only fully exist if it has a state committed to protecting and developing that language as the medium of its public life. Alternatively, in colonial territories where English and French have been imposed as the medium of public life, the state must produce a nation by educating its population into adopting and acknowledging that (originally alien) language which now defines a shared identity transcending the divisions of local vernaculars.

For Anderson, the important issue in the emergence of the nation is the emergence of this new unity, a vernacular language in which a population can communicate with one another uniformly across a particular territory. And this was why, for Gellner, a nation has to be of a scale sufficient to support an effective educational system, because it is only through education that the nation can ensure its citizenry speak the same language. This is an idea which seems to derive from the work of Canadian theorist Marshall McLuhan, who had argued in *Understanding Media* (1964) that,

Of the many unforeseen consequences of typography, the emergence of nationalism is, perhaps, the most familiar. Political unification of populations by means of vernacular and language groupings was unthinkable before printing turned each vernacular into an extensive mass medium. The tribe, an extended form of a family of blood
relatives, is exploded by print, and is replaced by an association of men homogeneously trained to be individuals. Nationalism itself came as an intense new visual image of group destiny and status, and depended on a speed of information movement unknown before printing.44

The nation itself becomes a ‘mass medium’, a circuit for the rapid exchange of information. That information circuit, however, does not, for McLuhan, produce ‘unified fields of exchange’, each locked in the separation of its own inner realm: at the same time that it produces nations, typography ‘extended the minds and voices of men to reconstitute the human dialogue on a world scale that has bridged the ages’.45 What typography made possible was not only the consolidation and expression of a new unified vernacular consciousness—it was translation, it was the exchange of texts between cultures. ‘Until 1700’, McLuhan notes, ‘more than 50 per cent of all printed books were ancient or medieval’.46 The establishment of vernacular print cultures required, by the very limitation of their cultural reach both in time and in space, the translation into them of all the knowledge that they lacked: the Bible, the classics, the sciences and literatures of other cultures. The ‘imagined community’ of belonging, of ‘unified fields of exchange’, is also, and necessarily, the environment of exchange between fields which are not unified, which are now separated by historical (Greek, Latin) or linguistic (French, German, Spanish) boundaries. The language which is the medium of national unity is also, at the same time, the medium that makes inevitable the awareness of non-unified fields of exchange. The very singularity of national vernaculars requires their engagement in a process of cultural translation and cultural exchange in which print capitalism is every bit as dynamic in the exchange of goods across borders as was capitalism itself. Far from being closed environments, those vernacular print cultures were precisely, for increasing masses of people who had been excluded from the world of Latin learning in the Middle Ages, the medium by which they could encounter that which did not belong within, and was not native to, their own vernacular environment. The emergence of national cultures, drawing into literacy larger and larger proportions of their populations, makes possible a previously undreamed of exchange of cultural information. Far from being an information circuit contained within and limited to its own boundaries, cultivating its own roots, the nation is an
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information circuit making possible the re-routing—like the re-rooting of plants in botanic gardens—of information from cultures anywhere in time and space.

The nation has to be understood as the medium that makes possible both a new sense of shared cultural identity and an unprecedented level of cultural exchange. Which is why nationalisms begin not from the inspiration of their own local cultures but in imitation, in the search for a local equivalent of what has been encountered previously only through translation. James Macpherson’s Ossianic poems provide the perfect instance of this process, for they begin not only as the translation into English of a supposedly ancient Gaelic poetry but as a translation of those Gaelic epics into a poetic mode that conforms to eighteenth-century taste and eighteenth-century morality. A linguistic translation becomes a cultural translation, one that makes Ossianic heroes ‘at home’ in the eighteenth century. The translation is also undertaken, however, in the expectation that the reader will recognise in the poems a Gaelic equivalent of ancient Greek epic literature, and recognise, therefore, that Greek literature is not a unique, time-transcending universal but only one expression of the common cultural situation of early human societies. The translation is thus an ‘imitation’ in a double sense: first, it imitates ancient literature in a style which fits with contemporary aesthetic expectations; at the same time, by its conformity with the principles of Homeric narrative, it reveals that all ancient works and all ancient cultures are mutually comprehensible, and so can be appropriately understood as alternative ‘translations’ of a shared, underlying experience. This double translation was undertaken, however, at the behest of a Scottish intelligentsia which was itself engaged in an equally radical ‘translation’—the ‘translation’ of a Scots-speaking people into an English-writing people. It is as though the translation of Scots speakers into English writers requires a radical counterbalance—the discovery of an ancient Gaelic epic which can be translated into English but which, at the same time, establishes that the Scots are not the same in origin as the ‘English’ into which they have been translated. Instead, they are the inheritors of an alternative, classical culture, a modern translation of a culture as ancient and as distinguished as the Greek. Thus does Scottish culture, in the mid-eighteenth century, become a culture of translation, an anglicising culture which could also celebrate Burns’s translation of the fine feelings of the Enlightenment into the language of the Ayrshire peasantry, a translation that Burns comically symbolised in the ‘The Brigs o Ayr’:
(That Bards are second-sighted is nae joke,
And ken the lingo of the sp’ritual folk;
Fays, spunkies, kelpies, a’, they can explain them,
And ev’n the vera deils they brawly ken them).

_Auld Brig_ appear’d of ancient Pictish race,
The vera wrinkles Gothic in his face:
He seem’d as he wi’ Time had warstl’d lang,
Yet, toughly doure, he bade an unco bang.

_New Brig_ was buskit in a braw new coat,
That he, at _Lon’on_, frae _Adams_ got.47

Burns’s Scots presents itself, here, as the medium through which is translated the voice ‘of ancient Pictish race’ and of a voice—and accent—that comes from ‘_Lon’on_’ in a ‘braw new coat’. ‘Bards’ are translators of ‘the lingo of the sp’ritual folk’, and, like the bridges which his poem celebrates, poems are the crossing places of cultures—one leading back to a ‘Pictish’ past, one pointing forward to an anglicised (_Lon’on_-oriented) future. What the poem celebrates, however, is precisely that there are two bridges, and therefore a multiplicity of crossings between alternative cultural possibilities.

Poetry, in Burns as in Macpherson, is acknowledged and exploited as a crossing place—which is, perhaps, what made both poets so _translatable_. No poet, other than Shakespeare, has been as translated as Burns,48 and Macpherson’s work, as Howard Gaskill has shown, developed its enormous influence through the translation of translations. Not only was Macpherson’s own text a translation but many of the translations of his work were themselves translations of the work of his translators—so Montengón’s _Fingal_ (1800), the only complete translation of Macpherson’s poem into Spanish, is based not on Macpherson’s English but on Cesarotti’s Italian version,49 which was itself an attempt to transform Italian poetry by vernacularising a ‘classic’ into a new kind of Italian. By holding out the possibility that every culture could recover, from its own fragmented past, epics that were the equivalent of the classical Greek, Macpherson’s poetry gave an enormous impetus to the search for and the assertion of independent national cultures, but this was achieved precisely
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through the translation of translations. The aesthetic issue of the ‘authenticity’ of Macpherson’s poetry—does he deserve credit, as an author, for effectively ‘faking’ (and faking effectively) an ancient epic?—has distracted historians from the importance of its cultural form. Macpherson’s work inaugurates the era of nationalism as self-conscious translation—translation from heroic past to banal present, translation from an ‘original’ tongue into the shared medium of a standard modern lexicography, translation from someone else’s culture into one’s ‘own’. Macpherson’s work was translated, and translated many times, into most of the major languages of Europe until well into the nineteenth century, long after his work had been ‘discredited’ in Britain: the longevity of its historical influence depended precisely on the ambiguity which allowed it to point towards the recollection and recovery of a lost ancient origin while, at the same time, inviting, by its status as a translation into a modern idiom, another translation, another modernising, another recontextualisation. The modern nation, Ossian teaches us, is born not out of the discovery of native ‘authenticity’ but out of the always fragile process—because it can never be certain, can never be absolutely accurate, and is always open to a new version—of translation; the nation is not an ultimate truth to be rediscovered, whatever some nationalists and some nation theorists may say, but an ongoing act of translation.

That conceptions of the nation based on unity, harmony and linguistic purity have continued to shape modern discussions of the nation are indicative of the extent to which our understanding of the nation and national culture has been dominated by the dominant cultures of the Western tradition, for whom it has been ideologically convenient to regard translation as a minor activity within the total cultural economy of the nation. Raymond Williams’s *Culture*, published in 1981, is symptomatic, since it is written by a confessedly radical author born in what he called ‘Border Country’, but for Williams translation and cross-border cultural exchange is an after-thought to the analysis of ‘culture’ as a single-nation category. Cultural exchange is a ‘function of relative political or commercial dominance, with especially clear cases in the political empires’ but, most importantly, a function of modern processes in ‘cinema and television production [where] conditions of relative monopoly, not only internally but internationally, have led beyond simple processes of export to more general processes of cultural dominance and then of cultural dependence’.\(^{50}\) Exchange is, in other words, a *modern* phenomenon in terms
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of its cultural significance, at least for major cultures such as England’s: it is a product of a new globalised capitalism that has broken down the boundaries of what was previously a self-contained cultural entity. That self-containment is clear in Williams’s major studies of ‘culture’ in Britain, which, from *Culture and Society* in 1958 to *The Country and the City* in 1973, presented not only a single culture version of British society—there is only the barest acknowledgment of internal cultural difference, and Joyce’s *Ulysses* is invoked as the ultimate version in ‘our literature’ of the fragmentation brought about by the ‘city’, as though cities had no national context—but also a conception of British culture as an ‘export’ which required no balancing ‘import’. The experience of ‘country and city’ as a product of capitalism ‘began, specifically, in the English rural economy, and produced, there, many of the characteristic effects… which have since been seen, in many extending forms, in cities and colonies and in an international system as a whole’. Cultural transmission is directed outwards by the internal dynamics of an English development which can be analysed in isolation because it is fundamentally autonomous: its values are transferred to other cultures, its language translated into other languages but it remains immune from any inward cross-fertilisation, either from those cultures with which it is directly adjacent or through any counterflow from the territories it dominates.

The same was true in the same period of the influential sociology of Pierre Bourdieu in France. Despite his own early experience of Algeria, and despite claims that what he analyses will be true of all class societies, Bourdieu’s analysis of culture in *Distinction* is insistently ‘national’ by virtue of the very invisibility of the concept of the nation. Claims are constantly made about the influence of ‘the specific history of an artistic tradition’, or the taste of ‘working-class people’—who refuse ‘any sort of formal experimentation and all the effects which, by introducing a distance from the accepted conventions… tend to distance the spectator’—as though these were not French traditions, French working-class people or the views of a French analyst. Bourdieu assumes that what is true of France is true of all modern societies because he assumes that all modern societies can be understood in terms of their own autonomous inner organisation. The ‘art for art’s sake’ aesthetic of the French bourgeoisie
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may derive from Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of Judgment* (*Kritik der Urteilskraft*), but the fact of the translation of German theory into French culture is never raised by Bourdieu, because the Kantian aesthetic is assumed to be *internal* to French cultural traditions. Translation, like the nation, has disappeared in a universal structure shared by all, allowing the specific culture of France to be assumed true of all nations. And yet the very existence of a study of *distinction* in France tells us something that is itself distinctive about French culture: the importance to France—to its government, to its intellectual elite, to its tourist industry, to its agricultural and industrial exports—of a distinctive and distinguished culture, a culture distinctively different from those of its neighbours. The ‘distinction’ which Bourdieu attributes to the accumulation of ‘cultural capital’ by the upper classes in France depends, in fact, not merely upon their access to the top schools and to the élite higher education establishments—that is, to their power within the French class system—but to their access to the cultural capital of France as a nation. This makes their activity, whether as writers, artists, film makers, historians or literary critics, more *translatable* than the work of equivalently upper class and culturally endowed individuals from smaller, less well-endowed nations. ‘Distinction’ within France is enhanced and magnified by the lens which legitimises France as a capital of culture, and therefore as the country in which cultural capital has more value than in any other.

Cultural capital in France, one might say, has more exchange value than similar cultural capital in Ireland or in Scotland: translation is disproportionate and French culture has greater presence in Ireland and Scotland than Irish or Scottish culture has in France. For Bourdieu, ‘cultural capital’ is about accumulation: the accumulation achieved through the family’s investment in itself and in the choice of school and university by which its culture can be reproduced from generation to generation. What this ignores is that what is accumulated is only, ultimately, of value if it can also be exchanged and that the exchange value of French culture is very high; it is worth accumulating cultural capital in France precisely because it has a very high translatable value throughout the rest of the world. Joyce’s *Ulysses* establishes itself as the great modernist novel not because it is ‘about’ Dublin but because it is published in Paris and is given the cultural credit that comes from recognition by the French cultural capital. Bourdieu ignores translation because he ignores, equally, the value that comes from translatability, a translatability that continually enhances and enriches French cultural capital.

These versions of an autonomous ‘nation-state-culture’, it might be thought, would have been overthrown by the rise of ‘postcolonialism’,
with its emphasis on ‘writing back’ to the old colonial centres, and on the ‘contrapuntal reading’ of the colonial centre by its colonised margins, but what has emerged most strongly from the postcolonial analyses as an alternative to the autonomous national culture is the concept of ‘hybridity’. Taking its inspiration from Bakhtin’s conception of ‘hybridization’ as ‘a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor’, postcolonialism has been constructed as the conflict between traditional, homogeneous cultures and the new cultures produced by the impact of colonialism on local cultures or on the impact of migrants within the body of traditional societies. So Homi Bhabha suggests that contemporary criticism needs to learn from the experience of ‘those who have suffered the sentence of history—subjugation, domination, diaspora, displacement’, and who therefore inhabit a hybrid culture, one which is, as Wilson Harris has suggested, constantly struggling to free itself from a past which stressed ancestry, and which valued the “pure” over its threatening opposite, the “composite”. Equally, Declan Kiberd applauds Davis’s description of the Irish as ‘a composite race’ because ‘What had been billed as the Battle of the Two Civilizations was really, and more subtly, the interpenetration of each by the other: and this led to the generation of the new species of man and woman, who felt exalted by rather than ashamed of such hybridity’. ‘Hybridity’ is the antithesis of the autonomous ‘culture-nation-state’ that organises the analyses of Williams and Bourdieu, but the problem with hybridity is that it requires the ongoing reality of that ‘pure’ notion of culture to have any purchase: the hybrid can only be the product of the contamination of the pure; the pure has to exist and has to continue to exist if the hybrid is to have any relevance as a category. But if the original purity was no more than an illusion, what then is hybridity? If, as seems to be the case, all cultures of the modern world are ‘hybrid’—in the sense that they are the products of ethnic, linguistic and cultural crossings—then the concept of hybridity becomes redundant: its only
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purpose is to act as an ideological tool for challenging dominant cultures, a tool which obscures the real nature of the relationship that it seeks to describe. Indeed, it was precisely against the self-evident *hybridity* of modern nations that notions of cultural purity were promoted in the nineteenth century by theorists of race such as Robert Knox in Scotland, and by theorists of the ‘Celtic’ such as Ernest Renan in France. Ironically, in the light of modern developments in Ireland, Renan regarded Irish culture as one of the few cases in the world of a cultural *purity* based on unmixed blood, and, even more ironically, Robert Knox developed the concept of hybridity in order to prove that miscegenation would undermine any culture’s ability to survive in the world. The ‘mixed’, for Knox, was the weak.

The ‘hybridity’ proposed by postcolonial theorists is a hybridity which ignores the history of the concept as part of the theory of race purity, a history which underlines that ‘hybridity’ involves ‘fusion’ between two ‘purities’ and therefore drastically simplifies the much more complex process of translation, adoption, adaption and projection which are actually involved in cultural exchange. Thus the hybridity which recent Irish criticism has celebrated is a hybridity only of Ireland and England—‘Ireland was soon patented as not-England’, Kiberd observes—but in doing so entirely erases the presence in Ireland of the very different ‘fusion’ which produced the ‘Scots-Irish’ who have come to be seen as such a powerful force in the shaping both of American independence and of American popular culture. ‘Hybridity’, in other words, assumes a relationship between two purities, but the reality of both Irish and Scottish cultures is that they are the outcome of multiple origins, of diverse exchanges, of dynamic intersections which result not in ‘fusion’ but in the translation and juxtaposition of many different cultural resources which can never be simply combined. John Claudius Loudon’s conception of the ‘gardenesque’ (as the juxtaposition of plants from entirely different environments) is, we might suggest, a much more appropriate image for the modern nation than Robert Knox’s conception of the ‘hybrid’. The nation is a series of cultural juxtapositions, requiring a continuous process of translation, out of which arises neither unity nor hybridity but only the trajectory of an ongoing debate which the participants
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agree to continue, whether out of necessity (‘we share the same space and neither of us is going to go away’), or out of loyalty to the past (‘these are the inheritances we share despite our differences’), or even out of loyalty to the future (‘this is the nation we wish to create whatever the differences in our conception of it’). When translation between these different value systems breaks down, civil war ensues, because the ‘nation’ has ceased to be the context in which one set of values can be recognisably translated into the language of another set of values. What Ireland and Scotland represent is the nation as translation, the nation in translation, nations which require a very different conception of the nation to those provided by recent nation theory.

IV

‘Diaspora’, Greek for the scattering of seeds, is a word whose implications have been defined largely by the history of Jewish experience. This translation is itself significant, for the Greeks had another word for the diasporic experience – *xeniteia*, which implies not the exile from a homeland to which one wishes to return but the carrying forth of the values of the *polis* from which one sets out, of the *khora* in which one’s cultural values were formed, and their re-establishment in a new place, a place of exile but one which is not a place of suffering and alienation, continually posited on the possibility of a return home, but a place of fulfilment through the recreation and re-establishment of the values of the homeland. Diaspora in the form of *xeniteia* represents the ability to scatter the seeds of the homeland in a foreign environment and make them grow into a new version of the culture from which one set out. Exile is not loss but recovery, the re-enactment and repetition of the establishment of the *polis* and its values.

Modern discussions about ‘diaspora’ have been hampered by the etymological and historical connotations of the term, since it assumes that all diaspora must share the same experience of exile and loss, the same desire to return to a homeland, that was inscribed in Jewish experience. This is clear, for instance, in Robin Cohen’s influential account of diaspora, which stresses ‘the wish to return to the home country’ as a key feature of diasporic
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consciousness. But to the xeniteian consciousness there is no such need because the home country has been rebuilt in a new location: no ultimate return is required since no ultimate rupture has taken place. (One might recall 1950s adverts that presented New Zealand as a ‘Better Britain’). What we have is not a lost nation, maintaining consciousness of a homeland to which it wishes to return, but a refounded nation, running in parallel with its place of origin.

Key moments in Irish and Scottish history—the Famine, the Clearances—have been constructed in terms of the victimhood which produces a diaspora suffused with nostalgia for a homeland that remains a potential place of return. But many Irish, Scots and Scots-Irish migrants travelled with no such sense of victimhood; they were xeniteian migrants, seeding their old culture in new places, the desire for return transformed into the casual wish to revisit. They were a people translated (in its original sense of moved to another location) rather than dispersed, and thus the desire to impose the names of the homeland on their new territory. On the coastroad from San Francisco to Monterey there is a sign that points you to ‘Bonny Doon’, a place of hills and lochs (one is even called Loch Lomond) which is sufficiently conscious of its Scottish heritage (despite the fact that its contemporary population is of predominantly Italian origin) that its local newspaper is titled *The Highlander*. It is easy to read this as the nostalgia of exile, but the Scottish migrant who first logged these wooded hillsides carried his Robert Burns with him as the language of a homeland he was constructing rather than a homeland to which he wished to return. Spanish America renamed became Scotland refounded.

In these xeniteian communities, since there is no desire for a return to a ‘lost’ homeland, there is no need to ‘live apart’ in order to maintain the purity of the culture for its future reintegration into the body of the nation. National identity is maintained over generations, therefore, by its ritual performance, performance that ranges from distinctive religious observation shaping the texture of daily (or, perhaps, weekly) life, to the ritual enactment of national identity on national ‘days’ such as St.Patrick’s or St Andrew’s. Such ritual performances restate national communal values both to the community itself and to its neighbours, assuring both of its continuing existence and distinctive purpose, and reminding the ‘hostland’ that it is also a ‘homeland’. These ritual xeniteian performances of national identity

---

produce forms of ‘national’ culture which may be quite distinct from, or have a very different tenor to, the culture of the nation from which they derive. That secular St Patrick’s day celebrations were long established in North America before being taken up in Ireland, and that the demand for St Andrew’s day to be acknowledged in Scotland came from North American Saint Andrew’s societies, is symptomatic of the ways in which xeniteian identity celebrations not only change the nature of the culture in their own territory but produce a backflow which reshapes the culture of their original homeland. The homeland is translated by its translations.

In the language of organicist or single-culture models of the nations, such translations prove the nation—or certain nations, such as Ireland and Scotland—to be at best an invention, at worst a fiction or a fraud; in the language of postcolonial theory, they prove the nation to be composite, its ‘hybridity’ the distinctive outcome of a violated purity. Neither is adequate to the dynamic of ongoing transformation which the nation, both in its homeland and in its xeniteian doubles, initiates. National culture is not something which simply accumulates from the past into the present, nor is it the outcome of a once and for all coupling of two purities: it is the product of a continuous process of exchange in which a self-consciously asserted national distinction is itself part of the cultural capital which is available for exchange. So Irish and Scots migrants carried their cultures with them as a capital that could be invested or as a credit in which others would be prepared to invest; so Irish and Scots at home adopted and promoted those markers of distinction—from folk song and military prowess to education and religion—which would be recognised and valued elsewhere as national cultural capital, thereby offsetting the unequal exchange which had forced them into the adoption of English as the language of their daily cultural transactions. Translated into English speakers, they became, like their xeniteian migrants, performers of their cultural difference, always translating anew their past translations; like their gardeners and botanists, they were forever discovering ways in which the alien could be made to flourish in native soil.

That flourishing of foreign seeds suggests, however, another relation between ‘diaspora’ and the modern nation, since one of the sources of modern nationalism, it has been suggested, was the parallel that the national churches of the Reformation encouraged ‘between the election and persecution of the children of Israel with their own lot, their Old Testament interpretation of

67 As early as 1737 in Boston and 1766 in New York.
their sufferings at the hands of hostile state authorities’. The ‘reformed’ were not at home in their native lands, but were on a journey through spiritual exile. The diasporic seed of the Word had made exiles of all of the elect, urging them towards the remaking of their homeland as the promised land. Contemporary Israel may be a late-comer among modern nations, a forced replica of the homeland as a nation state, but Israel may have been, in its earlier diasporic experience, the very foundation of the modern nation and of modern nationalism. The desire to return home of those who have been cast out, the desire of the exile to refind and to refound the promised land, was a model on which the longing for national fulfilment in the early period of nationalist development was based. Nationalism is the expression of the sense that even those who inhabit the ‘homeland’ are exiles, are a diaspora seeking a return to the home from which they are outcast. The diasporic imagination has been able so powerfully to reshape national cultures because the very notion of a national culture is itself founded on the model of the original, Biblical diaspora. Modern diasporas are not a consequence of the existence of the nation and of national nostalgia; rather the nation itself is the outcome of diasporic experiences, whether literal, spiritual or allegorical. Diasporas are, in effect, the creators of nations. In the beginning was homelessness—here, there, or elsewhere.

*University of Aberdeen*
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As a mode of explanation for past and present patterns of international migration and settlement, *diaspora* has recently gained considerable currency but it remains a contested and problematic term. Earlier emphases—following the paradigm of Jewish experience—on population movements that were forced, exilic, and driven by ethnic or religious persecution, have been supplemented by discussion of ‘almost any expatriate group … regardless of the conditions leading to the[ir] dispersion’.¹ Recent studies have identified dispersed political minorities, economic migrants, trans-national language groups, religious communities, ethno-cultural and nationally-defined solidarities, as well as gays, whites, rednecks and fundamentalists, as all deserving diasporic status. As Brubaker notes, however, this more inclusive usage carries its own dangers: ‘if everyone is diasporic, then no-one is distinctly so … The universalisation of diaspora, paradoxically, means the disappearance of diaspora’.²

At the core of these conflicting inclusions and definitions lies the issue of the geographical locatedness—or otherwise—of individual identity. To what extent are the identities of people in diaspora in any sense bounded, whether by their sedentary diasporic present or the ‘remembered’ places of their past? Alternatively, as critical scholarship suggests, are people in diaspora so thoroughly displaced that they always occupy ‘in-between’ space, neither here nor there? Robin Cohen has argued that however diasporas are caused, they all share certain common characteristics: a mythic ‘memory’ of the homeland and an aspiration to return there; a distinctive ethnic consciousness; empathy with co-ethnics in other host countries; and a troubled relationship with the host society in the country of settlement.³ Individually, people in diaspora possess both a sense of dislocation and of wider belonging. Grounded in core beliefs and memory that are external to their present situation, this atavistic
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wider ‘belonging’—the sense of being ‘rooted’ elsewhere—positions these individuals in ‘two worlds’: their expatriate or expatriate-descended present, and their imagined past.

For Cohen, diasporic identities are necessarily grounded in a variety of time-place moments: the experiential reality of the ‘now’, and invocations of the remembered ‘then’. Similarly, William Safran grounds the diasporic present within the wider frame of memory. He suggests that people in diaspora habitually retain some sort of memory of their place of origin, create religious and cultural institutions that are its mirror, and continue to engage with it in symbolic or practical ways. However, because many emigrants doubt whether they are totally accepted by their host country, they preserve an aspirational belief in the possibility of returning to their homeland. Consequently, diasporic life is characterised by an underlying dialectic arising from being in one place physically but thinking regularly of another place far away. Thus people in diaspora are characterised by a spiritual, emotional, and cultural attachment to their perceived but distant homeland. Viewed thus, diaspora provides a useful ‘metaphorical designation’ that encompasses the widely differing experiences of ‘expatriates, expellees, political refugees, alien residents, immigrants and ethnic and racial minorities tout court’.4

Both Safran and Cohen assume that collectively, diasporic identities depend on some form of bounded locality, a country or region say, as a defining point of reference. Critical representations of diaspora as a ‘transnational’ state of being and consciousness challenge this assumption. The key issue is essentialism. Kalra, Kaur, and Hutnyk, for example, dismiss Cohen’s ethnographic distinction between victim/refugee, imperial/colonial, service/labour, trade/business/professional, and cultural/hybrid/postmodern diasporas as ‘essentialist primordialism’. Claiming that this accommodates neither the possibility of multiple diasporic moves nor the absence for some of any memory of a homeland, they emphasize instead the potential capacity of transnational movement to ‘de-territorialize’ the individual. Instead of being ‘absolutist notions’ based on ‘prescriptive locations in territory and history’ (that is, a homeland), diasporic belonging and identity invoke shared experience and practice, and the consciousness that derives from these.5 In short, diasporic consciousness invokes ‘routes’ rather than ‘roots’.

Each approach offers considerable insights into what Patrick O’Farrell once described, in the context of Irish migration to Australia, as the emigrants’
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capacity ‘to live in a jumble of worlds, past and present, near and far, real and imagined’ or, as Seamus Heaney put it, ‘to live in two places at the one time, and in two times at the only place’. Both, in short, seem capable of recovering something of the unstable, changing transnational worlds inhabited by first-generation migrants and their descendents, and of the ways in which their presentist daily existence was inevitably framed by past experience. How may we best combine these insights? How can we bring together anti-essentialist notions of diaspora which see it as a continuous process or practice ‘that makes claims, articulates projects, mobilises energies, and appeals to loyalties’ on the one hand, with the idea, stressed by Kokot et al that while diaspora may transgress boundaries of culture, identity and locality which are themselves diffuse, the ‘essences’ of (diasporic) identity remain implicated within and reflected by the ‘realities of sedentary diasporic life’? With the idea, in other words, that no matter how complex and unstable the sense of identity constructed by diasporic people, nor how strong their sense of non-belonging, their diasporic lives still impart meaning to, and acquire meaning from, the material circumstances of their daily life?

Place and Identity

In this paper we argue that current critical geographical understandings of place offer precisely this degree of accommodation. They allow us to embrace the idea of diaspora as practice and experience, in other words, as a performative process of changing agency and identity, and to locate this within the material framework of the lived world people in diaspora encounter. In this way we retain the key idea of geographical difference that, common sense seems to suggest, must inflect any process of movement through space and time. Thus our conception of place is more than simply a synonym for a particular location in the physical landscape. We conceive place to be a subjectively constructed site of agency, identity and memory. Place exists in the imagination as a set of cultural meanings which individuals attach to the behaviour they observe in others at different locales. Meanings of place are therefore intensely personal.

8 The extensive Geographical literature on place is usefully summarised in Tim Cresswell, Place: a short introduction (Oxford, 2004).
and reflect the contingency of the individual’s positionality and experience. For this reason, meanings of place are never essentialist or singular. They reflect the individual’s own sense of who they are and, perhaps more importantly, who they are not; in short, their sense of ‘self’ and ‘other’.

These ‘grounded’ constructions of identity thus form part of the individual’s internalised ‘world view’ or mentalité. As such, they are capable of being expressed in a variety of material and non-material ways, and are susceptible to recovery via both the archive and the material cultural landscape. By combining both strategies, we may explore the ways in which people in diaspora ‘performed’ place in their countries of settlement and the different forms of memory these performances invoked. In the remainder of this paper we exemplify this by exploring the ways in which two members of the Irish diaspora, Michael O’Reilly and William Wall, performed place in the Australian town of Belfast (Port Fairy) during the second half of the nineteenth century. We begin by outlining the history of the town and its importance as an early centre of Irish settlement in Western Victoria. Thereafter, we consider the meanings which O’Reilly, a first-generation Catholic migrant and local newspaper owner, and Wall, a local government official and second generation ‘native’ of Catholic immigrant stock, attached to the public and private semiotic spaces there between the 1850s and 1880s. We conclude by briefly considering what these suggest about the construction of diasporic place generally.

**Contexts: Belfast (Port Fairy) 1843–1899**

Belfast (Port Fairy) was established as part of a land alienation process which offered the founding landowner a unique opportunity to erect tenurial structures which mirrored those in Ireland.9 Overlooking a natural anchorage at the mouth of the River Moyne in the far south-west of Victoria, the site was first occupied by Europeans as a seasonal whaling station, named Port Fairy and settled from Van Diemen’s Land, in the late 1820s. Urban settlement began in 1843, when James Atkinson, a Sydney-based lawyer of Irish gentry stock, consolidated his title to the land he had been acquiring in the area since at least 1837 by purchasing its freehold as a ‘Special Survey’.

---

9 This paragraph draws upon and expands our earlier account of the history of Belfast in Lindsay Proudfoot and Dianne Hall, ‘Memory and Identity in “Irish” Australia: Constructing Alterity in Belfast (Port Fairy), c. 1857–1873’, in Mark McCarthy (ed.), *Ireland’s Heritages Critical Perspectives on Memory and Identity* (Aldershot, 2005), 89–104.
Designed to promote well-capitalised systematic settlement, four of the ten Special Surveys granted in the Port Phillip District had significant Irish gentry involvement. Under their provisions, anyone who purchased a Land Receipt for at least 5120 acres, either from the Land and Emigration Commissioners in London or the colonial government in Sydney, could demand a survey of that amount of land in the locality of his choice, provided it was at least five miles from Melbourne, Geelong or Portland. Under these regulations, Atkinson established himself as landlord of some eight square miles of relatively rich agricultural land, all area capable of supporting what was—for this part of Australia—an unusually numerous population of tenant farmers. He named the new town and survey after Belfast in Ireland. This act of toponymic commemoration mirrored the actions of a neighbouring Irish land speculator, William Rutledge, who had, in 1841, already acquired a survey adjacent to Atkinson’s. Rutledge named this the Farnham Survey, after the major landowning family in his native Co. Cavan. Atkinson remained owner of the Belfast Survey until his death in 1864, when it passed to his son, Nithsdale. The family retained ownership until 1883, when they sold their remaining lands to a local business syndicate, who two years later sold the property to the sitting tenants and others.

As Atkinson and Rutledge developed their surveys, they adopted practices that were redolent of the discourse of improvement in Ireland. Like many Irish landowners, Atkinson was an absentee landlord in Belfast. Nevertheless, by 1846 his surveyors had begun to lay out the town and farm allotments, and by 1848 the town’s grid-iron plan had begun to take shape. Over the next ten years Atkinson followed the customary practice of many Irish landlords in repeatedly endowing his town with sites for the various public buildings necessary for its well-being and prosperity, including church sites for all the local denominations. Arguably, however, it was the

10 The name of ‘Belfast’ survived until 1887, when the borough council voted to alter the town’s name back to ‘Port Fairy’.
13 For example, sites were given for St Andrew’s Presbyterian church in 1849 (built
tenurial practices forged on the Belfast and Farnham Surveys which may have invoked the most powerful cultural memories for the 40 per cent or so of the town’s population who were of Irish stock.  

Atkinson’s absenteeism was accommodated by means of a delegated patronal authority which closely matched the managerial structures on many Irish estates. Until 1848, William Rutledge acted as James Atkinson’s middleman in Belfast. Responsible to Atkinson for payment of the head rent, he was empowered to negotiate leases with individual tenants, and was himself Atkinson’s major merchant tenant in the town.

When Rutledge withdrew from this arrangement to concentrate on his other business interests, James Atkinson replaced him with his own nephew, Robert Woodward, who had partnered Rutledge in establishing the Farnham Survey. Woodward continued his association with Rutledge while he acted as agent for James and Nithsdale Atkinson, exercising day to day managerial control over Belfast and the surrounding agricultural land. On both the Belfast and Farnham Surveys tenures were introduced which mirrored customary practice in Ireland. James Atkinson offered twenty-one-year building leases for urban plots in Belfast, and like Rutledge adopted the conacre system among his agricultural small holders. From 1854 he also instituted a generally unsuccessful programme of freehold sales to sitting urban tenants. Despite the local tradition that Atkinson’s influence hindered Belfast’s growth, the population grew steadily from a few hundreds in the late 1840s to 2,325 in 1873. The subsequent temporary decline to just over 1,750 by the early 1880s probably owed more to the energetic expansion of Belfast’s eastern neighbour and rival, Warrnambool.

1853–4); for St John’s Anglican church in 1853 and for its predecessor in 1846; and for St Patrick’s Roman Catholic church in 1857. See Marten A. Syme, Seeds of a Settlement: Buildings and Inhabitants of Belfast Port Fairy in the Nineteenth Century (Melbourne, 1991), 70, 96, 102.

14 If one accepts the conventional historical assumption that in colonial Australia Catholic affiliation was more or less synonymous with Irish origins, then the 1857 Census suggests that 21 per cent of the district’s population were Irish. This rose to over 30 per cent in 1891. In 1857 24 per cent of the population were Presbyterian, and among these a significant proportion were likely to have been Ulster-Scots, hence the estimate of 40 per cent for the total population of all Irish cultural traditions. See Syme, Seeds of a Settlement, 7–8.


than to the effects of landlordism. As the town expanded, so too did the institutions of local government. The Belfast District Road Board was declared in 1843, and was responsible for early road and other improvements. Recognition of Belfast’s growing importance as a regional centre came with the declaration of its municipal status in 1856, followed by its borough status in 1863. Like his counterparts in Ireland, Woodward played various roles in this institutional development, ensuring all the while that the Atkinsons’ interests were preserved. Elected as a member of the Road Board in 1843 (when James Atkinson was also elected as a Magistrate), he was subsequently both a Municipal and Borough Councillor, and latterly Lord Mayor (in 1866 – 7).

Place and Memory: Michael O’Reilly, Landlordism, and the Catholic Church

It was as part of this material narrative that Michael O’Reilly, William Wall, and every other person whose life connected in some way with Belfast, performed the town as place. Each brought their own understanding, grounded in their own values and experience, to the material spaces they shared—and to the behaviour others’ enacted in these spaces. In turn, these meanings drove their own behaviour or ‘performance’. Because these understandings of place were framed by personal experience, they inevitably invoked memory of various kinds. As a first-generation member of the Irish diaspora, Michael O’Reilly’s remembered Ireland possessed a personal immediacy which William Wall’s, as an Australian-born ‘native’, did not. O’Reilly also possessed an acute political consciousness, which may account for the character and intensity of his representations of Ireland and the way these framed his behaviour in Belfast. Prior to emigrating, O’Reilly had been a member of both the Young Ireland movement and the Irish Confederation of 1847, and in 1848 he had the unlikely distinction of being jailed for protesting against Queen Victoria’s visit to Dublin in that year. Following his arrival in Sydney in 1853, O’Reilly
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moved to Kilmore, a predominantly Irish town north of Melbourne, where he obtained work as a master in the Catholic school before falling out with the local priest.20

The dispute was prescient, and prefigured one of the major issues that drove O’Reilly’s own performance of place during his early ownership of The Banner of Belfast. Arriving in the town in 1857, O’Reilly established the paper as a radical organ that, while it privileged news from Ireland and frequently framed its interpretation of local events in terms of Irish experience, also championed what it conceived to be wider social justice. Two themes dominated the paper’s early columns: the continuing influence of the landed minority (‘the squattocracy’) in Victorian life and politics, and the ways Atkinson, Rutledge and Woodward exemplified this locally; and the alleged moral deficit in the way the (predominantly Irish) Catholic clergy behaved in the colony. In each instance, O’Reilly invoked memories of the behaviour of similar groups in Ireland, inviting his (Irish) readership to judge local squatters and clergy in that light. The comparison was rarely favourable; nor was it intended to be.

For O’Reilly, the squatters’ monopoly of Crown leases offered the real prospect of the creation of an Australian landlord class capable of the same predatory behaviour as its counterpart in Ireland. Atkinson and Rutledge’s freehold possession of their respective special surveys simply enhanced the local likelihood of this happening. The Banner’s editorial returned to the point repeatedly prior to the Victorian legislature’s land reforms in the early 1860s and after.21 In February 1857, the paper castigated Woodward for allegedly dispossessing some English tenants of Atkinson’s, leaving ‘the little homestead[s] they raised by their savings clutched in the merciless grip of landlordism’.22 A year later, commenting on the Derryveagh evictions in Donegal, the paper warned Charles Gavan Duffy, ex-Young Irelander and now Minister of Lands in Sir John O’Shanassy’s second Victorian government, of the broader danger of a resurgent landlordism in Australia:

Mr Duffy justly regarded landlordism as the main cause of the miseries of his countrymen at home, and we presume that his sagacity as a statesman will point out to him that the same effects may be had from the same causes in Australia.23
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21 The Victorian land legislation is discussed in detail in Joseph M. Powell, The Public Lands of Australia Felix (Melbourne, 1970), passim.
22 The Banner of Belfast, Editorial, 10 February 1857.
23 The Banner of Belfast, Editorial, 12 May 1858.
In August 1858, *The Banner* presumed on the cultural memory of its Irish readership to assert that none would dispute the ‘wretched condition’ to which Irish landlordism reduced Ireland’s peasantry.\(^{24}\) Four years later, the social consequences of widespread harvest failure in Munster were graphically described in morally-charged terms, which again indicted the Irish landlord class:

The aged parents sent to die by the ditch side by the landlord or his agent, the grown up sons and daughters emigrated and none but the helpless little ones left, who writhe in hunger by their sides. How many such pictures are still fresh in the recollections of hundreds of their countrymen?\(^{25}\)

*The Banner*’s message at this early stage in its history was clear. Landlordism was a malign social force, more than capable of the same economic predation in Australia as had characterised it in Ireland—as any Irish settler could affirm, or so O’Reilly claimed. Similar invocations of memory—and similarly negative assessments—inflected the paper’s representations of the Catholic clergy in the colony during the late 1850s. With the decline of English Benedictine influence in Australia earlier in the decade, the Catholic Church became increasingly Irish in temperament and membership.\(^{26}\) The creation in 1847 of the separate diocese of Melbourne under its first (Irish) bishop, James Alipius Goold, had already begun this process in Belfast, as it had in Victoria generally. The Catholic community in the town benefited from Goold’s twin priorities, church building and religious education, but not without controversy.\(^{27}\) Arguably, the problems arose from the senior diocesan clergy’s failure to recognise the fundamental differences between the colonial circumstances in which the Church now operated and those that had ‘naturalised’ its authority in Ireland. While the Church continued to demand the obedience, loyalty and support of the laity in Belfast, as elsewhere in Victoria, it appeared incapable of recognising that, in return, it needed to demonstrate some openness in its dealings with them. Among Irish migrants, the customary deference shown to the clergy in the closed and introverted spaces of rural Ireland was in danger
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\(^{24}\) *The Banner of Belfast*, Editorial, 5 August 1858.  
\(^{25}\) *The Banner of Belfast*, Editorial, 9 September 1862.  
of dissipating in a colonial environment characterised by widespread mobility, opportunity, and egalitarianism.\textsuperscript{28}

In the eyes of \textit{The Banner} at least, Goold’s heavy-handed attempts to maintain his authority were entirely inappropriate, as was the culture of episcopal secretiveness and arrogance which surrounded them.\textsuperscript{29} Matters came to a head at Belfast over plans to build a second, larger Catholic church, St. Patrick’s. The need for a replacement for the wooden structure built on the site given by Atkinson in 1847 had quickly become apparent, and when Fr William Shinnick arrived in the town as priest in 1853 some £1000 had already been collected by the parishioners.\textsuperscript{30} Shinnick had a reputation for drunkenness and high-handed behaviour, and by the time he was removed from Belfast by Goold early in 1856, he appears to have alienated many of his parishioners.\textsuperscript{31} Nothing, consequently, had been done about the new church. Shinnick was replaced by another Irish priest, Fr Patrick Dunne. Dunne had been one of three priests sent to Geelong, where they had established a reputation as vocal critics of what they saw as Goold’s mismanagement of the diocese.\textsuperscript{32} Quite why he was given charge of a parish which had become disaffected from his predecessor is unclear, but he was nevertheless given responsibility for erecting the new church. By this time, Atkinson had provided another, larger, site to the west of the town, which was in the process of being conveyed to the Church. Dunne established a building committee of ‘good and zealous Catholics’, called for tenders, and found that the cost of the new church was likely to be £2,500. Given the government grant of £1,000, this left a balance of £500 to be found by further local subscription.\textsuperscript{33}

Shortly after Dunne’s appointment, Goold cancelled the proposed building for that year. Instead, Dunne was instructed to raise another subscription to cover £250 of unreceipted costs Shinnick claimed to have incurred while building the new presbytery at Belfast, and which Goold now proposed to meet out of the money already subscribed for the church.\textsuperscript{34} Dunne voiced the
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\item \textsuperscript{29} O’Farrell, \textit{The Catholic Church and Community}, 114.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Syme, \textit{Seeds of a Settlement}, 97.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Entry for William Shinnick, ‘Port Fairy Priests’, Melbourne Diocesan Historical Commission, DH 20/5/23.
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Belfast subscribers’ objections to having any of the money they had raised for the new church used to defray Shinnick’s costs, but in a way which Goold evidently thought challenged his authority. By suggesting that lay trustees should be appointed from among the Belfast parishioners to manage the sums already collected, Dunne trespassed on Goold’s claim to ‘absolute diocesan control, with no public accountability, of all parish funds’. Despite Dunne’s attempts at explanation on the grounds of conscience and his repeated affirmations of loyalty and veneration to the bishop, he was eventually removed from Belfast in September 1856 and Shinnick reinstated. Shinnick’s tenure was brief. In April 1857 he was replaced by the first of a succession of Irish priests, each holding the cure for relatively short periods. Meanwhile, despite Goold’s concerns about how the money would be found to pay for the new church, its foundation stone was laid by the bishop with considerable ceremony in July 1857, and the nave and turret were duly completed in 1859.

The Banner’s role in all of this was as both protagonist and commentator. When Dunne’s removal became public, the paper’s pronouncements were entirely in line with its self-appointed task of defending social justice:

The removal of this reverend gentleman has caused considerable indignation throughout the entire Catholic community in this district. The proximate cause of this step on the part of the Rev Dr Goold was, we believe, the refusal of the Rev Mr Dunne to identify himself with the misappropriation of the Church Building Fund, to which the Rev Mr Shinnick laid claim for unauthorised expenditure on his private dwelling alleged to amount to £250, and to liquidate which the people subscribed £200. The Bishop also requested that the names of public trustees should not be inserted in the conveyance of the church lands, and this proposition the proprietor and the people utterly rejected… It is, in fact, for acting straightforward and independent that the Rev Mr Dunne has been sacrificed… In the meantime, the Catholic body have unanimously resolved not to support the Rev Mr Dunne’s successor, and the fact of the Rev Mr Shinnick being appointed to succeed him, has made them still more firm in their resolve, as they attribute to his want of candour and independence the entire disorganisation that prevails…

In fact, The Banner’s statement caused further problems for Dunne. The statement’s republication in the decidedly Protestant (and hostile) Melbourne
Argus led Goold to demand that Dunne issue a public disclaimer, which he duly did.\textsuperscript{39} O’Reilly, however, did not stop there. In February 1857 he took the opportunity of news of Bishop Goold’s impending visit to Belfast to renew his attack on Shinnick. Dismissing rumours that the bishop was to announce the start of work on the new church, O’Reilly concluded that one reason why this could not be so was because ‘no one would trust the Rev Mr Shinnick with subscriptions towards it lest he build another row of stables with it. Indeed we scarcely think (though not indeed a very bashful man) that after the recent exposé he would venture into one house in Belfast to collect it. The Rev Mr Shinnick has done irreparable injury to the Catholic body and it is not likely that during his stay there will be any church built’.\textsuperscript{40}

Nor was there. On this occasion at least, O’Reilly’s personal reading of events in Belfast seems to have been in accord with wider public feeling in the town. From the outset, the new church’s meaning as ‘place’ was contested at the most fundamental level. Different groups, the local Catholic laity, individual priests, the diocesan hierarchy, even James Atkinson, each brought their own understanding—grounded in their different values and experience—to bear upon what the church, and the issues surrounding its construction, signified for social, cultural and religious discourse in the town. But as a site of agency, memory, and identity, the meanings the new church held for each of these groups themselves changed. For Alipius Goold the church initially was a place of intolerable opposition to his Episcopal authority, but latterly became marked as one where he ultimately prevailed. For Patrick Dunne and the Catholic laity who supported him, the early phases in the church’s construction were redolent of the interventionist nature of that authority; an unwelcome reminder, perhaps, of less egalitarian days in the home country. For Fr Dunne it was also, personally, a site of official rejection, as well as a place of considerable popular support.

How might O’Reilly have ‘read’ the new church as place? Undoubtedly in different ways as time progressed. Initially, as a site of Shinnick’s duplicity and Goold’s interference in local affairs, its meanings are likely to have been negative, but once the church was completed and the controversy surrounding its construction was relegated to memory, we hear little more of it in the pages of The Banner. In short, although it seems to have constituted one of the most profoundly negative spaces in O’Reilly’s construction of Belfast as place in the late 1850s, thereafter it fades from view as other issues, other

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 14.
\textsuperscript{40} The Banner of Belfast, District Intelligence, 13 February 1857.
aspects of Belfast as ‘place’, came to the fore. In 1862, however, O’Reilly fired a parting shot on the subject. Commenting on Goold’s continuing demands for funds for the ongoing reconstruction of St Patrick’s cathedral in Melbourne, he concluded:

Nothing can be more strange to Catholics coming to this country than to find themselves excluded from any control over funds which they contribute so liberally … We have always upheld the right of the Catholic body to have a public statement of funds collected by public subscription. Such is the practice in the old country (where the name of the priest is synonymous with gentleman) …  

But as a contested site of agency and identity, St Patrick’s (Belfast) had lost its purchase on O’Reilly’s sense of place, or rather had changed its meaning. Much the same was true of his initially fiery attitude towards Victoria’s landowning class. As the deficiencies in Duffy’s 1862 Land Act, which *The Banner* supported, became increasingly apparent, and ‘land jobbers’ distorted the market for small holders and pastoralists alike, so the paper grudgingly acknowledged the latter’s right to defend their livelihoods against such speculation. Its rhetoric became more inclusive, and squatters were no longer denounced as the reincarnation of the ‘curse of Irish landlordism’. All of which points to a fundamental truth about place and diaspora. For first-generation emigrants like O’Reilly, the importance of personal cultural memory in constructing place altered as their diasporic experience widened. It might weaken or be reinvented; it could not remain the same. What of those people in diaspora with no personal memories of a homeland, of a cultural ‘there and then’, the native born?

**Place and Inheritance: William Wall and the Business of Being Irish**

William Wall was born in Belfast in 1859, and died there, prematurely from cancer, in 1899. He was the son of Catholic Irish emigrants who ran first the ‘Commercial Inn’ (from 1852) and subsequently the ‘Farmers Inn’ until 1880. In that year they bought land adjacent to the nearby village of Kirkstall, which Wall subsequently referred to—with perhaps conscious irony—as ‘the estate’.

---
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His father, John Wall, was among the top ten per cent of ratepayers listed in the 1854 rate return, paying £6.5.0 for a hotel, premises and land in Sackville Street, which was by then already developing as the town’s commercial hub. Wall senior appears to have been an active figure locally. In 1852 he was prominently involved in organising anti-squatter meetings in Belfast as part of the ‘Unlock the Lands’ campaign instigated by the Melbourne press, and when the town was proclaimed a municipality in 1856 he was one of the assessors called upon to verify the results of the first council election.

Between them, father and son exemplify something of the social mobility that could characterise successive generations within this ‘pubs, pints and pastures’ model of Irish immigrant settlement. Their careers also bear witness to David Fitzpatrick’s characterisation of emigration as achieving for many Irish migrants and their descendants the modest success and comfort that may have been denied them in Ireland.

The evidence for William Wall’s performance of Belfast as place derives from the diary he began in 1878 at the age of 19, which he kept until four months before his death in April 1899. It provides a detailed account of the quotidian practice of his daily life, his changing professional role and status within the town, and his subjective reaction to the social behaviours he encountered in others and the semiotic spaces this created. His career, and thus this aspect of his identity in Belfast, encompassed twin trajectories: first as someone who became increasingly involved in local government, and who was therefore privy to the hegemonic perspectives of civil authority; and second, as a businessman. He began his career, however, as a schoolmaster. In January 1878 he was appointed as a primary teacher in the government school at Rosebrook, but in September that year moved at the parish priest’s request to St Patrick’s Catholic school in Belfast. He remained there until he was elected Shire Secretary in 1881, a post he held until 1885 when he was elected Shire Auditor. He remained Shire Auditor until 1889 and held various additional posts, including that of Rabbit, and later Road Inspector. In 1894 Wall qualified as Municipal Auditor, and the following year was appointed as
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a Justice of the Peace. He was elected as a Borough Councillor in 1896.47 As Wall became more prominent in local government so his commercial interests widened. In 1888 he joined the Boards of various local companies as auditor, and became local agent for others. Two years previously he had been involved in ultimately unsuccessful talks to establish a new Catholic newspaper in Belfast.48

Wall’s varied professional roles defined only part of his agency and identity in Belfast and consequently the ways he performed the town as place. From his youth, his life was also framed by membership of numerous associational networks, some of which were Irish ethnic solidarities, but many were not. Thus, while he was an active member of the Hibernian Association and the Hibernian Australian Catholic Benefit Society (he was elected local president in 1897), raised funds locally for the Irish Land League in 1881 and supported Home Rule, he was also a member of the local militia (where he rose to the rank of sergeant), the rowing club, the Belfast Debating Society, the ‘Christy Minstrels’, the Mechanics’ Institute, and the ‘Australian Natives’ Association, which he helped to found in 1890.49 All of this should alert us to the fact that however Wall conceived of his ‘Irishness’ and whatever its importance to him, it only ever formed part of his sense of identity, of who he was and was not. In short, Wall’s identity, like that of anybody else, was complex and multiple, rather than primordial and singular. He enacted his life through a multiplicity of different socially-constructed ‘imagined spaces’—whether of sport, music, the militia, the Church, politics, or his professional role in local government, each of which inflected the others and reflected a different aspect of his own sense of self.

But, as with Michael O’Reilly, so too William Wall’s sense of selfhood was contingent on circumstance and thus subject to change, as were his readings of place. As a second-generation ‘native born’ member of the Irish diaspora, his identification with Ireland (which he frequently describes as ‘home’) was learnt behaviour. It was not a primordial ‘given’ founded in personal experience, but rather a set of values that he had actively acquired, and which could therefore be relatively easily modified in the light of experience. His diaries suggest that this is precisely what happened. As a young man in the late
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1870s and early 1880s, his sense of ‘Irishness’ was enacted primarily through Hibernian Dinners, St Patrick’s Day races at Koroit, and the maintenance of an extensive social circle of Irish emigrants, mainly of his parents’ generation.\textsuperscript{50} Significantly, although Wall’s involvement in St Patrick’s church was already important to him at this stage, his diaries make no explicit reference to the Irish background of many of his co-religionists. They present his involvement in Catholic affairs as a socially-framed religious duty, a question of Faith not Nationality. For example, in describing Father Hennessy’s mission to Belfast in 1881 Wall wrote:

Father Hennessy’s mission closed today … sermon til 2 o’clock. Grand spectacle at night about 400 people attended, among them a great number of protestants. Each catholic held a lighted candle and renewed his baptismal vows … The mission will be productive of great good. Numbers have attended daily and sincerely. Even protestants appeared en masse on several occasions. The instruction was such as to dispel doubts not only of protestants but catholics who did not thoroughly understand the ceremonies and rites of their own religion.\textsuperscript{51}

None of this seems to have posed Wall any problems regarding his militia membership and his occasional participation in ‘loyal’ ceremonial duties. Indeed, his early enthusiasm for these is clear. Writing in May 1881, he evidently approved of the good comradeship engendered in the militia by the Queen’s birthday celebrations: ‘Her Majesty Queen Victoria’s 62nd birthday … went to drill at the Orderly Room. After dismissing went inside on the invitation of the Captain to drink the health of the Queen which we did very enthusiastically’.\textsuperscript{52} Seemingly, at this stage, Wall saw no contradiction between these expressions of imperial loyalty and his support, for example, for the activities of the Irish Land League. As the 1880s progressed, however, Wall’s attitude towards expressions of imperial sentiment hardened as his support for Irish and Irish-Australian causes increased. His early political activism in support of Sir John O’Shanassy as local member for the Victoria Legislative Assembly in 1880 and 1883 continued. At successive elections between 1889 and 1897 he
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actively campaigned in support of Sir Bryan O’Loghlen, and he also played a prominent local part in the visits of the Redmond brothers in 1883 and of Home Ruler Sir John Esmonde in 1889.  

Seemingly, as Wall charted his ‘route’ through the imagined spaces of the Irish diaspora in south-west Victoria, so these ethnicised spaces became—for him—increasingly politicised. This was reflected in the ways he began to perform his identity in the material landscapes of Belfast. By the end of the 1880s, his diary entries had become increasingly ambivalent about the ‘loyal ceremonials’ performed by the militia and other bodies in the town, and he was less willing to participate in them. For example, in 1887, in contrast to the enthusiasm he exhibited in 1881, he refused to attend either the ball or the banquet held to celebrate Queen Victoria’s 50th Jubilee, even though he was Shire Auditor. As a member of the Hibernian Australian Catholic Benefit Society, he had also been party to that organisation’s decision not to take part in the celebratory parade which marked the occasion. In short, by the time he had reached his late twenties, Wall had begun to distance himself from public expressions of loyalty to the British Crown at much the same time as he was becoming more deeply involved with expressions of Irish Nationalist politics in the colony.  

It was during this period that Wall also began to privilege his ‘native Australian roots’. In 1888 he became a member of the ‘Australian Natives’ committee set up to organise celebrations of Australia’s centenary. Two years later he became a founder member of the local branch of the Australian Natives Association. This assertion of his Australian identity, locally grounded in the imagined and material spaces of Victoria, speaks of both the contingent and multiple nature of identity construction among people in diaspora. A ‘native’ Australian identity was, of course, one denied O’Reilly and other first-generation emigrants. There were also other differences between their constructions of Belfast as place. During O’Reilly’s early career in Belfast, the town was a site of memory that embodied echoes of his own remembered past in Ireland. These he found troublesome. As time passed, however, these troubling memories seem to have faded, at least as far as the pages of The Banner were concerned. William Wall possessed no such trajectory of
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memory. His ‘Irishness’ was constructed, an acquired set of behaviours which became increasingly politicized as time passed. But even this self-conscious politicization had limits, and towards the end of Wall’s life, his inherited sense of ethnic belonging gave way to a more presentist understanding of his Australian identity—and of his authenticity as a ‘native’.

Conclusion

So what is to be made of all of this? Michael O’Reilly and William Wall have been presented as two case-studies of how people might perform place as a means of locating their identity in the ‘here and now’ and ‘there and then’ of diaspora. O’Reilly and Wall’s lives overlapped, briefly, in the material spaces of Belfast. There the connection ends. Despite the similarity in their religious and ethnic backgrounds, the different meanings with which they imbued Belfast demonstrate a fundamental truth: the diasporic condition, like place itself, was singular and subjective. For Michael O’Reilly, Belfast began as a site of contested memory, a place where the worst (for him) aspects of his own personal ‘remembered’ Ireland might revivify. As time passed, it became a place of accommodation, where the realities of Australian life and the increasing time distance from those memories weakened their purchase on his colonial present. For William Wall, much the reverse was true. Despite his engagement in a wide variety of non-ethnic solidarities and his evident professional success—which one might have expected would ground his identity ever more deeply in the colonial present—his learnt ethnic consciousness became ever more politicised in the cause of an Ireland he had never known. Moreover, his was only one possible Ireland among many. Irish emigrants of his parents’ and other generations had not left ‘one Ireland’, a place of primordial uniform experience and unchanging, essentialist, values. They had left ‘many Irelands’, each an intensely personal construction deriving from their memories, values, and sense of self. They and their descendants in diaspora, like William Wall, created sites of meaning—places—beyond number.

Queen’s University, Belfast
This article explores some paradoxes of self-conscious marginality. During the 1930s and 1940s, the encounter with modernity saw both Scots and New Zealand poets engaged in imaginative projects of decolonization. Although their relationships to the British ‘other’ were somewhat different, in both instances achieving cultural nationalism depended strategically upon essentialized conceptions of place, re-imagined histories and representations of forgetting. From self-imposed exile in Shetland, Hugh MacDiarmid embraced peripheral places, simultaneously celebrating these as microcosmic prototypes of national identity while squirming at the narrow parochialism of actually existing Scottish society—a condition he attributed to Calvinism and capitalism, twin spectres of internal colonialism. Meanwhile, for Allen Curnow, settler modernity in the antipodes involved ‘awakening from a dream of home to a home that [was] alien’. Confronting this ontological dilemma betrayed a double gaze where anti-suburban eyes fixated upon local landscapes yet drew on a European, non-indigenous vocabulary.

Any analysis must necessarily consider the relationships between poetry and the social construction of nationhood. Ernest Gellner famously argues that ‘it is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way round’, but that this requires conditions of modernity in order to happen. Nationalist poetry was always an encounter with modernity—and by the 1930s it was also an encounter with modernism. But what shape did it take? Was this something that happened in comparable ways in different places, in, say, both Old and New World countries? In addressing how MacDiarmid as a Scot and Curnow as a New Zealander went about the task of representing national identity, my contention is that paradoxically the very idea of a homeland could only emerge as a result of these writers exclaiming their alienation from actually existing societies. It was, therefore, exile and self-conscious marginality—a sense of homelessness—that defined what home might be. It would be erroneous to

claim that either poet was typical of their generation or their times, hugely influential though both were. Nevertheless, the particular structure of feeling they create has a resonance in the mid-twentieth century that coincided with perceived crises of national development: it was of the moment, in that such a vision of the relationship between the self, culture and society could not have occurred in Victorian times or in the allegedly post-modern present. In terms of literary style, much of the cultural production of the era was a realist reaction against Georgian romanticism. But it is not my concern here to explain such; rather, I am interested in how the dialogue between poet and nation (or, rather, their conceptualization of ‘nation’) was expressed as an ontological predicament. If one’s mental security depends upon a sense of order and continuity gained from experience, then what do acknowledged feelings of homelessness tell us about how this sense of self has been disrupted? What was awry in the scheme of things and how was one’s sense of being in the world to be re-instated?

MacDiarmid’s lonely republic

Between 1933 and 1942, Hugh MacDiarmid lived in self-imposed exile on Whalsay, a small Shetland isle, just five-and-a-half miles long by two wide. Forty years later, the social anthropologist Anthony Cohen also lived there, making, over seventeen years, the most sustained study to date of a British rural community. Cohen claims that since community is about symbolising ourselves and others, ‘people become aware of their culture when they stand at its boundaries’. This is a comment on the consciousness of the observed, but it applies at least as readily to MacDiarmid the observer. As leaders of the self-proclaimed Scottish Renaissance during the 1930s, MacDiarmid and Lewis Grassic Gibbon wrote respectively from Shetland (140 miles north of the Scottish mainland and 400 from Edinburgh) and Welwyn Garden City (a planned new town deep in southern England), arguing that ‘distance from the Scottish Scene would lend them some clarity in viewing it’. It was a vantage


point that led to a ‘crucial correspondence between the local and the universal’ in the development of a vividly Scottish rhetoric. What is also remarkable is that MacDiarmid’s vision depended upon the imputed values of remote and rural rather than urban contexts.

While MacDiarmid’s work demonstrates many traits of high modernism, his spatial frame of reference ran contrary to the metropolis, so definitively its milieu. His vision of resistance, difference, pluralism and, at the same time of nationhood, required that he go out of his way to reject Anglocentricity. This he did quite literally:

Inspired by Langholm [his birthplace], MacDiarmid’s best creative work was written in Montrose and Whalsay. It is by living and working in these peripheral places that MacDiarmid developed a political strategy through which to resist the symbiotic assault of anglicization and capitalism and so suggest a radically nationalist Scotland [Langholm is a small town very close to the English border; Montrose, a fishing port and market town on the northeast coast; Whalsay, a Shetland island, lies at the extreme north extremity of the British Isles].

Presaging the internal colonialism thesis later espoused by critics of modernization theory, he castigates the English core not only for systematically retarding the ‘Celtic fringe’, but also for being both provincial in itself and imperialistic in its drive to negate cultural difference. Turning the idea on its head, he renders the culture of the periphery central to understanding nationhood, hence, for example, his conviction that ‘the cultural “treasures” of humanity can still come “frae the lanely places,/No’ the croodit centres o’ mankind yet”’. As Scott Lyall is quick to elaborate, in the voices silenced by imperial versions of history lie the sources of national revival, his renaissance project being ‘calculatedly rooted [in] geopolitical marginality’. But this is no post-colonial hybrid; it is a vernacular society that emphasizes the continuity of a tradition pre-dating Reformation and the Union, and in which small towns act as catalysts, Scotland in microcosm.
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‘He perceives’, continues Lyall, ‘that there can be no nation without the unending imagination of community…“Until I saw a timeless flame/
Take Auchtermuchty for a name,/And kent that Ecclefechan stood/As part o’ an eternal mood”’.10 Against this MacDiarmid sets a capitalist, anomic ‘urbanisation of the mind’, part and parcel of ‘the paralysis of internal colonisation and the detritus of industrialism [that] defile Edinburgh and Glasgow’.11 Despite this, for him the virtues of small places most definitely do not inhere in their existing civil society. Among other things, his monumental poem, ‘A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle’ (1926) caricatures parochial Scotland. Elsewhere he denounces its ‘damned democracy’, its ‘egalitarian attitude of ordinary chumminess’.12 While Empire capitalism has produced the alienation and proletarian decay of the cities, so a provincial culture, born of the Reformation and carried forth by the Union, created a legacy of canny lads o’pairts, courty Kailyard ministers and populist music hall characters, all ‘fostered by a capitalist education system grounded in Calvinist self-repression’.13 For him, such false consciousness can only be overcome through the Nietzschian self-realization of an intellectual vanguard: it is the cultural producers, not the consuming public, who will transform the nation by recovering a medieval sensibility, one that requires a concept of national anteriority, while rendering England as ‘the Other’.

Cultural difference is underpinned by three factors. Firstly, in opposition to the centralising tendencies of British internal colonialism that threaten to extinguish place-bound heterogeneity, MacDiarmid wants to create an autochthonous culture, unified in its refusal to adapt to capitalist modernity. Each different community is regarded, in its ideal incarnation, as culturally organic, thus ‘Our ideal ethnological method/ May be fairly called the ecological one’.14 Secondly, this rootedness is imaginatively consolidated by myths of racial origin, ‘a timeless background against which the generations come and go’.15 Thirdly, insofar as it has been argued that during his brief sojourn in London and Liverpool ‘a sense of geographic and emotional displacement
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prompted the need for his creative vision to refocus around memories of home’, a spiritual rather than social feeling of belonging provides a signal emotional resource. However, writing again from Shetland, he departs from the modernist orthodoxy of conceiving home from exile, because living on the Scottish margin, among the places of the periphery, he can claim there to be at least culturally at one, while it is mainstream Scotland that has become detached from its bearings.

Because his literature foregrounds a Scottish strain of modernism, unusual in its inseparability from socio-economic and political debate, Lyall regards MacDiarmid as critical in the shift from ‘elitist modernism … to the ideal of postcolonial society’. But such a stance is far from politically convincing given the elitism of a difficult poetry which although written in Lallans—a synthetic vernacular of Lowland Scots tongues—is nonetheless fiendishly difficult to comprehend in its intellectual complexity, even wilful opacity, and may in no way be construed as the voice of Everyman. Like many a critic of popular false consciousness, MacDiarmid, although very much a ‘public poet’, is scuppered by his own failure to connect with the people so central to his aspiration for a new nationhood, and, not least, his departure from a view of history that corresponds to that of many of his compatriots.

The life course of nations

In contrast to MacDiarmid’s fractious singularity, literary nationalism (if it ever was such) in New Zealand, most particularly during the 1930s, provides an excellent example of how national culture has been defined as a collective endeavour. One critic reflects:

"My own generation, born at the end of the Second World War and growing up in the Fifties and Sixties, were told that New Zealand literature had begun almost overnight in 1932, with the arrival in
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18 Stuart Murray Never a Soul at Home: New Zealand Literary Nationalism and the 1930s (Wellington, 1998), 18 argues: ‘The writing of the 1930s is one event, certainly the most important literary one, in New Zealand’s process of self-imaging as a nation’.
Auckland of a marvellously talented group of young men and women who had put together a literary magazine called *Phoenix*... It is the story that the young men and women who came of age at that time told about themselves.19

Central here was the myth-making of anthologist-poet Allen Curnow. Curnow took his idea for a nationalism born of allegorical images from Yeats. Writing in 1945, he claimed: ‘Strictly speaking, New Zealand doesn’t exist yet... It remains to be created—should I say invented’.20 Using his friendship with publisher Denis Glover of the Caxton Press and his position as editor of two landmark anthologies, *A Book of New Zealand Verse*, and *The Penguin Book of New Zealand Verse*, he set about doing just this. His project is an object lesson in how intellectuals invent tradition, where carving out a literary space requires the visualization of nation as imagined community, a country that can be written about. Necessarily a process of inclusion and exclusion, it relies on a teleological linear journey that either perverts or ignores alternative narratives. Its ingredients begin with a life-course model of literary development in the century since the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) that posits a trajectory towards ecological maturity. The early colonial settlers, achieving ‘migration bodily, but not in spirit’,21 exhibit doubts over identity, reflected in Samuel Butler’s feeling that ‘my power over collecting myself was beginning to be impaired’ as he ventured into a strangely forbidding wilderness.22 Thereafter, such poetry as exists consists of doggerel in affected dialects ‘out of touch with the common converse of the place’.23 With the second generation comes at best a conflict of spirit as English-bred sensibilities are part-accepted, part-denied (Katherine Mansfield’s stories), at worst, further evasion of the problems thrown up by an ongoing colonial relationship, made more hollow by the absence of any nostalgic possibility. There is no fit between poet and place. With R. A. K. Mason and D’Arcy
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Cresswell at last comes serious confrontation, but it is one of solitary outpost survivors, men [sic] alone.

Nonetheless, argued Curnow, by the Thirties, wherever they were in the world, in seeking their own identities poets were questioning New Zealand as a place-concept that became, in his words, ‘a meaningful analogue for the homelessness of the modern mind’.24 When Charles Brasch writes ‘The godwits vanish towards another summer./ Everywhere in light and calm the murmuring/ Shadow of departure; distance looks our way;/ And none knows where he will lie down at night’,25 he is looking back from afar; but in Oxford and London, it was, he says ‘New Zealand I discovered, not England… part of myself as I was part of it’.26 Whatever he found, it remained something amorphous. For Curnow such arrivals, departures and lack of labelling were ‘full of the failure of the New Zealander… to make the land his own’.27 In articulating a coherent culture of difference, his own Not in Narrow Seas collection explores how popular settler narratives create a national culture that is artificial to the point of theatre—‘The cloud, the mountain-terror tamed now/ Framed to taste for parlour chimneyplace’.28 The ‘disenchanted detailing of cultural suburbia’ is thus an act of creating an internal other alongside the external European other against which coalesces his essentialized critique.29 In lambasting ‘the cosmopolitan whimsies of suburban grandes dames’,30 the topography of the written nation becomes one defined by its cultural inadequacies, A.R.D. Fairburn’s ‘second-grade heaven/with first-grade
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butter, fresh air,/and paper in every toilet’. So how and when is this staged authenticity to be replaced by a genuine spirit of civil society? ‘How many generations does it take?’ chafes Curnow, interestingly betraying an ethnicised trajectory.

And yet, by 1963, he feels able to claim: ‘Nobody need feel as Brasch did twenty years ago when he wrote “The plains are nameless and the cities cry for meaning,/The unproved heart still seeks a vein of speech.” Nobody would echo the thought I had myself, twenty years ago, when I wrote of the “great gloom” that “Stands in a land of settlers/ With never a soul at home”’. Somehow, due in no small part to his canon construction, a defining national poetry appeared to have arrived. From his own inductive method he had wrought an understanding borne of an implied and unconscious kinship among poets: ‘I am convinced that the impulse towards a formed myth of place and people is the chief energizing principle among those of their generation’. He speaks of a shift from early colonists feeling homesick for Britain to a second generation ‘home’ sick in New Zealand, to ‘the theme of the homeseeking, homesick exile, finding himself “at Home” … in England, and finding that home was not there after all, it was in the land of his birth’, to the homecoming poet, whose ‘uncompromising fidelity to experience’ is there in ‘a language of location that revolved around a connection to the landscape as settled place’. Finally, albeit dismissive of Curnow’s wishing to make ‘the condition of never being quite at home a spring to the imagination’, the younger poets of the 1950s certainly ‘insisted that they were at home and the voyage was no longer a problem; though … they lost no time in telling us how satisfactorily alienated, modern and in due course post-modern they were in that condition’. That, perhaps, is the poet’s lot.
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31 Cited in Curnow, ‘Introduction’, 65; Murray, Never a Soul, 230, remarks: ‘it is a place devoid of narrative. But if the culture is waiting to be written as genuine civil society, it is also being written by Curnow as the imagined community defined by lack’.
33 Curnow, ‘New Zealand literature’, 198. There were shifts in Curnow’s own work, reflected in his self-conscious creation of the terms ‘unhistory’ and ‘anti-myth’ to label his emergent counter-narrative.
36 J. G. A. Pocock, The Discovery of Islands (Cambridge, 2005), 12. Pocock also describes a ‘culture of resentment’ where ‘too much fear of a former colonial identity inhibits one from replacing it’ (9). Both Murray and Pocock take their book titles from Curnow’s poetry.
would be something disingenuous finding resolution through any settled connection, for as W.H. Oliver autobiographically insists, ‘to eliminate the experience of being a stranger is also to preclude a sense of belonging that stretches across oceans to places both as distant as the other hemisphere and as close as breathing’. The antipodean sense of home appears by definition paradoxical. Because colonialism happened, the relation between self and nation must forever acknowledge its complexities. The other is never banished.

**Fracturing the myth**

Clearly, as public mentor, Curnow intervened in the accounts of others. In deconstructing Curnow’s project, then, one has an eye both to alternative interpretations and to what it defined out. There are other spaces. He celebrates Fairburn’s *Dominion* as a great nationalist document because of its subject matter, while its schizoid sense of conflicting representations of locality is played down. Others are more fundamental. Eileen Duggan’s demotic writing, in which the peasantry wrote a country’s, literature was clearly influenced by her Irish inheritance, yet this cross-cultural aspect is lost in Curnow’s dismissal of her work as gently evading the New Zealand problem by ‘trying to substitute for it something prettier’. Similarly, John Mulgan’s rejection of his Irish ancestry but affection for England, and, indeed, his dilemma of how to respond to the impending war, is ignored. Curnow makes much of Mason’s vivid alienation—here in this far-pitched perilous hostile place/…/fixed at the friendless outer edge of space—but the counter-narrative is again absent, for, as Stuart Murray indicates, ‘Instead of a nationalism based upon geography, suffused with references to the local, Mason’s conception of the national community in the late 1930s was moving towards a view of the people as a socialist brotherhood’. In common with modernists everywhere in the 1930s, apprehension about social and political breakdown is registered in retreat. From England, Fairburn writes to Mason: ‘I would like to live in the backblocks of New Zealand…Somewhere where I might escape the vast halitosis of the Press, and the whole dreadful weight of modern art and

---
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literature’. So why, like Brasch, Mulgan and James Bertram, was he there? Why, like Frank Sargeson and Cresswell, did he feel the need to walk through Britain as an itinerant? These are troubled souls in search of themselves and, quite clearly, neither return to New Zealand nor escape from it provide solace. Why, roam the heart of the old Empire looking for home?

Perhaps the most intriguing clues to this existential conundrum come not from Curnow’s striving heroes but from two abjected women poets. Murray notes that: ‘The supposed overnight transformation from what Denis Glover once termed the “feminine-mimsy” school of writing [‘a bunch of bores in stuffy drawers’] to the hard edges of a new masculine nationalism resulted in a national narrative that was necessarily partial and deceptive in its seeming simplicity’. Similarly, Patrick Evans has remarked how the Phoenix poets pursued their mission with a possessive ‘male literary territorialism’, evident again in Glover’s lines ‘Alas, New Zealand literature distils/ An atmosphere of Petticoats and frills’. He continues: ‘The historical effect is curious, for while men seemed to be pushing themselves forward into British models of High Culture, women at the same time seemed to bury themselves in the small and the local’. If such specificity is omitted from the masculinist self-narrative, nevertheless the landscape is a vital component since it enables a frame of reference for resisting urban-industrial modernity. It provides locales in which national meanings may be negotiated and is thus a key component in many works, not least those that celebrate the ‘authentic’ ecology of people in place. This follows the pastoral vein of much earlier poetry (hence its being disregarded as conservative and traditional).

Embarrassed by the tone of much that passed for poetry at the time, Curnow justified his 1945 anthology on the grounds that without his judicious editing ‘it might have looked like a Gardening Guide’. In part, this was a dig at Ursula Bethell’s work, which includes dozens of ‘garden poems’. An English émigré living near Christchurch, Bethell develops a gaze which balances that of the New Zealanders in England looking the other way. Aware of her liminality—‘I don’t belong anywhere in particular—I’ve dodged to
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and fro\textsuperscript{45}—she seeks resolution in her ‘small fond human enclosure’ in the hills above Christchurch: ‘Oh, become established quickly, quickly, garden!/For I am fugitive, I am very fugitive’.\textsuperscript{46} In the face of permanent exile, her garden becomes her own small corner. Possibly because of the implications of reticence and retreat, and not just because it countered the masculinist view, such narrow immersion was only useful to Curnow insofar as it aided in ‘making poetry that sounded localised’.\textsuperscript{47} Initially, Curnow is unable to work Robin Hyde into the canon because any place-bound sense of belonging was at best an evanescent sensation for her. However, in 1936 she declared: ‘it’s just dawned on me that I’m a New Zealander, and surely, surely the legends of the mountains, rivers and people that we see about us should mean more to us than the legends of any country on earth’. As Evans notes, ‘this promises an accommodation to local things far more authentic in fact than any self-conscious mythology of attachment male writers were devising’, and she did indeed begin to include local references in her poetry, evident for instance in the \textit{Houses by the Sea} volume.\textsuperscript{48} Like Mansfield, she used memories of childhood to evoke ‘a genuine attachment to the local that was outside the growing dominance of male ideology’.\textsuperscript{49} Yet this only serves to mark a triple displacement—not just from the patriarchal canon, but also across time and place. In 1937, close to the end of her short life, and from a bach in the Waitakere ranges, Hyde wrote \textit{A Home in This World}, an autobiographical fragment about her difficulties in finding a home for mind or body.\textsuperscript{50} Living in a caravan in Kent, then in London boarding houses, before convalescing in Brasch’s house, she eventually sought escape from her personal turmoil in suicide. Her travels in Australia, China and Japan capture something of the restless sensibility that was the antipodean dilemma. But, unlike Curnow, she did not contrive an imagined political community; rather, she sought, and failed to find, a permanent place ‘conducive to the workings of the literary imagination, and a political conception of the culture that came

\textsuperscript{45} Ursula Bethell Papers, MS Papers 1020, quoted in Murray, \textit{Never a Soul}, 90.
\textsuperscript{48} Evans, \textit{Penguin History}, 112.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 114.
\textsuperscript{50} Murray, \textit{Never a Soul}, 182.
from that’. Here the meaning of home is rather more prosaic—a thinking space functionally akin to Bethell’s (and Voltaire’s) garden. Yet significantly, if inadvertently, her approach ushered in ‘the destabilizing of narrative authority and representation of place that has become a postcolonial orthodoxy’.

Conclusion

The common thread in both MacDiarmid’s and Curnow’s nationalisms is the strategic maintenance of ecological integrity via an ecology of mind and geography. A sense of belonging concerns the goodness of fit between the individual and the landscape, and more rarely—because the social has also to be comprehended—between people and place. Curnow’s search for a language of authenticity, found through ‘an uncompromising fidelity to experience’, requires us to connect with settled places; it is the fixing of identity in place. Likewise, MacDiarmid’s desire to create culturally organic communities, unified by the will to resist capitalist modernity, stems from a rootedness both in myths of origin and the underlying geology. As he himself wrote: ‘Our ideal ethnological method/ May be fairly called the ecological one’. This, of course, represents an ideal, spiritual belonging rather than actual social harmony. Nevertheless, his fixity displays ‘a far more concrete sense of geography and geology than Curnow provides’. When MacDiarmid asserts in the opening line of ‘On a Raised Beach’ that ‘All is lithogenesis’ he lends the nation anchorage an essential, absolute landscape. On the other hand, he perpetually shunned or bickered about his neighbours. As we have seen, neither he nor Curnow, nor any of our poets, felt at one with the world; indeed, their value for us inheres in their expressed alienation from it. But whereas MacDiarmid was legendary in his cantankerous eccentricity, Curnow worked to impose a sense of collective national feeling, hence ‘figures who would have been surprised to be dubbed “nationalists” in 1938 were worked into the national canon by 1948’. Equally, his exclusions are a clear
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illustration of how nationalism involves deliberate ‘forgetting’. By the 1950s the Wellington Group, particularly James K. Baxter and Louis Johnson, had become fiercely critical of Curnow’s localism, favouring instead a universalism that problematized *inter alia* the historical predicament of the dispossessed, not least the Maori who were distinctly absent from his national story.

For latter-day historians like Pocock, the antipodean sensibility ‘sees people in motion, histories traversing distance and “identities” as never quite at home’. Yet Curnow’s project resists the implications of such plurality and ambivalence. In a retrospective lecture in 1970, he claimed that ‘if the “centripetally” guided work of New Zealanders is excluded, what is left of the country’s poetry is a dull and random residue … the poet cannot do without a country’. There is an overt social constructionism here, and it is this manoeuvring that needs to be addressed: firstly, because it elides the fracture of alternative narratives; and secondly because it omits engagement with the social. Cultural nationalisms thenceforth continued to battle over images of location: ‘for the New Zealand critic of the 1940s, the yardsticks of quality were those of an essential notion of place – of landscape, of language use and of history’. But to see all poetry as obsessed with or contained by such a focus would be foolish. For instance, Robin Hyde’s attempt ‘to write a sense of place that matched the doubts and contradictions of the culture she saw around her’ required her to de-centre the representation of place. Rather acerbically she spelled out the implications of such a multi-vocal understanding:

*If society consists of a body of individuals with some real tie of feeling between them, we have no society in New Zealand yet: there are ties of prejudice and self-interest, but of genuine feeling, no. However, there are some very lovely gardens, some very nice dogs, and the sun shines here as elsewhere.*

To be fair, Curnow was sceptical in his ‘constant refusal to allow the stereotypes of convention to simplify the complexities of New Zealand’s spatial and temporal location’, himself penning the line ‘Nation is a hazardous sign’. And whatever the conventions he in fact devised, there was no escaping the peripheral structure of feeling. Here stood marginal men and women. Notwithstanding they articulated, like M. H. Holcroft, an awareness of the ‘brooding presence of the land’, there remained the perpetual
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‘alienation from where they were and where they would like to be’.\textsuperscript{64} In these doubts they differed from the steadfast if deeply contradictory agenda set by MacDiarmid and, by the 1940s at least, Curnow’s undertaking was regarded as being about nationality, but not nationalism: ‘To his readers in that decade it was anything but news that nations were imagined communities; we were saying that ours would not be a nation or a community until it learned to imagine itself; but we were saying also that the antipodean imagination could not create itself out of any unifying myth’.\textsuperscript{65} Stranded, in their gardens, baches and harbours, as much as their London bedsits, the New Zealand poets negotiated the fragility of their being in the world. So it was that their chronicler ‘presented an imagination which could never be fully at home where it was, could never fully return to where it might have come from, and had travelled too far to fly off and live anywhere else’,\textsuperscript{66} while our solitary Scot in his island fastness contrasted his countrymen’s errors with the surpassing certainty of the rocks.
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Scotland’s Feminine Nationalism: some distant views of Jane Porter
Graeme Morton

To take for granted as truth all that is alleged against the fame of others, is a species of credulity that men would blush at on any other topic.¹

Nationalism with the lights out

Darkness envelops the place of gender within nationalism. As political movements in various manifestations, few instances are found where their aspirations converge. Most commonly the blindness comes from the nationalist side as the rights of women and men are marginalised to the agenda of the nation’s needs. So hidden have the claims of gender been within the nationalist project, that the leading theorists have only fitfully explored the interaction and only recently have others taken up the challenge to re-imagine what nationalism and national identity might have meant, and may mean, through the power relations that gender analysis unearths.²

It is through the study of literature that the most extensive engagement with ‘gendering the nation’ is found in Scotland. Conversely this has produced results that are both feminine and masculine in communion with the core nation of England and the state of Britain.³ It is easy to be sucked in to a shorthand characterisation of the Scottish nation that is male dominated, particularly in analysis of its popular culture.⁴ Whether a literary or historical
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⁴ E. Breitenbach and L. Abrams, ‘Gender and Scottish Identity’, in L. Abrams, E. Gordon,
approach is used, the popular canon is stubbornly male: Saint Andrew, William Wallace, Robert Bruce, Charles Edward Stuart, Robert Burns, and Hugh MacDiarmid continue to dominate. Indeed, they are paraded within the national narrative for their excessive masculinity.

The one place where the feminine has claimed a major symbolic presence is at the constitutional level where the nations of Britain have been represented by the images of Britannia, Scotia, and Hibernia. Yet there is irony here, for notwithstanding their gender, these are masculine symbols of authority. Representing ‘women-as-nation’ they are most often masculinised in times of opposition or international dispute. And this is some help to our conceptual understanding, with the main works of theorists who have incorporated gender into nationalist analysis having levelled their focus on the state. If nothing else, this scholarship makes us aware that when national identity is privileged then it is based on inequalities of ‘repressive gender regimes’. There is, explains McLintock, no nation that gives women and men the same access to the rights and resources of the nation-state. Thus Virginia Woolf could muse in *Three Guineas* (1938): ‘How can England belong to me, how can I be a part of it, if I do not have the vote’. This exclusion is a powerful difference: ‘Excluded from direct action as national citizens, women are subsumed symbolically in to the national body politic as its boundary and metaphoric limit’. Women’s bodies are regarded as the preserve of the nation. To some, women are ‘active transmitters and producers of the national culture’ and ‘symbolic signifiers of national difference’ as well as,
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That Burns, Bruce and Wallace head surveys of the ‘most important Scots’ is shown in M. Penman, ‘Robert Bruce’s Bones: Reputations, Politics and Identities in Nineteenth-Century Scotland’, *International Review of Scottish Studies*, 34 (2009), 7.


perhaps wrongly at times, ‘active participants in national struggle’. The weaker or defeated nation is feminised, penetrated, occupied and culturally dominated. Whether it is soldier rape as the epitome of power over another nation or in providing the newborn life to build up a nation’s military or economic forces, women and the nation are coupled during any military campaign.

Nor has the state been immune from legislating on women and men in ways that might seem to reflect constitutional rather than personal nationalism. Sex, itself, has been politicised. State (and church and institutional) control over sexual behaviour is the norm, with control over age of marriage, marriage to relatives, sodomy, bestiality, homosexuality, and masturbation. It is unclear how much Victoria was aware of her Prime Minister’s attendance at the culmination of her confinement to ensure the royal line was protected, although insistence that she be a virgin upon marriage would have been something she was, however subtly, reminded of. Interest in the royal progeny was more than constitutional. With the birth of Princess Victoria in 1840, nine months after marriage, and Edward VII in 1841, Victoria was both mother of the nation and symbol of bourgeois domesticity; during the period when her infants were breast-fed this maternal activity became popularised as the domestic ideal.

In most instances women’s interaction with the state, and the embodiment of women by the state, is no different between Scotland and the other nations
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of Britain. The theories of gender and nationalism take our understanding so far. Where they reveal less are for nationalisms that are feminised and thus similarly excluded from the state. This, then, is where the literary romance, and specifically the writing of Jane Porter, can provide some clues for the Scottish example.

**Romantic Nationalism**

Of the many genres, the romance has played a particular role because it is a feminised literature. This is not from any simplistic notions of femininity or love, but because it is not a high literature or a literature of politics or the state. Even in core nations it is thus, and within its boundaries it incorporates rural and parochial literature. The romance tradition can also be traced in continuities over time, providing the patriotism of a national tale that sustains Scottish poetry, as it does the historical novel. In Scotland of the second half of the nineteenth century the parochial element is most notable in the literature of the Kailyard and its place within the diaspora. This has not been lost on commentators and the contribution of such writings to structuring identity has been studied in depth. What further emasculates the Kailyard, Christopher Whyte has noted in relation to Neil Gunn, is that it is a trope where ‘women are ready to serve their husbands and sons’, to be silently on hand, to be strong and resourceful but not to demand anything for themselves. It was a literary style that was then dismantled and consciously masculinised in the writings of Lewis Grassic Gibbon and Hugh MacDiarmid at the start of the twentieth century. As Zumkhawala-Cook maintains, MacDiarmid stood for a new vitality in Scotland against ‘the


feminine nineteenth-century forms as a homosocial change existing between men’.21

Yet we must take care that the Kailyard, the romance, and the symbols they carry, are not wrongly interpreted through a misunderstanding of Scotland’s nationalism in these decades. It has been argued that Kailyard was a literature that symbiotically reflected the constitutional settlements emasculated by the unions of 1603 and 1707. That it was immersed in a world where the restoration of the Scottish monarchy and nation would lead not to modern Scotland but, later commentators feared, to the old unreconstituted Scotland.22 Alternatively, in the argument of Martin, the romanticisation of the Scottish Highlands in art, most dramatically represented by Sir Edwin Henry Landseer’s *The Monarch of the Glen* (1851), and the cult of deerstalking, is theorised as a constitutional incorporation of Scotland into England and as the primal masculine element of an English and British identity.23 By suggesting that Britishness was simply an expansion of Englishness, Martin’s hypothesis that the Scottish symbols are masculine is based on a supposed preponderance of a misplaced pro-Union context.24

There is some rhetorical power to these reactions, yet they bookend a nationalism that is not to be found. Restoration of the Stuarts or an unreformed parliament were not on the agenda, other than for a very few. The symbols might be masculine, but again this is not the nationalism they reflected. It was Britain not England that contemporaries envisioned when blending the Scottish nation with English constitutionalism, a meld where the Union was inviolate.25 It did this not by being ‘pro-Union’, but through the equality of nations embodied by the term unionist-nationalism.26 Indeed, the construction of the highlands or the kilted soldier was a contribution to the peripherality of the nation, forging a nationalism that was decidedly feminine despite its masculine motifs. In the antinomies of the Celt and the Anglo-Saxon, feminine and masculine are part constructs in the moral, personal, immediate and social
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opposites of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft.* To the anatomist Robert Knox, writing in 1859, the ‘Caledonian Celt of Scotland’ and the Lowland Saxon were as distinct ‘as any two races can possibly be’. So Cairns Craig explains from these observations, the nation is returned to its racial types, taking it further from hybridity or commonality, and thus accentuating difference. It was a case of opposites attract. The Scottish symbols were not appropriated by England because they were masculine, but because they could be feminised. To Ernest Renan in 1860 the Scotland of this century had become melancholy and feminine. Once a land of masculine heroes, now ‘diminutive feminised pygmies’ inhabited Scotland. For Matthew Arnold a distinct Celtic identity was an essential component, as well as counterpoint, to the British Empire. And this thesis can be taken one stage further, to argue that consciously or not the Scots were complicit in this feminisation. Edward Said’s influential theory of Orientalism teaches us that the culture of the periphery is consumed through the imperatives of the core, and that such culture is then assimilated within the periphery as if it were its own. The darkness faced by studies of gender and nationalism in Scotland has come from the struggle to make sense of privileging social constructions of sex, but no progress can be made until the nation’s nationalism is imputed correctly. It was a feminine identity because it was the product of a peripheral nation in partnership with a core nation, a union envisioned, if not in actuality, as one of equality.

It is perhaps no surprise, then, that the romance is a literature reflective of this nationalism. And in many respects the author Jane Porter offers the historian some of the best insight into its construction. Hitherto scholarship has focused on her merits as the creator of the historical novel. It was a
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debate she herself perpetuated, but this is to ignore a perhaps more significant contribution to Scotland’s national culture. Porter’s literary works were singularly romantic, and she was renowned most for a feminine romance made out of one of the most masculine characters, Scotland’s greatest military patriot Sir William Wallace. Jane Porter was someone personally connected to the royal family as well as publicly to the British military. And while no contributor to the nation’s need for births to enhance its manpower against its enemies, her barren spinsterhood came to define her religiosity and the morality of her readership throughout the diaspora.33 Thus within the literary genre that is feminine, her contribution to framing the contemporary Scottish view of their nation was an influential one. To make this case, three elements of her life and work are identified here. The first is the success of her second full-length novel, *The Scottish Chiefs*, published by Longman and Co. in 1810. Following quickly on the heels of Margaret Holford’s *Wallace; or, The Fight for Falkirk; a Metrical Romance* (1809), Porter’s romance became the dominant narrative of Scotland’s patriotic hero in this century.34 The second is the conception of nation she expressed through her highly personal and often self-serving forewords to her reprinted volumes. Here she offered an historical Scotland deeply rooted in the British nation of her day. The third theme comes from the connections between her life and the royal household, connections that ensured her nationalism was always paired with that of the British army at war and the British state at home. The many that read, heard and shared her work embedded the tale in how Scottish national identity was imagined as unionist-nationalism at home and abroad.

**Her Book**

The demand for Porter’s *The Scottish Chiefs* was instant and would continue with new impetus through revised and repackaged editions wherever English romantic literature was sought. First published in 1810 with an initial print run of 2000, Longman and Co. of London printed a further 1500 copies in 1811, and 750 in each of 1816, 1819 and 1825.35 But the biggest numbers

33 *Museum of Foreign Literature and Science*, XXVII (1835), 113 reproduced from Fraser’s Magazine of the same year.
35 *Longman Impression Book* No. 4, fol. 31, fol. 107; *Longman Impression Book* No. 6, fol.
came from the printing presses of others. American publishers quickly took up its production: in 1810 (New York; Philadelphia), 1811 (Baltimore), 1814 (Vermont), 1815 (New York), 1817 (New York), 1818 (Vermont), 1819 (New York; Vermont), 1831 (New York; Philadelphia), and in 1840 (New York). These reprints would continue and the book was still worthy of new printings as the century turned: in 1891 (Chicago), 1899 (Chicago), 1900 (New Jersey; New York; Chicago,) and in 1903 (New York). The American publications, and those of Ward Lock of London and the Strathmore Press in Scotland, found their way to New Zealand and Australia, with Ayres and James of Sydney publishing a comic strip version in the twentieth century. There were French translations published in 1814 and 1820, plus a dramatisation performed in Paris in 1819. The book was a staple of circulating libraries in Scotland and England, as well as overseas. Mr R. Campbell of Bligh Street in Sydney used the classified advertisements of *The Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser* in January 1814 to declare that he was missing the first volume of *The Scottish Chiefs*, and ‘whomever may have [it] was requested to send it immediately’ to him. Aitken’s Circulating Library in New Zealand advertised the work of Jane Porter to its South Island readership throughout October and until Christmas 1854. A performance of the play in the Scottish settlement of Otago in 1863 was denounced as overly sensational when ‘a gory head, intended to be a striking resemblance of the actor, was raised by the executioner’ upon the fall of the axe. The audience were not calmed until the actor appeared from behind the curtain with the promise


36 *The Scottish chiefs by Jane Porter*; adapted by John H. O’Rourke; illustrated by Alex A. Blum (Sydney, NSW, 19--).


that the offensive incident would not be present in future performances.41

The standard edition of 1831 was the more affordable, staying in print throughout the century and copied by others, some with permission, but more often by those free to do so under weak North American copyright laws until 1891.42 Shortly after the standard edition gained circulation, *The Scottish Chiefs* was described as ‘a work no female should be without’.43 Such success, however, did little for Miss Porter’s persistently precarious finances, as frequent entries in her diary were to attest. Her literary friends rallied in 1840 when her unrequited romantic interest Nathan P. Willis negotiated with the publisher John Virtue to reclaim Jane’s copyright and produce a velvet clad edition with a new and extensive introduction by the author, herself benefiting from payment of £210.44 Near the end of her life, as well as posthumously throughout the second half of the century, the book was readily discussed. Porter quotes approvingly the reply she received from Mr Hastings when debate fell on how she could write so well of the heart when she was then so young: ‘It is the rousing virtue that language conveys, which draws down those bursts of acclamation to a word of patriotism or of generous feeling between man and man’.45 Such impressions were to last. It was recalled as ‘an absorbing book’ in 1860 by the author Ann Taylor Gilbert (1782–1866).46 *The Graphic* remembered Miss Porter in 1882 for her contribution to romantic literature.47 Out of 250 works of fiction thought worthy by the American Library Association in 1895, *The Scottish Chiefs* and *Thaddeus of Warsaw* were recommended to girls, women and their reading clubs.48
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45 *The Scottish Chiefs by Miss Jane Porter. Revised and Corrected with a new retrospective introduction, notes, etc. by the Author*, 1 (New York, 1841), xxxiv. [Its preface is hereafter Porter, *Preface* (1840)].
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The text, without doubt, is melodramatic, and this was a major element in its appeal. Take, for instance, what in historical reality was the gruesome death of its hero:

At this sight, Helen, with a cry that was reechoed by the compassionate spectators, rushed to his bosom. Wallace, with a mighty strength, burst the bands asunder which confined his arms, and clasping her to him with a force that seemed to make her touch his very heart, his breast heaved as if his soul were breaking from its outraged tenement, and, while his head sunk on her neck, he exclaimed in a low and interrupted voice, “My prayer is heard! Helen, life’s cord is cut by God’s own hand! May he preserve my country, and, oh, trust from my youth!” He stopped he fell and with the shock the hastily erected scaffold shook to its foundation. The pause was dreadful.  

There was no mention here of the disembowelling while alive, the drawing or the quartering, and the story immediately shifts to the heroics of Bruce. Constructing a basic concordance of the text gives insight into the all-encompassing coherence of the language used. In Table 1, showing the twenty most frequently used terms in the text, it shows the great focus given to its hero, with the name ‘Wallace’ used on 2209 occasions, over five times the frequency that ‘Bruce’ appeared (479), a divergence that increases when compared with the addition of their forenames (Table 2).

There are only 18 occasions when Wallace and Bruce are mentioned in sentence proximity, highlighting the ease with which Wallace was made the more heroic of the two chiefs. The latter, indeed, is given few opportunities to shine. Between Tables 2 and 3 it is seen that ‘Helen’, the love interest, is mentioned more often than Bruce, ensuring the personal tie overshadows the political bond. And there was no shortage of ‘crying’ going on throughout the text: characters cried 610 times (with no doubt much of it to do with having themselves heard), and ‘cry’ was found 52 times, ‘tears’ were shed 136 times and words were ‘exclaimed’ 198 times (Table 4). ‘Wallace’ and ‘love’ were only found in sentence proximity nine times, ‘heart’ was highlighted 476 times, and ‘love’ (189) won over ‘honour’ (172) (Table 5). Titles of honour were used descriptive and critical notes and a list of periodicals and hints for girls’ and women’s clubs (Boston, 1895), 29.
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### Table 1

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cried</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen’s</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion’s</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cried</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cry</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tears</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclaimed</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honour</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
frequently (Table 6) but Wallace was given the (administrative) title ‘Guardian’ on only sixteen occasions. The characters were ‘brave’ 265 times (table 7) and the communitarian values of ‘friend’ (338), ‘friends’ (146) and ‘friendship’ (56) were to the fore (Table 5).

Despite the historical claims made by the author in her introductions to have made use of ‘the old standard historians’, their names do not make it into the text, nor does Hary (or Harry or Harrie), other than in the preface to the first edition. Indeed, the blood spilling of The Wallace is not there to flow: ‘Blood’ was mentioned 194 times and was linked to ties of genealogy, but there were few other blood-related instances (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Table 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brave</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave and Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave and Wallace</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear and Wallace</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brave and Wallace</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak and Wallace</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most sustained nationalist reading of the text comes from Ian Dennis, who comments on the contrast Porter draws between then and now, good and bad, the classic dualities of ‘them and us’ which sustain perceptions of the historical ‘other’. Imagining the domestic bliss of Wallace at the start of the story, Porter depicts the hero living quietly with his ‘wife’, then contrasted against the evil of Hesselrigge. Porter objects to the death of Marion at the hands of the English, and by allowing women in men’s clothes to participate in warfare and national politics,51 Porter makes the novel a story about revenge for the ravished Helen and the murdered Marion, on behalf of all ‘outraged and violated womanhood’.52

52 I. Dennis, Nationalism and Desire in Early Historical Fiction (Hampshire & London, 1997), 15.
With such features to the fore, this is not an historical novel; this was no early Walter Scott, but it was a major contribution to more than just the reception of the historical novel. Wallace, like Thaddeus Sobieski, who appeared in Porter’s first full-length novel, is portrayed as an ideal Christian gentleman. Since this is more Jane Austin than Blind Harry, Wallace, it might appear to some, could be Darcy! Both Carlyle and the literary theorist Georg Lukács found difficulty fitting her work into the genre of the historical novel because of her failure to acknowledge the transformative power of change over time. Yet Price suggests we should judge Porter by her ability to connect to ordinary people through the repetition of key historical narratives, creating identification with the nation through inheritance of the past. Not change and empathy with period, but continuity. Similarly Peta Beasley has argued that Porter’s female characters throughout her oeuvre have been drawn as strong and resourceful women, with Marion Wallace and Helen Marr in the forefront, maintaining domestic order in times of revolution and strain. Porter herself argued that ‘[t]he melancholy circumstances which first excited him [Wallace] to draw his sword for Scotland, though it may be thought too much like the creation of modern romance, is recorded as fact in the old poem of Blind Harrie.’ Here she tries to downplay it, but still the power of the novel comes through personal romance not historical fidelity, a characterisation picked up in scholarly attention where Porter’s Wallace is nobler because of his superhuman moral and religious purity; but less noble because he is only moved to action by the death of his wife, and because he is made the victim of a sentimental, feminine intrigue. Yet this makes Porter no less a contributor to reading the nation than the historical fiction of Scott, and the life he led at the epicentre of the nation’s introspection. Rather she may be regarded as providing a ‘true’ reflection of the nation for the very reason that her most influential writing was so undoubtedly ahistorical. That, after all, is how the nation is popularly conceived: narrated in suitable and legitimate pasts by means of getting history wrong.

---

54 Price, ‘Resisting “the Spirit of Innovation”’, 638.
55 Ibid, 651.
Her Scottish Nation

It can be said that Jane Porter was never hesitant to project her life upon her fiction in order to make its impact all the greater. Her connection to Walter Scott was central, if not to him, with the pair having known each other since childhood. They also shared Longman and Co. as a publisher. Porter made claim to having written the first historical novel and was gracious to Scott to suggest that, in following her lead, he bettered and mastered the approach. She conspired to create her own Waverley-like mystery with the unknown location and authorship of Sir Edward Seaward's Narrative, the story of a shipwreck and simple utopian society. She kept an interest in mementos passed between queens Margaret and Mary. Jane came across some unpublished letters of the tragic Scottish queen when visiting her brother in St Petersburg in 1841, letters she transcribed from the original French and delivered to Agnes and Elizabeth Strickland for their Letters of Mary, Queen of Scots (1842–3). Sir Walter’s intense antiquarianism was well known, the novelist complaining on one occasion of the request sent by letter for him to start a hunt for the real Wallace sword, and he was frequently sent items of historical interest. Porter herself was to receive gifts carved from Wallace’s great oak, cut down to its roots in 1790, and other relics sent by those whom she had inspired. Similarly, Scott owned a chair carved from the wood of the house at Robroyston where Sir John Stewart of Mentieth betrayed Wallace in 1305, presented by the storyteller and

---

60 Katherine Grimston, Countess Clarendon, Letter: 1843 July 1, Grosvenor Crescent [London] to Agnes Strickland. A request originating from Miss Jane Porter and expressed through Lady Clarendon relating to a ‘small wooden casket’ once the property of Margaret, Queen of Scotland, then Mary Queen of Scots. Edinburgh University Library, Gen. 1070 fols. 278–9. Letters from Miss Porter during this trip to her friends back in England were transcribed by The Public Ledger, 19 April 1842, 4.


antiquarian Joseph Train. Jane Porter relied upon her childhood friendship to broker visits to the famed novelist in his Abbotsford home:

But to see Sir Walter Scott would be a rich satisfaction to them both! Captain Montgomery has seen much foreign service; and is now returning to the West Indies, by the way of Scotland, to his native country, Ireland. A brave man, suffering under service, is worthy indeed a candid grasp of the hand from the Chivalry poet of Dear Old Caledonia.

Indeed it tended to be returnees to Scotland from abroad for whom she wrote to Sir Walter, saying her guests were ‘[i]nterested in the magical pen, before which all the world has bowed’. Others were visitors to these shores, in one case a likely contact of her brother Sir Robert Ker Porter: ‘The present pilgrim to bonnie Scotland’ being an officer of the Prussian Imperial Guard. Jane kept up the connection of their youth when their respective mothers were friends. Jane wrote to Walter to describe her mother’s passing:

And as her faculties near failed her one moment to the hour of her death, even to the age of eighty five, she enjoyed conversing with him [Sir Walter] in his books; and talking of his boy days, with those about her who appreciated the safe gratification but who had near seen the author. This memorable parent and friend was born in the memorable year 1745, on the day of the Duke of Cumberland’s march through her native city of Durham, to the eventful field of Culloden! And, on the 18th June 1831, the anniversary of the important day of Waterloo, she was taken from this world of still awful expectancy! Having always been impressed with a foreboding that as “she came into the world in so troubled a public time, she would be called to quit it in some season of similar circumstances!”. But thanks be to God, that whatever has been the stir in Europe, nay all over the Globe, as well as in this little land, she

---

67 Jane Porter to Walter Scott, 10 September 1825. NLS: MS 3901 Folio 118–19.
laid down her [-] head in Peace. And with prayers for her country, and for her children near and distant, gently resigned her meek soul into the saviour’s promised safe keeping.68

Jane Porter lived her youth in Scotland, but her adulthood in England. There is no evidence that she ever returned back across the border, although she always maintained a fond attachment for the country that set her imagination towards a literary path. It was after living in England that she began publishing (in 1797 for the journal *The Quiz*) and after sixteen years in the south she produced *The Scottish Chiefs*. In her first preface of 1809, she takes care to assign Scotland as the identifier of William Wallace, and to stress the importance of lineage to the nation. Yet she does this both for England and Britain: ‘It is now too common to condemn as nonsense even an honest pride in ancestry. But where is the Englishman who is not proud of being the countryman of Nelson? Where is the British sailor that does not thirst to emulate his fame?’ She pleads that this sentiment must be right and if so then ‘respect for noble progenitors cannot be wrong, for it proceeds from the same source—the principle of kindred, of inheritance, and of virtue.’69 It was a personal virtue, but also a national one, not for Scotland, or for England, but for Britain:

Happy is for this realm that the destiny which now unites the once contending arms of those brave families has also consolidated their rival nations into one, and by planting the heir of Plantagenet and of Bruce upon the throne have redeemed the peace of Britain, and fixed it on lasting foundations.70

In the preface written in 1828 she expressed ‘her grateful sense of the candour with which so adventurous a work from a female pen has been generally received’. With translations made into the Continental languages, approval from those countries and those even further distant, including India and Australia, was a source of pride. In preparing the retrospective preface to the illustrated edition of 1840, she chose to explain what ‘impelled her to choose a theme so unusual to a female pen—a theme of war and bloodshed!’ She justified it as a story where ‘men [were] true to themselves, to the laws and rightful independence of their country’. Her story is teleological in that

---

68 Jane Porter to Walter Scott, 5 October 1831. NLS: MS 5317 Folio 185–6.
70 Ibid.
she identifies a clear pathway from the past to the present, but is primarily ahistorical because of her chosen juxtaposition of past events: ‘Such subjects,’ she argues, ‘are consecrated to a purpose beyond the time of their action’, here linking the battles of Falkirk (Scottish defeat – 1298) and Runnymede (English constitution – 1215) with ‘our own glorious field of Waterloo’ (British military – 1815), and in that order. Despite the new love interest in Helen, the death of Marion makes it too simplistic to accept the suggestion that the inevitability of Union was mirrored in the inevitability of marriage as the purest bond. Her ahistoricism was classic nationalism, plugging in preferred historical events whenever necessary to construct a suitable historical past.

Her Monarchy

The company she kept and the names that she dropped aided the wider influence of Porter’s story. When living in Esher between 1822 and 1844 she was a neighbour to Prince Leopold, king of Belgium, uncle to both Victoria and Albert, then residing one mile distant in Claremont House. The royal party often attended the parish church near the small cottage where the female Porters lived, their respective pews facing one another. The novelist spoke in ‘rapturous tones of the beauty of Princess Victoria at this time’ (in 1824, when Victoria was aged five). They had moved to Surrey from London once their brother Robert had left for overseas. Robert was an artist of grand epics and his work gained him the kind of attention that reflected well on his family. In 1804 he moved to St. Petersburg to take up the appointment as historical painter to the Russian Emperor Alexander I. In Russia, Robert met and later married a princess, Mary van Schertbatoff, was then knighted by Gustavus IV of Sweden in 1806, became a knight of St. Joachim of Würtemberg in 1807, and upon returning home was knighted by the Prince Regent in 1817. Adding to the
fashion for her family, it ensured the continuation of recently acquired royal patronage for the novelist. Robert’s art remained in vogue and Sir Sidney Smith brought Prince William of Gloucester to see work in preparation and to meet the shy Jane. Her reputation survived the encounter and Duke Christian of Luneburg (1824) was written at behest of the future George IV (r.1830–7) after the king’s librarian, Dr Clarke, had reported his Majesty’s pleasure with Miss Porter’s ‘historical fidelity’ in the heroes she portrayed. George also conveyed that The Scottish Chiefs had won her favour with the late William IV (r.1820–30), their onetime close neighbour in Thames Ditton. But it was to Victoria that she mostly claimed connection. Apparently written from her own bed, possibly where she was confined after having waited in the rain for six hours at Pall Mall for the royal procession to pass, Jane Porter sent six lines of verse to the royal couple on their wedding day. The lines ‘were graciously acknowledged’ although not published until the golden jubilee celebrations of 1887:

Wake Albert, wake! from dreams of hope arise!
And clasp with blissful arms the hovering prize;
A lily from the highest Eden bends
To seek thy bosom, and in light descends,
Not cold, but chaste, and spotless as its hue,
It breathes of Paradise, and breathes for you!

The queen had earlier received a ‘fine copy’ of Sir Edward Seaward upon its publication in 1831. A complimentary copy had also been sent to Sir Walter Scott, who was third on the list of recipients after the United Services Club and the Athenæum Club. That Miss Porter was in the thoughts of the monarch was seen when she became ill in 1840 and received best wishes for her health and the pecuniary help of £100 from the Royal Bounty—described by Porter as ‘proofs of the value her gracious sovereign set upon such talents so applied’.

---

78 Porter, Preface (1840), xxxvi.
79 The Graphic ‘Jubilee Number’ 20 June 1887; Pope-Hennessy, Agnes Strickland, 8.
80 Durham University Archives: Porter Correspondence B [1831]: ‘A note on the binding of presentation copies of Sir Edward Seaward’s narrative’.
it is right to accept that as late as 1898, under the title of ‘Ladies’ Gossip’, the
*Otago Witness* noted that ‘[o]ne of the most favourite books of the Queen when
she was a girl was Miss Jane Porter’s “Scottish Chiefs” and Sir William Wallace,
among these, her Majesty’s pet hero’. The latter claim, one might suspect,
unlikely, with the queen found to express publicly her lineage to Bruce, but the
appeal of the romantic novelist is more believable. It suggests some measure
of royal connectedness that is not solely the creation of the authoress herself.
Porter was acknowledged for her loyalty and friendship by the hero from the
Siege of Acre, Sir Sidney Smith. When it was learned that the sister of the great
naval man was in London and found to be in destitute circumstances, it was
to Miss Porter that Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel entrusted £150 from the
Royal Bounty to pass on to Mrs Dwyer. Government and monarch alike knew
Porter, for all her marginality in the highest literary circles, and it helped spread
the sentiment of her feminine nationalism.

**Scotland’s Feminine Nationalism**

Porter’s Scottish identity was the identity of choice, reflecting the complexity
of contemporaries’ nationalism. Her ahistorical connections sidestepped
the teleology of Union. Neither political nor marital connections were
necessitates for the Scotland she envisioned in her novel, and thus she went
beyond the minimum structure of a romance to make wider historiographical
constructions. Her Wallace followed a higher morality of action in the events
of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but one framed in the military
heroism that so engaged her passions in the nineteenth century. She was

---

82 *Otago Witness*, Issue 2301, 7 April 1898, 43.
83 In Victoria’s continuation of her highland journal she records seeing the National
Wallace Monument in the distance, but no visit, and no other mention of the patriot,
is recorded, *More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands, From 1862–1882*
(London, 1884), 121. The first journal notes that Wallace was incarcerated at
Dumbarton Castle, but nothing else, *Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands
From 1848 to 1861* (Leipzig, 1884), 78. Her lineage to Bruce was expounded in
George Russell French, *The Ancestry of Her Majesty Victoria, and of His Royal Highness
Prince Albert* (London, 1841), ch. 15.
84 ‘English Extracts’, *New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator*, IV, Issue 262, 12 July
1843, 3.
85 Although within the genre of the historical novel, Porter’s ascriptions of feminine
motivations to Wallace—for the love of his wife, the ravaged Helen and for all
womankind—undermines his morality, Dennis, *Nationalism and Desire*, 15.
writing Scottish history to reflect the Britain of her time. Born in England of Irish parentage, raised in Scotland, living and writing in England, connected to the world through the travels of two brothers, so enmeshed in following the successes of Sir Sidney Smith and the military, she located Scotland in some of its deepest British moorings.

Throughout all this, Porter’s centrality to Scottish national identity is strengthened because she used romance masquerading as the historical novel to produce it. If it is accepted that Scotland’s contribution to British identity is that of a peripheral and feminine identity in commune with England’s core and masculine identity, notwithstanding internal infractions to these broad characterisations, then Porter’s appeal becomes evident. Feminising the most masculine of Scottish heroes ensured the greatest impact, dominating the literary output in this strongest phase of the Wallace cult. It caught the popular construction of Scottish nationalism like no other in the decades before political nationalism. The life of Miss Porter and the literary style she adopted made it so. The lack of participation which elsewhere masks women from the state stands aside to a Scottish nationalism itself masked from the state. This nationalism, it would appear, was a gendered concept.

University of Guelph
‘Irishness’ on the New Zealand Stage 1860–1920: 
The Boucicault and Allgood Tours 

Peter Kuch

This paper, which grows out of the Irish Theatrical Diaspora (ITD) project, focuses on two major theatrical events that took place in New Zealand, one during the ‘colonial’ period and one during the ‘dominion’ period. The first is Dion Boucicault’s five-city tour of colonial New Zealand in 1885; the second is Sara Allgood’s extensive tours of dominion New Zealand in 1916 and 1918.

Both tours intersected with major events in Ireland. Boucicault arrived in New Zealand at the height of Parnell’s power and on the eve of the First Home Rule Bill, while the atrocities arising from the Land War, from boycotts and from evictions, were being periodically and sometimes

1 The Irish Theatrical Diaspora Project (ITD) has been running for six years with the aim of producing a cultural history of the performance of Irish Theatre in provincial Ireland, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, and New Zealand and Australia. Nicholas Grene (Trinity College) is directing the project and has taken responsibility for Ireland; Richard Cave for the United Kingdom; Ann Saddlemeyer for Canada; John Harrington for the United States; and I have responsibility for New Zealand and Australia. To date there have been five major conferences: the first at the Mansion House in Dublin, in conjunction with the Royal Irish Academy; the second at the National Portrait Gallery in London, in conjunction with the Institute of Advanced Studies at London University; the third at Glucksman House in New York, in conjunction with the University of New York; and the fourth at The Project Theatre in Dublin as part of the celebrations of the fiftieth anniversary of the Dublin Theatre Festival, and the fifth in Lille in mid-2008. There are some forty-five researchers associated with the project.

2 Michael King, The Penguin History of New Zealand (Penguin, 2003), 280: ‘Among the many changes which took place during the term of the Liberal Government was that in 1907 the country ceased to call itself a colony and became a dominion, implying the beginnings of a sense of independent identity’.

3 Dr Lisa Marr, who is working with me as a researcher on the ITD project, has prepared detailed itineraries of the tours, and a vignette of Sara Allgood (see Appendix).
fulsomely reported in the New Zealand and Australian press. Arguably, the failed Fenian Rising of 1867, the trial of the Manchester Martyrs (1867), the explosions at Clerkenwell Prison (1867), the abortive Fenian invasion of Canada (1870), the Catalpa escape (1876), and the brutal murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and his Secretary T.H.Burke in Phoenix Park (1882), were all still fresh in living memory. Sara Allgood arrived in New Zealand in the aftermath of the 1916 Easter Rising, the execution by firing squad of fifteen of the revolutionaries, and the hanging of Sir Roger Casement. She was in New Zealand just after the Dunedin editors of The Green Ray were arrested, tried and imprisoned; in the dying days of the Battle of the Somme; when both conscription crises erupted; and when the Armistice was signed. Her brother was killed in the War; her daughter died at birth; and she lost her husband in the influenza epidemic—an epidemic that killed more New Zealanders and Australians than all the battles of the First World War.

**Boucicault’s tour of New Zealand: 22 October 1885—5 December 1885**

Without doubt Boucicault was the leading dramatist of the day, having taken the London stage by storm as a twenty-year old in 1841 with London Assurance. A prolific playwright and highly accomplished character actor, he had written some one hundred and twenty-five plays, produced almost two hundred, and won and lost several fortunes by the time his New Zealand tour was announced in The New Zealand Herald on 16 September 1885. As a playwright and a celebrity he was no stranger to local audiences, the ‘news items’ in the Theatre columns of the major papers regularly reporting his new projects, major events in his life, and the progress of the tour. 

---

4 *The New Zealand Herald*, 1 December 1885, 6.

5 Material relating to the Boucicault tour of Australia and New Zealand is held at the Templeman Library, University of Kent.

6 In a deposition tendered by his wife who was suing him for divorce, (as reported in *The New York Times* 9 June 1881) Boucicault’s income was estimated at $50,000 per year, while his personal fortune was said to be in excess of $1,000,000. It was reported in *The New Zealand Herald*, 26 November 1885, that Boucicault was earning £118 per week in royalties from a revival of Arrah-na-Pogue at the Adelphi. If a 2/- ticket equals $NZ35 this equates to approximately $NZ35,500 per week.

7 *The New Zealand Herald*, 7 February 1885, 7: ‘A special performance of Mr Dion Boucicault’s new drama Robert Emmett, has been given at the Greenwich Theatre for the purpose of securing the English copyright’. *The New Zealand Herald*
life, and his many triumphs on the English, French, Irish and American stages.
In fact, before he arrived, Auckland had been favoured with a production of *The Shaughraun* mounted by the MacMahon and Leitch Company that had opened at Abbott’s Opera House on Saturday night 26 June 1885.9

In the 16 September 1885 issue of the *Herald* readers were informed that Boucicault’s New Zealand tour was to follow his tour of Australia, and that his seventy-five nights in Melbourne and Sydney had drawn audiences upward of 140,000.10 Supported by the MacMahon and Leitch Company, and accompanied by his new wife, Louise Thorndyke, by his son Dion Jnr. and his daughter Nina, the Boucicault company were contracted by the Melbourne-based firm of Williamson, Garner and Musgrove for a twenty-six night tour that would take in Dunedin, Oamaru, Timaru, Christchurch, Wellington and Auckland.11 The plays to be performed were listed as: *The Colleen Bawn*, *Arrah-na-Pogue*, and *Conn the Shaughraun*, plays that had premiered in 1860, 1864,

---

*Herald*, 4 April 1885, 4: ‘Mr Dion Boucicault is engaged in the composition of a new five-act drama in the style of *London Assurance* and also dramatising Ouida’s story, “Two Little Wooden Shoes”.’

8 *The New Zealand Herald*, 30 May 1885, 4: ‘Mr Dion Boucicault has cancelled his dates in London, sold his London house and furniture and announced his intention of residing in future in the United States’.

9 As announced in *The New Zealand Herald*, 26 June 1885, 5. George Leitch had taken over the lead part of Conn the Shaughraun from Boucicault for the final 100 performances in the original Adelphi production. It was hoped that Boucicault, who was en route to Australia at that time on the *Zeelandia*, would arrive in Auckland to see the performance. See *The New Zealand Herald*, 27 June 1885, 5. In the event the *Zeelandia* arrived on Sunday afternoon.

10 Boucicault himself has given a very detailed account of his time in Australia. The unsourced document is published in Harold Love (ed.), *The Australian Stage: A Documentary History* (Kensington, 1984), 102–6.

11 See Appendix.

12 *The Colleen Bawn* [*The Fair Haired Girl*, or *The Bride of Garryowen*], was based on Gerald Griffin’s novel *The Collegians*, and was first staged in New York on 29 March 1860, then at the Adelphi Theatre in London on 10 September 1860. The London season ran for 278 performances and was seen three times by Queen Victoria.

13 *Arrab-na-Pogue* [*Arrab of the Kiss*] or *The Wicklow Wedding* premiered at the Dublin Theatre Royal on 7 November 1864. It opened in London on 22 March 1865 at the Princess’s Theatre, running for 164 nights.

14 *The Shaughraun* opened at New York’s Wallack’s Theatre on 14 November 1874 and at Drury Lane on 4 September 1875. It was also mooted that *Kerry*, also titled *Night and Morning*, which had premiered at the Prince’s Theatre,
and 1874 respectively and that had enjoyed long runs on the New York and London stages. *The Colleen Bawn*, for instance, ran for 278 performances in its first season, during which it was seen by Queen Victoria three times. The Queen and the Prince Consort even made a visit to the Lakes of Killarney, where, as Boucicault himself once mischievously quipped, ‘the events never took place’.15

To mine the newspapers of the day is to be gently reminded of cultural and social continuities. *The New Zealand Herald* reported on the opening night of the performance of *The Shaughraun* in Dunedin that: ‘the theatre was densely crowded last night in every part, and many had to be turned away before the commencement of the performance’.16 Neither the size of the audience nor the Dunedinites reticence to book in advance should come as a surprise. Needless to say Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland, vied with one another in providing a Mayoral welcome. But it is Boucicault and the etic (Irishness as seen by the non-Irish, extrinsic), emic (Irishness as seen by the Irish, intrinsic), and situational (performative within a specific context and often with reference to stereotypes or specific socio-political circumstances) representations of Irishness that are of particular concern in this discussion.

Arguably, there were four main etic images of Irishness at large while Boucicault was touring New Zealand. One was of the Irish as pre-human, as a race yet fully to evolve, yet to enter civility. The vehicle for this trope was simianisation (*pace* Darwin)—as evidenced by the numerous cartoons in *Punch* and the popular press depicting hairy people with low foreheads and gangly limbs uttering gibberish.17 After the Phoenix Park murders, the Irish as Frankenstein, as barbarous, rampant ape-like monsters, also gained currency. Another image was of the Irish as Celts—as an ancient people, untouched by Graeco-Roman civilisation, lyrical of speech and intensely imaginative, worshippers of nature, possessing a mythopoetic consciousness, and so peculiarly unfitted for the practicalities of contemporary industrial urbanised society against which, it was believed, they were perpetually in revolt. This was a trope popularised by Ernest Renan and Matthew Arnold, buttressed by the

16 *The New Zealand Herald*, 27 October 1885, 5.
archaeological finds of Sir William Wilde, and promoted by the proliferation of antiquarian societies. ‘Celticism’ reached its apogee in the pan-Celtic societies of early twentieth-century Europe and is still remarkably robust. A third image was of the Irish as the swarming, multitudinous, post-famine poor—idle, illiterate, lawless, deeply superstitious, in thrall to a religion that denied them intellectual independence, calculatingly subservient, cunning, opportunistic, treacherous and perennially unreliable. The fourth was the Stage Irishman—a stock character in English theatre, at home in melodrama and comedy, with origins that go back to Captain Macmorris in Shakespeare’s Henry V. The role was crisply delineated by the drama critic of The New Zealand Herald in his review of the MacMahon and Leitch production of The Shanghaun that premiered on 26 June 1885 in Auckland, four months before Boucicault’s tour: ‘The typical Stage-Irishman is unfortunately too often but a vulgar buffoon, with no distinctive characterisation but a “brogue” and the adventitious adjunct of a pipe and a shillelagh’; in other words a receptacle for whatever prejudice was then in fashion.

The principal emic image of Irishness that Boucicault encountered among the diaspora Irish in Australia and New Zealand was of a people who, in countries that governed themselves, had triumphed over the stereotypes, realised their potential, and were proudly taking their place as valuable, patriotic, peace-loving citizens advancing the prosperity and participating in the governance of the new colonies. Irish successes in Australia and New Zealand, it was argued, proved that self-government unleashed potential; and so granting self-government to Ireland would enable those Irish living at home to fulfil their destiny. Ireland would thereby gain an equal footing with New Zealand, Australia and Canada, and would proudly take its place ‘among the nations of the earth’. Thus, the illuminated Address presented to Boucicault by the Auckland Irish prior to his departure for San Francisco requested him ‘to take the message [to our countrymen at home] that we watch over their destinies with unflagging solicitude, that we long to hear of better days dawning upon them, that we attribute our contentment and prosperity here to the right of self-government which New Zealand enjoys, so different from the lot of our native land…’ While Boucicault himself fulsomely reiterated the same argument in the various responses and public speeches he gave while on tour, remarking that ‘Irishmen might be as valuable at home as abroad if they
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19 Ibid., 1 December 1885, 6.
had the chance’, 20 he repeatedly emphasised that it was through his plays and his acting that he hoped ‘to clear away the prejudices that unfortunately exist concerning the Irish people and the Irish character’. 21

This clearing away proceeded on several fronts. The first involved eliminating the Stage Irishman and replacing him with a protagonist whose character not only challenged etic images of Irishness but also possessed those attributes that were perceived to be necessary for bringing about a peaceful solution to Ireland’s problems. As a Wellington theatre critic observed of the playwright who wrote the roles of Conn the Shaughraun, Shaun the Post, and Myles na Coppaleen:

[Boucicault] had an aim in mind. It appears to have been to crush out of existence the stage Irishman, with his wild antics and shillelah [sic], and show to the world the character of the Irish peasant in his true and better phase—rollicking if you please, light-hearted under any circumstance, but true as steel to a benefactor or friend, loyal and faithful in his affection, and as a man, worthy to associate with the noblest of any race. 22

The key images here are ‘loyalty’, ‘faithfulness’ and ‘manliness’. But where New Zealand audiences were particularly fortunate, the Auckland theatre critic for the Herald pointed out following a performance of The Colleen Bawn, was that they were privileged to see these roles interpreted by their creator:

As Myles, Mr Boucicault seems to have a double purpose in view. It is to eliminate from the Stage Irishman the mere character of a rowdy, but he has also to show to those who have often seen the drama the way in which the part should be played. There is nothing outré in his whole conception. However, pathos, tenderness and self-abnegation spring from Myles with direct spontaneity.

So to ‘loyalty’, ‘faithfulness’ and ‘manliness’ can be added ‘self-abnegation’. Coincidently, these were the very qualities that Parnell was advocating his fellow Irishmen must exhibit if Ireland was to achieve Home Rule. 23

20 Ibid., 20 November 1885, 5.
21 Ibid., 20 November 1885, 5.
22 Ibid., 24 November 1885, 5.
23 Note also Parnell’s stricture circa 12 August 1885: ‘Our movement this winter should be distinguished by its judgement, its prudence, its moderation’. Quoted in F.S.L. Lyons, Charles Stewart Parnell (London 1977), 293.
reported in *The Auckland Weekly News* on 26 September 1885 that at a banquet held in Dublin in support of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Parnell had ‘dwelt upon the importance of securing loyal and self-denying members in the next Parliament’. This is not to say that Boucicault was a Home Ruler *avant la lettre*—that the *Colleen Bawn*, *Arrah-na-Pogue*, and *The Shaugraun*, were anything from twenty-five years to a decade ahead of Parnellism. In fact only one use of the term ‘Home Rule’ has been found in the many speeches Boucicault gave while on his Australasian tour, and that in a throwaway line at an impromptu speech in Clontaff in Sydney. Nor is it to claim that Boucicault’s plays, as popular as they were, influenced the Irish Parliamentary Party; though Boucicault himself confided to his Auckland-Irish audience that not only had he been invited to advise the Party on the support they might expect from America but that he had also been offered a seat in Parliament. He was also proud to recount that the Duke of Leinster had confided to him that ‘his Irish dramas were doing a very great deal of good in England’, and that ‘many people had reformed their ideas of the Irish peasantry from the pictures they had seen on the stage in *The Colleen Bawn*’. But what I would like to claim is that the image of Irishness dramatically enacted in the *Colleen Bawn*, *Arrah-na-Pogue*, and *The Shaugraun*, particularly when Boucicault himself led the cast, resonated strongly with what New Zealand audiences were being told were the qualities that Parnell considered the Irish should exemplify if they were successfully to negotiate Home Rule.

Finally, there were other aspects of the *Colleen Bawn*, *Arrah-na-Pogue*, and *The Shaugraun* that would not only have challenged etic images of Irishness held by colonial New Zealanders, but would also have resonated strongly with local audiences. While all three plays are set at times of patriotic struggle, the intensity of that struggle is defused by eliding its more controversial aspects. Those characters who espouse extreme nationalism are marginalised in the vein of the villains of melodrama, while those characters, whether Irish or

---

24 See Lyons, *Charles Stewart Parnell*, 292–7, for the context of this dinner.
25 *The Auckland Weekly News*, 17 October 1885, 7: ‘During his stay in America, from the Chief Justice of New York, Mr Daley, to the Bonanza King of San Francisco, Mr Mackay, he had met with Irishmen in every position and he could speak of the benefit to them of self-government—(applause)—or, as he was going to say “Home Rule”.’
26 *The New Zealand Herald*, 1 December 1885, 6.
English, who espouse domestic fidelity, romance and reconciliation are lauded. As Nicholas Grene has pointed out, issues of class played a significant role in this reconciliation, the more so since the largely middle-class New Zealand audience who could afford the ticket prices, even as they entered the Royal Theatre or the Royal Victoria Theatre, took up their positions in seating arrangements that ‘emblematised a class hierarchy’. In the Colleen Bawn, Arrah-na-Pogue, and The Shaughraun, the Irish heroes and heroines are shown to possess a native refinement and a class consciousness that ensures, if not equality with the ruling elite, then at least a gracious acceptance by them. As Grene goes on to say:

For such audiences, the social conservatism of the plays’ politics, the reassuring picture of a pseudo-feudal bond of gentry and loyal peasants allied against greedy and unscrupulous bourgeois ambition offered an ‘optimistic myth of reconciliation’ in the colonial context of Ireland. In the magic space of melodrama the realities of Fenian politics, the power struggles as agrarian and national level, [were] susceptible to domestic solution.

Thus, in 1885 those New Zealanders who were privileged to see Boucicault play the leading roles in these three plays would have been encouraged to see the Irish as manly, loyal, patriotic, faithful, dismissive of extremism and somewhat restrained (perhaps even to the point of self-abnegation), but possessing a degree of self-assurance, wit and civility that eminently fitted them to be given the right to find a domestic solution to their own problems.

It is worth noting that during the decade 1891 – 1900—that is, allowing five years to pass after Boucicault’s 1885 tour—The Shaughraun was performed at least thirty times in New Zealand; Arrah-na-Pogue at least thirty; and The Colleen Bawn at least twenty times. There were also performances of The Flying Scud (4); After Dark (4); The Streets of London (8) and its variant The Streets of New

---

29 Nicholas Grene, The Politics of Irish Drama: Plays in Context from Boucicault to Friel (Cambridge, 1999), 17. See also Chris Morash, A History of Irish Theatre 1601–2000 (Cambridge, 2002), 87–93, where Morash convincingly argues that ‘holding together the ambivalent politics of these Irish plays of the 1850s and 1860s are two key conventions, both inherited from earlier theatrical conventions: the conciliatory ending and the rebel hero’.
Sarah Allgood’s 1916 (11 October–12 December) and 1918 (26 July–12 November?) tours of New Zealand

Sarah Allgood’s 1916–18 Australasian tour came about as a result of two quarrels. The first erupted in 1915 and embroiled the management and players of the Abbey Theatre in Dublin over the dictatorial style of the manager, St John Ervine, the irregular behaviour of the business manager, the growing impatience of Yeats and Lady Gregory, and the players’ fear that the Abbey was losing so many engagements and so much money that they would soon be out of work.\(^{31}\) The second developed a year later and involved a more sedate, but nevertheless equally intense, power struggle between two Australian impresarios, the one side headed by J.C. Williamson and the other by the Tait brothers, who believed they could engage better plays and players and earn themselves more money by going into competition with what had become known as ‘The Firm’.\(^{32}\) What induced Sarah Allgood to leave the Abbey when she did, as she was one of their star players, was the invitation to tour J. Hartley Manners’ *Peg o’ my Heart* throughout provincial England. The play was a sure-fire winner. Written by Manners in 1912, when his leading lady, Laurette Taylor, later to become his wife, bemoaned the lack of good parts for Irish women, it became an immediate hit, running for 604 nights in the Cort Theatre in New York and for over two years at one of London’s main theatres. As *The Dominion* informed its Wellington readers after the play had been announced for New Zealand: ‘Laurette Taylor…acted the part

---

\(^{30}\) Data from John Thomson, *The New Zealand Stage 1891–1900* (Wellington, 1993).


\(^{32}\) Michael and Joan Tallis, *The Silent Showman: Sir George Tallis, the man behind the world’s largest entertainment organization of the 1920s* (Kent Town, South Australia, 1999), 145ff.
1400 times before sheer fatigue compelled her to give it up to another’. The most successful of those ‘others’ was Sarah Allgood, who after a successful tour, played Peg to great acclaim in New York, where she was spotted and engaged for an Australasian tour by the Tait brothers as their first venture into theatrical management.

New Zealanders first learned of the tour on 8 January 1916. In the ten months between then and the opening at the Grand Opera House in Wellington on Wednesday 11 October 1916 ‘advance publicity’ amounted to no fewer than twenty-four news items (not including the standard theatre advertisements) or sixty-eight column inches (173cm), either reiterating the success of the play in America and England, providing a brief outline of the plot and the main characters, describing its origins, or imparting discrete information about Sarah Allgood’s life and career. The opening in Sydney was described in great detail, the high praise for Sarah Allgood in the title role ending with a euphoric account of the curtain calls—because ‘at the end of the evening enthusiasm ran riot’. The only slightly discordant note was in a report entitled ‘The American Invasion’ where it was pointed out that almost all of the plays currently running in Sydney and Melbourne and bound for New Zealand were American. As The Dominion correspondent somewhat ruefully observed:

So far we have not been permitted to form an acquaintance with the beautiful plays that have been written by Somerset Maugham, [Horace Annesley] Vachell, and such later plays by Pinero as His House in Order, The Thunderbolt, The Big Drum, and to dream of dramatic refreshment by Shaw, Barker, or Galsworthy appears to be altogether out of the question. Yet Justice, by the last named English author, is one of the big hits of the present New York season. So it is to America one has to journey to see the best English plays.

Plus ça change! From the 1880s to the 1920s the Irish believed the English were

---

34 It was reported in The Dominion on 15 July 1916, 6, that Peg o’ my Heart would transfer to Melbourne on 22 July 1916. Details of New Zealand itinerary were first published in, The Dominion 2 September 1916, 6.
35 “Sarah Allgood as “Peg””, The Dominion, 29 April 1916, 9.
vulgarising their theatre; the English thought the Americans were coarsening theirs; and the New Zealanders suspected that Australian impresarios—with their obvious preference for commercially successful American melodrama, musical and farce—were selfishly depriving them of cultural enrichment.

The advance publicity for the 1916 tour syndicated in the New Zealand papers is revealing of contemporary images of Irishness, or at least of an etic Irishness that is as winsome as it is aspirational, given the ways the savagery of the First World War daily intruded on dominion life. It also suggests that the Taits were as successful in choosing their publicity agents as they were in recruiting their plays and players. The role of Peg is progressively described as embodying the ‘irresistible manner, the humour, wit, and pathos of an Irish-American girl’,37 as ‘full of Irish wit and sentiment’,38 as ‘full of Irish wit and sympathy’,39 and as ‘sweet and beautiful’.40 On stage Peg is said to be ‘a dainty, sprightly, sparkling little lass, with a subtle touch of brogue,’41 who evokes in the rest of the cast and the audience ‘the laugh of pure joy and the tears of pathos’.42 The play itself is described as ‘an undiluted delight from beginning to end, and that almost exclusively from the perfect pleasure of a simple, fresh, comely, and outspoken maid, whose directness of speech gives shocks to the nerves of the ultra-refined rich relations’.43 Its international success, it is claimed, citing a ‘well-known London critic’, ‘[is] due to the fact that the comedy [is] a comedy of youth, bubbling and vivacious, and full of the sheer healthy joy of living’.44 ‘The play is plainly written. There is nothing startling or outrageous or risky in [it]’.45 ‘It is,’ moreover, ‘an idyll all through, told in clean and crisp dialogue’,46 adorning a plot that is ‘simple and direct in its appeal to the better side of everyone’s nature’.47 Sarah Allgood, early described as ‘one of the first of Ireland’s young intellectual actresses’,48 is portrayed as the perfect ‘Peg’: ‘she has youth, good looks, and remarkable

---

37 *The Dominion*, 8 January 1916, 9.
38 Ibid., 15 January 1916, 9.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid., 5 October 1916, 3.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid., 3 October 1916, 9.
44 *The Otago Daily Times*, 11 November 1916, 10.
46 *The Dominion*, 30 September 1916, 5.
47 Ibid., 7 October 1916, 2.
48 Ibid., 22 January 1916, 9.
dramatic talent; while the brogue which she brings from her Dublin home silvers the words that ripple from her lips’. Her premiere performance on the tour is reported as evoking ‘an essential charm mingled with a Puck-like spirit, which brought to mind the early triumphs of Nellie Stewart’. In fact it is only as the Wellington opening is imminent that the publicity admits that *Peg o’ my Heart* is ‘a clever comedy story on somewhat theatrical lines’. And, while Sarah Allgood’s opening performance in Wellington, attended as it was by the Earl and Countess of Liverpool in all the splendour that Wellington’s Grand Opera House could muster, was highly praised, the local reviewers were quick to point out that it was ‘only a little play’, that some of the supporting cast were either ‘below pitch’ or somewhat too comedic, and that the role, as charming and winsome as it was, disclosed ‘the suggestion that the talent Miss Allgood possesses does not reach the limit of its resources in Peg’.

The parallels between the New Zealand reception of Boucicault’s plays and Sarah Allgood in *Peg o’ my Heart* are worth emphasising here. In these plays the Irish protagonists courageously endanger their reputation and their freedom by willingly confessing to a crime they have not committed in order to save another person’s reputation and freedom. In these plays the honesty, precision, clarity and forthrightness of ‘brogue’ is pitted against and unmasks what is claimed are the accepted niceties of upper-class English. In these plays the Irish are depicted as having a more subtle and seemingly more innocent grasp of the English language than their overlords. As Oscar Wilde once quipped: ‘je suis Irlandais de race, et les Anglais m’ont condamné à parler le langage de Shakespeare’. In these plays wit triumphs, not for its own sake, but because it is harnessed to a perspicacity that sees through English pretension, and to a genuine rather than an assumed class status. The Irish succeed because, in critiquing themselves performing expected roles, they are at once, as natural aristocrats, more alert and more responsive to others and to events. At home in the subtleties of language, they are quick to detect deceit, hypocrisy, or the formulaic language of imitated desire or assumed class. In

49 Ibid., 3 October 1916, 9.
50 Ibid., 29 April 1916, 9 quoting the Sydney *Herald’s* review of Sara Allgood’s opening night of her Australasian tour.
51 Ibid., 29 April 1916, 9.
52 Ibid., 12 October 1916, 3.
53 Oscar Wilde to Edmund Goncourt, 17 December 1891, in Rupert Hart-Davis (ed.), *The Letters of Oscar Wilde* (London, 1963), 304.
these plays extremism is shunned, hero and heroine relying on conventional pieties, pieties that are unashamedly Catholic, for what in the end proves a resounding moral, economic, romantic, and political victory. Conn gets his lady; Shaun the Post gets his Arrah-na-Pogue; the Colleen Bawn wins her man; and Peg unwittingly but successfully woos her English Lord (possessed of what by the First World War proved to be the unfortunate name of Jerry). But, perhaps most of all, it is the fortitude of self-assurance that wins through. As one critic of the opening night in Wellington asserted:

*It is the Irish in Peg* that saves her from breaking down under the steady pressure of [the Chichester’s] insolence and contempt. Peg’s heritage from her father includes an acute sense of humour, and whenever things are getting intolerable there is always something to make laugh-bubbles, and what she sees to laugh at the audience sees to laugh at, wherein lies the ingenuity of the author. But Peg is a sentimentalist as well as a humourist, and she has the power to induce tears if she would but postpone the joke that is rising to her tongue, while her eyes are still wet with tears.54

While laughter and tears are the stock in trade of melodrama, and central to the discourse of the late nineteenth century Celt, and while Yeats has rightly pointed out that ‘the rhetorician would deceive his neighbours, / the sentimentalist himself, while art / is but a vision of reality’,55 what is of interest here is the degree to which the dominion audience is persuaded to identify with Irishness, whether or not that Irishness is uncritically etic, or authentically emic, or captivatingly situational.

In summary, it is worth observing that in the colonies at the time when Fenianism and the Land War were at their height, and again in the aftermath of the Easter Rising and the eruption of the conscription crises—in other words, at times when the British Empire was being most pressed by the nationalist Irish—the theatre, as popular culture, was offering an image of Irishness that was seen to be both personally sustaining and socially and politically desirable. Whether or not the effect of such plays was ‘incalculably diffusive’, whether or not they were in reality being manipulated by political
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54 The Dominion 12 October 1916, 3; partly reprinted in the New Zealand Herald 25 October 1916, 5: ‘It is only the Irish in Peg…’. The emphasis is mine.

or economic imperialism, their success was in part at least attributable to local irritation with certain forms of English pretension; as one Wellington critic remarked

The author has hit on an ingenious theme when he makes the members of one of the ‘real old families’ the butt of an attractive but unpolished Irish girl’s witticisms. All the English-speaking world dully resents the airs and affectations of a certain silly section of the upper classes, and as Peg scores off nearly every line spoken by one of the Chichesters she has a fine sympathetic backing from the audience.56

What is indisputable is that New Zealanders (and for that matter Australians) flocked to the theatre in record numbers. Perhaps Patrick O’Farrell is correct. Perhaps for a New Zealander in 1885, and again in 1916 and 1918, buying a ticket to an Irish play when the British Empire was most under stress was one way, whether consciously or not, of contributing to that ‘gradual growth and development, through confrontation and compromise, of a [New Zealand] people of distinctive quality and character, derived from and produced by cultures—majority and minority—in conflict’.57 After all, as Victor Hugo pointed out, and Yeats often liked to quote, it is ‘in the Theatre [that] the mob becomes a people’.58

‘Peg’ on Tour

The following table lists the itineraries for the 1885 Boucicault tour and the ‘Peg o’ My Heart’ tours to New Zealand in 1916 and 1918. While the Boucicault tour and the 1916 ‘Peg’ tour followed well-worn theatrical paths to the major cities and towns, the 1918 ‘Peg’ tour explored rural tracks as well, moving into the provinces and smaller settlements. Our principal sources for what follows have been New Zealand papers from the period.

56 The Dominion, 14 October 1916, 16.
58 Peter Alt and Russell K. Alspach (eds), The Variorum Edition of the Poems of W. B. Yeats (New York, 1973), 836: ‘A nation should be like an audience in some great theatre—‘In the theatre’, said Victor Hugo, ‘the mob becomes a people’—watching the sacred drama of its own history; every spectator finding self and neighbour there…’
‘Peg’s’ success across the Tasman was noted in New Zealand periodicals, and a tour to New Zealand was announced in late-August 1916. The company was to open their eight-week tour in Wellington at the Grand Opera House on 10 October; however, due to the late arrival of the Moeraki from Sydney, the opening performance actually took place the following evening, on the 11th. On this first tour, the company played the four main centres and visited several smaller towns and cities along the way, including Hamilton, Napier, Hastings, Oamaru, and Invercargill.

After an eighteen-month absence, in which they performed ‘Peg’ Australia-wide and briefly staged another J. Hartley Manners play, ‘Out There’, the company returned to New Zealand. This second New Zealand tour opened in Dunedin on Friday 26 July 1918, as in Australia, the company took the play to the smalls. From Dunedin, for example, they travelled to Invercargill, but then took in more than a dozen small and country towns on the way to Christchurch, towns such as Winton, Riverton, Bluff, Kaitangata, and Mataura. This extensive tour was scheduled to run for about eighteen weeks and to finish in Auckland in early December 1918.

One of the curiosities in this tour is the advertising. The advertisements assured locals that they would see the same production as audiences had seen elsewhere: the same ‘scenery, mounting, and dressing […] on the same lavish scale, as in the larger towns’. The advertisements stressed that patrons would see ‘the original company’ and, of course, the ‘Incomparable Peg’, as Sara Allgood was known. The Riverton paper, the Western Star, for instance, announced that Sara Allgood ‘will positively appear’.

Several life-changing events occurred for Allgood during her time in Australia and New Zealand. In her letters and upon her return to Ireland, she only talked about these events to her closest friends; as a result, they are little known. While meeting all manner of success in the role of Peg, Allgood experienced personal highs and horrific lows. In September 1916 in
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59 In Sydney and Melbourne, the play set various theatrical records.
60 In addition, in the summer of 1918, Sara Allgood shot the film ‘Just Peggy’ – her first movie role; the film was released on 10 August 1918.
61 The company arrived in Dunedin the week the fate of the Green Ray seditionists was announced.
62 Otago Daily Times, 1 August 1918, 1. The management rescheduled the start time in some smaller towns so that all who wished to could attend the entire performance.
63 Otago Daily Times, 1 August 1918, 1.
64 30 July 1918 [3].
Melbourne, she married Gerald Henson, the company’s leading man.\textsuperscript{65} By all accounts, Henson was a ‘good’ man, though not a particularly good actor.\textsuperscript{66} While in Australia in 1917, Allgood was notified of her brother’s death from ‘wounds received whilst fighting in France’,\textsuperscript{67} this at a time when news of Ireland, printed in New Zealand, was often on the subject of conscription and recruiting problems. Then on the 18th of January 1918, Allgood gave birth to her daughter, Mary; the baby lived only an hour.

November 1918 produced, perhaps, the cruelest blow of all. In its tour of New Zealand, ‘Peg’ was doing ‘excellent business’, setting all kinds of theatrical records. In the second week of November, while the company toured Taranaki, the advance agent reached Wellington, placing around town advertisements and publicity pieces for the Wellington season, which was due to start on November 18. There was much excitement as, amongst other things, this was the first time the Wellington Town Hall was to be used by a professional comedy company.\textsuperscript{68} By this time, however, the influenza epidemic had progressed rapidly through the country. In response, the authorities were taking every available precaution to halt the spread: schools and some work places were closed; public meetings, even some church services, and sports meetings were cancelled; theatres and other places of amusement were closed, too.\textsuperscript{69}

The closure of public buildings in Waitara forced the ‘Peg’ company to abandon their dates and travel to Wellington to ‘await developments’.\textsuperscript{70} Within days of checking into their Wellington hotel, several members of the company fell ill—Sara Allgood and her husband, Gerald Henson, seriously so; it took several days to procure medical aid. Henson was removed to a temporary hospital in Alexandra Hall and died shortly after, on Sunday the 24 November, in what was called ‘Black Week’. Within days of Henson’s death, newspapers reported that ‘Sara Allgood intends to leave for Australia by the first steamer sailing from Wellington’,\textsuperscript{71} however, shipping services

\textsuperscript{65} Henson played the role of ‘Jerry’.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Otago Witness}, 16 May 1917, 46.
\textsuperscript{68} \textit{The Dominion}, 9 November 1918, 11.
\textsuperscript{69} Schools and places of amusement closed in Auckland on 7 November. In Wellington, schools closed on the 11th and places of amusement, including theatres, on the 12th.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{The Dominion}, 25 November 1918, 4.
\textsuperscript{71} \textit{The Dominion}, 27 November 1918, 2.
would not resume between New Zealand and Australia till late January the following year.

Appendix

“Peg o’ My Heart” Tour (1916)

Wellington Wed. 11\textsuperscript{72}–Thur. 19 Oct. Grand Opera House
(8 nights and a matinée on Sat. 14 Oct.)

Gisborne Mon. 23\textsuperscript{73}–Wed. 25 Oct. His Majesty’s Theatre

Auckland Sat. 28 Oct. – Tues. 7 Nov. His Majesty’s Theatre
(9 nights and a matinée on Sat. 4 Nov.)

Hamilton Wed. 8 Nov. Theatre Royal

Wanganui Thur. 9–Fri. 10 Nov. Opera House

Hastings Sat. 11 Nov. Municipal Theatre

Napier Mon. 13–Tues. 14 Nov. Municipal Theatre

Dunedin Thur. 16–Wed. 22 Nov. His Majesty’s Theatre
(6 nights and a matinée on Sat. 18 Nov.)

Invercargill Thur. 23–Fri. 24 Nov. Municipal Theatre

Oamaru Sat. 25 Nov. Opera House

Timaru Mon. 27–Tues. 28 Nov. Theatre Royal

Christchurch Wed. 29 Nov.–Thur. 7 Dec. Theatre Royal
(8 nights and a matinée on Wed. 6 Dec.)

Palmerston North at. 9 & Mon. 11 Dec. Municipal Theatre

Masterton Tues. 12 Dec. Town Hall

\textsuperscript{72} ‘Peg o’ My Heart’ was scheduled to open on Tuesday 10 October. Due to the late arrival of the company from Australia, the opening performance was postponed.

\textsuperscript{73} ‘Peg’ was to play Gisborne for four nights from Saturday 21 October. When bad weather and heavy seas led to shipping delays, the company had to cancel the Saturday performance.
‘Peg o’ My Heart’ Tour (1918)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Fri. 26—Wed. 31 July</td>
<td>His Majesty’s Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 nights and a matinée on Sat. 27 July)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invercargill</td>
<td>Thur. 1 Aug.</td>
<td>Municipal Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton</td>
<td>Fri. 2 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverton</td>
<td>Sat. 3 Aug.</td>
<td>More’s Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff</td>
<td>Mon. 5 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitangata</td>
<td>Tues. 6 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataura</td>
<td>Wed. 7 Aug.</td>
<td>Horticultural Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balclutha</td>
<td>Thur. 8 Aug.</td>
<td>Oddfellows’ Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Fri. 9 Aug.</td>
<td>Coronation Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Sat. 10 Aug.</td>
<td>Princess Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosgiel</td>
<td>Mon. 12 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston South</td>
<td>Tues. 13 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oamaru</td>
<td>Wed. 14 Aug.</td>
<td>Opera House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimate?</td>
<td>Fri. 16 Aug.</td>
<td>Theatre Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timaru?/Ashburton?</td>
<td>Fri. 16 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Mon. 19–Sat. 24 Aug.</td>
<td>King’s Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 nights and a matinée on Sat. 24 Aug.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greymouth</td>
<td>Tues. 27 Aug.</td>
<td>Opera House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokitika</td>
<td>Wed. 28 Aug.</td>
<td>Princess Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackball</td>
<td>Thur. 29 Aug.</td>
<td>Mandl’s Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reefton</td>
<td>Fri. 30 Aug.</td>
<td>Princess Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westport</td>
<td>Sat. 31 Aug.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murchison</td>
<td>Mon. 2 Sept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Tues. 3 Sept.</td>
<td>Theatre Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motueka</td>
<td>Wed. 4 Sept.</td>
<td>Motueka Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>Thur. 5 Sept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blenheim</td>
<td>Fri. 6 Sept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havelock</td>
<td>Sat. 7 &amp; Mon. 9 Sept.</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannevirke</td>
<td>Wed. 11 Sept.</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following newspapers assisted in the compilation of small-town dates: *Otago Daily Times*, 1 August 1918, 1; *NZ Truth*, 31 August 1918, 2; *The Dominion*, 7 September 1918, 11; *New Zealand Herald*, 30 September 1918, 7; *Auckland Weekly News*, 10 October 1918, 15; and *The Dominion*, 15 October 1918, 3.
Feilding | Thur. 12 Sept. | The Drill Hall
Hunterville | Fri. 13 Sept. |
Marton | Sat. 14 Sept. | Town Hall
Ohakune | Mon. 16 Sept. |
Taumarunui | Tues. 17 Sept. |
Te Kuiti | Wed. 18 Sept. |
Te Awamutu | Thur. 19 Sept. |
Otorohanga | Fri. 20 Sept. |
Hamilton | Sat. 21 Sept. | Theatre Royal
Kaikohe? |
Morrinsville? |
Te Aroha? |
Dargaville? |
Whangarei | Sat. 28 & Mon. 30 Sept. | Town Hall
? |
Thames | Wed. 2 Oct. | King’s Theatre
Cambridge | Thur. 3 Oct. | Town Hall
Rotorua | Fri. 4 Oct. |
? |
Tauranga | Mon. 7 – Tues. 8 Oct. |
Te Puke | Wed. 9 Oct. |
Whakatane | Thur. 10 Oct. |
Opotiki | Fri. 11 Oct. |
Gisborne | Sat. 12 & Mon. 14 Oct.\textsuperscript{75} | Opera House
? |
Hastings | Wed. 16 – Thur. 17 Oct. | Municipal Theatre
Waipawa | Fri. 18 Oct. |
Napier | Sat. 19 Oct. | Municipal Theatre
Pahiatua | Mon. 21 Oct. | King’s Theatre
Greytown | Tues. 22 Oct. |
Masterton | Wed. 23 – Thur. 24 Oct. | Opera House
Carterton | Fri. 25 Oct. |
? |
Otaki | Mon. 28 Oct. |
Foxton | Tues. 29 Oct. |

\textsuperscript{75} On Monday 14 and Thursday 17 October, the company performed Edward E. Rose’s play “The Rosary.”
Palmerston North  Wed. 30–Thur. 31 Oct.  Opera House
Woodville  Fri. 1 Nov.  Alexandra Hall
Kapiti?  
Shannon?  
Bulls?  
New Plymouth  Tues. 5–Wed. 6 Nov.  Good Templar Hall
Hawera  Thur. 7 Nov.  Opera House
Opunake?  
Patea?  
Eltham?  
Stratford  Sat. 9 Nov.  Town Hall
Inglewood  Mon. 11 Nov.  Town Hall
Waitara  Tues. 12 Nov. [tour abandoned]
Wellington  18 Nov.

Tour supposed to end in Auckland in early December
In 1965, Ewen Jardine shipped out to New Zealand for an extended holiday. Born into a multi-generational Scottish papermaking family and living all of his early life next to a papermill, he ended up working for New Zealand Forest Products at their Kinleith mill in the central North Island for the next three years. Interviewed in later life about his experiences there, he remarked:

it is quite interesting that—because when I was out there I went to Kinleith to try to get work and they offered me a job in production scheduling. And they had hostels there for people, staff hostels and there were three camps for the operators and other people. And I was in the staff hostel, which was called Rosyth. And…in fact walking through Tokoroa which is five miles away from Kinleith, which is where the paper mill is. It was like walking down memory lane. I was in Inveresk, Caddington, Babbington. Em Clyde Crescent and all names from home. If names are the linguistic vestiges of memory, street names embody a spatial locatedness which grounds memory in one time and articulates change over many times. This paper uses the ritual of naming as a starting point to understand the complex spatial and temporal relationships of migration,
identity and print culture between a Scottish industrialist, a New Zealand papermill, and a local community.

Sir David Henry

The key player in this narrative of migration and adaptation is Sir David Henry. He was born David Hendry into a labouring family on 24 November 1888 in Juniper Green, a small mill town on the south-western outskirts of Edinburgh in the county of Midlothian. His father, Robert Hendry (b.1851), was a stonemason, originally from Ireland, who married Agnes Stevenson in November 1877 in Chryston, North Lanarkshire, a brick-making, iron-forging, and coal-mining industrial town seven miles north-east of Glasgow. After leaving school, David worked as a clerk from 3 October 1903 to 24 August 1907 at the Kinleith Paper Mill in Currie, just down the street from his home, and attended night classes in the city of Edinburgh. Sometime between 1901 and 1903 he also changed his surname from Hendry to Henry. In 1907, at the age of nineteen, he emigrated to New Zealand, where he worked as a farm hand for a short period of time north of Wellington, then sold subscriptions for *Wise's New Zealand Post Office Directory*. He later moved to Christchurch to establish himself before inviting his two sisters to join him in a classic pattern of chain migration; there, with his future brother-in-law, he founded an engineering firm which subsequently failed. In the 1920s David moved to Auckland, wed Mary Castleton Osborne, and

---


Of the extended Hendry family there were four surviving children, all born in Juniper Green: Robert (b. 1878; a tailors' cutter), Mary (b. 1881; her father's housekeeper), Agnes (b. 1885; a warper's assistant), and David, who, according to the 1901 Scottish census, was a ‘scholar’. 1901 Scottish Census, ref: 1901 Census 677/00 005/00 016.

5 From Kinleith Mill wages bill ledgers, National Library of Scotland, ref: NLS MS. 20742–20743. He worked 60 hours per week, initially paid 1s. per hour; on 14 November 1903, his salary was increased to 1s.2d; 7 January 1904 it was raised to 1s.6d; and finally, on 9 December 1905 he received a raise to 2s. per hour. The sums were in line with standard clerk’s wages for the time, and what Kinleith was paying Henry’s clerking colleagues.

6 Henry married Mary on 28 April 1915 in Hamilton; when Mary died 2 March 1954, shortly after the Kinleith papermill’s official opening, David married her younger sister, Dorothy May Osborne on 24 November 1955, again in Hamilton.
rebuilt his engineering career, eventually developing a successful plumbing manufacturing and supply firm, D. Henry & Co. Ltd. He also became heavily involved in Auckland social and political work, joining the Auckland Manufacturers’ Association and the Rotary Club, becoming affiliated with the local Boy Scouts and Presbyterian Church, and serving for a period on the Auckland City Council.

Henry’s career focus changed in 1935 when he was invited to chair the board of New Zealand Forest Products, a private company established to convert the Central North Island’s vast forestry plantation into a commercially profitable enterprise. Over the next eighteen years he rose to become Managing Director of NZFP, and his life was consumed by a long, drawn-out battle to create a vertically integrated forestry and pulp and paper industry based in the North Island. Throughout the 1940s and 50s, he clashed frequently with government agencies designed to limit the licensing of specific industries. He also had to face the hard realities of potential competition from Tasman Pulp and Paper which, with A. R. [Pat] Entrican, head of the State Forestry Service and considerable government financial backing, was positioned to take advantage of new international markets in the post-war economy.

Notwithstanding these obstacles, Henry’s vision of a commercially viable pulp and paper industry finally came to fruition in 1954, when NZFP opened Kinleith just south of the mill town of Tokoroa. Named and modelled after Henry’s boyhood workplace, the mill became one of the largest in Australasia. Its development was controversial and Henry frequently faced criticism and opprobrium from both public and private sectors, in part due to a controlling personality informed by his strong Presbyterian, teetotal heritage. Business contemporaries found him stiff, sombre, intense, driven, and dictatorial, but ‘with his broad Scottish brogue, Henry could be a charming personality and a fluent and persuasive speaker’.⁷

David Henry retained a strong sense of Scottish identity throughout his life, which manifested itself most clearly in the interlinked Scottish industry and town models he adapted when creating Kinleith and Tokoroa. He named his house in Tokoroa Juniper Green after his home town, and returned there in 1955 to attend a reunion at his old public school. Now Sir David Henry,

---

having received a knighthood for his services to the forestry industry in 1954, he was held up as a successful example of the ‘hard-headed, hard-working Scotsmen’. He died in Auckland on 20 August, 1963.

The Mill

When David Henry was appointed Director of New Zealand Forest Products Ltd. (NZFP) in 1935, he led a company that soon boasted 176,000 acres of forests and assets totalling $2,694,000, but had no manufacturing facilities. Given David Henry’s background, pulp and paper mills were obvious choices for company expansion. However, while wood pulp had been used successfully for paper in Canada from the 1860s onwards, and there had been some preliminary testing of New Zealand native timbers in Otago in the early 1900s, it was not known whether the fast-growing *pinus radiata* would be suitable. Consequently, NZFP undertook extensive overseas testing and concluded that New Zealand-grown pine not only proved suitable, but was often a superior material for the production of high-quality pulp, paper and wallboards.

By 1943 NZFP had initiated plans to establish New Zealand’s first fully integrated forestry operation with a large-scale pulp and paper manufacturing plant, ‘19 Mile Peg’ near the company’s Maraetai forestry block in the South Waikato, being chosen as the site. Five miles south of Tokoroa, this site was promptly renamed ‘Kinleith,’ overwriting the Maori landscape with Scottish toponyms. From 1947, both the forestry activity and the boom in the nearby hydro-electric construction industry created a highly productive and prosperous environment, with lucrative employment opportunities. To meet labour requirements, the Government actively encouraged immigration programmes, and in the late 1940s and early 1950s, British as well as Pacific Island migrants were employed in state forests and in the massive Kinleith operations. An offshore advertising campaign also netted hundreds of

---

8 John Tweedie, *A Water of Leith Walk, with a historical industrial background and Juniper Green its living centre* (Edinburgh, n.d.).
9 See Healy for a history of NZFP up to 1982.
11 Alex Spence, ‘Pulp Friction’, *North & South* 195 (June 2002), 45.
applications for key operator positions at Kinleith from established pulp and paper mills in Norway, Sweden, England, Australia, and Canada.14

Henry’s plans were not supported initially by the Government, who were in fact developing their own interests through a rival company, Tasman Pulp and Paper at Murupara/Kawerau.15 As a result, NZFP was virtually solely responsible for developing the infrastructure for its new operation: company housing, water supply, railway lines, transport networks, and plant machinery. On 20 February 1954, Prime Minister Sidney Holland officially opened the mill with over 6,500 guests in attendance. The opening of Kinleith signified the foundation of a new export industry which swiftly bolstered the post-war economy16 and soon replaced the once mighty triumvirate of wool, meat and dairy.17 Even prior to the mill’s completion, the Melbourne-based Australian Newsprint Mills manufacturing plant in Tasmania turned its back on its traditional North American and Scandinavian sources18 and contracted to import 12,500 tons of Kinleith pulp annually. Henry continued to expand the operation, initiated building works, sought additional overseas markets, and shrewdly negotiated various inter-company agreements with local competitors, Tasman Pulp and Paper and the New Zealand Paper Mills at Mataura, Southland. His empire made everything from cardboard, kraft paper, wrappings, and multiwall bags, to newsprint, fine printing papers, stationery, and specialty papers. Kinleith’s kraft pulp mill, pulp dryer and paper machines produced the first run of paper from locally grown trees by September 1953. Having produced a modest eleven tonnes of pulp a day in its first year of operation, the mill soon reached an annual capacity of 45,000 tonnes pulp and 25,000 tonnes paper. By 1976 annual output was 389,000 tonnes pulp and 285,000 tonnes paper. Tight governmental control of the industry until Labour’s 1984 economic reforms ensured a stable and secure domestic market that greatly favoured the company’s endeavours.19 By the time of his death, Sir

---

19 Stuart McCaw and Raymond Harbridge, ‘The Labour Government, Big Business and
David Henry had put New Zealand on the map in terms of a viable, vertically-integrated, forest-based operation. As the company magazine *March of Pine* [1951–64] suggested after the opening: ‘What has been happening at Kinleith may well prove as important in the long run to New Zealand’s economy as the first shipment of refrigerated meat from Dunedin in 1882’.20

The Town

As the town’s largest employer, there is a direct and tangible correlation between the ‘wealth, health and bustle’ of Tokoroa and the Kinleith paper mill.21 Until the 1930s only a few hundred people resided in Tokoroa. Yet, by the mill’s official opening, Tokoroa had grown so rapidly that the *New Zealand Herald* remarked: ‘when the trees reached maturity after the Second World War—boom! … [there was an] astonishing transformation from insignificant wayside village to turbulent timber town’.22

Sir David Henry sought to impose an Edinburgh-inflected vision of town planning and mill operations in a remote New Zealand setting. The strategic integration of mill and town, and the assumption of the interdependency of working lives and living spaces, was bound up in Scottish paternalistic beliefs about ensuring the social responsibility of corporate organisations to their workers. Kinleith mill’s relationship with Tokoroa’s development is overtly evident in David Henry’s involvement in town planning, in the establishment of schools, churches, and sports fields, in funding scholarships, and encouraging social and cultural activities in the community. He also ensured that key positions for mill representatives were reserved on the local council, thus linking the mill to decisions on all aspects of the town’s growth, development and activity.

Ebenezer Howard’s socialist vision of the ‘Garden City’ inspired the model industrial towns of Port Lever, New Lanark and Bourneville, whose very architecture proclaimed the utopian combination of workplace productivity and sustainable, community benevolence. David Henry transplanted the

---

21 Chapple, *Tokoroa*, 18. Research informing the radical restructuring of the early 2000s indicated that, were the mill to shut, the local economy would immediately decline by 25%.
spirit of these social engineering experiments to a post-war New Zealand increasingly accustomed to a ‘cradle-to-grave’ welfare system, the envy of the world over.

Although the New Zealand government refused to build or subsidise state housing for Tokoroa (as they did for Tasman Pulp and Paper), David Henry directed NZFP to build standard tract houses to be offered at attractive rates to mill workers—their simple rectangular shape and format reflecting a vision of workers as part of a nuclear family unit—with 2–3 bedrooms and an enclosed back garden enabling workers to grow vegetables and providing space for their children to play. Managers lived in larger houses, situated at the corners of streets, the epitome of benign surveillance. As workers moved up the industrial ladder, they were expected to relocate, even if it was just down the same street.23 David Henry himself initially lived at Juniper Green, a gracious, tree-filled enclave on a slight knoll overlooking the unmarried women’s accommodation, part of the executive housing development, and adjacent to the railway line where he could assess the mill’s daily productivity from his own back yard. To seal the relationship between old world and new, the first NZFP residential subdivisions all bore names reminiscent of Henry’s childhood: Leith Place, Colinton Place, Currie Road, Pentland Terrace, Torphin Crescent, Balerno Road, and Strathmore Park, to name but a few.24

As March of Pine remarked in 1953, ‘some of these places commemorated at Tokoroa have today largely lost their old individual identity and ancient historical association…In years to come Tokorovians will doubtless feel gratified that many streets in their towns are endowed with simple, pleasant-sounding Scottish names providing an imperishable link with the personality who has played a dominant role in the development of N.Z. Forest Products Ltd and the founding of a great industrial community at Tokoroa’.25

At the height of Kinleith’s construction phase, five single men’s camps, both at the mill site and in Tokoroa, accommodated approximately 1000 men. Upon the mill’s completion the camps, familiarly named Rosyth, Glenside,

23 Building upon his Hons. B.A. research, Gareth Roderick has provided a detailed account of the Tokoroa housing project and its socio-economic implications in his 2009 Master’s research project from McMaster University, Canada, entitled ‘N.Z. Forest Products Limited—The Great Provider: Industrial Paternalism and Housing Policy in Tokoroa, New Zealand’.


Braemar, and so on, remained open to house the largely transitory workforce, including people like Ewen Jardine. The company also commissioned and built a community centre near the mill at a cost of £12,000. By 1967 it contained a recreation hall, billiards room, reading room, post office and cafeteria, as well as football and tennis arenas. As David Henry noted in 1952:

The Company’s Community Centre and buildings have already provided an excellent centre, especially for women, children, and youth activities… Tokoroa is rapidly expanding into a well-ordered town, possessed of all amenities… It is a healthy pleasant town with good natural surroundings and your Directors consider that the foregoing conditions will attract and hold the very best type of contented workers to the Company’s service.26

NZFP also supported recreational and social activities for workers, their families and the local community by creating sponsored clubs (rugby, cricket during business hours on Wednesday nights,27 and running were the most popular), hosting dances and organising various annual celebrations. The Pulp and Paper Workers’ Social Association (Inc.) started in 1969 with 300 members and organised social events for local mill workers and their wives. By 1971 membership reached 1,500. People also ‘made their own entertainment’. Ewen Jardine became an electrician for the local operatic society and the little theatre and helped to light imported acts like David Whitfield and Kenny Ball. He also recalled:

really there was little else to do but work and they used to bus us the 5 miles or 8 kilometres to the factory…. And if you were trying to get fit as I was and playing soccer at the weekends you used to run back rather than take the bus back. And run through the forest as well. And quite a lot of the people at Forest Products were in fact very skilled athletes and long distance runners. I used to work alongside Mike Ryan who won medals in the Olympic Games and Commonwealth Games.28

To ensure his workers remained ‘contented’ as well as educated, in true Scottish fashion, David Henry asked the NZFP board to establish adult night

---

28 Interview Jardine and Bromage, 6 August 2002.
classes; cadets were invited to undertake on-site training, and managerial skills were taught in-house to encourage retention and advancement. From 1954, the David Henry Scholarships were awarded to mill employees to further their study overseas and bring back competitive intelligence. They are now awarded for Tokoroa youth development projects.

Theorising Social Identity

The story of Kinleith Mill and Tokoroa is a co-dependent one, involving an uneasy implantation of a social model adapted from Scottish contexts. It is also an important New Zealand case-study into cultural importation, social adaptation and organisational culture. Social identity theory [SIT], derived from information technology and management studies, argues for a more holistic view of culture than is currently common in studies of nationalism, ethnicity, migration, or skills transfer. In particular, its governing metaphor of the ‘virtual onion’ addresses the complexities of human interaction, including personal identity, national culture and organisational culture; that is, it views culture and social identity as a complex set of layered, overlapping practices that are not fixed or monolithic, but ‘reflect the multiple, complex forces that shape individuals’ beliefs and behaviour’. Such an approach helps map out the multiple subcultures operating within the Tokorovian context, registering both the logic of place and the logic of time. The ‘virtual onion’ also helps to explain the effect of skilled, international migration to New Zealand in the print and paper industry. For example, there is evidence of both short-term mobility flows and multi-generational labour patterns amongst Pakeha and indigenous/Pacific Island skilled and semi-skilled workers that inevitably had an impact on David Henry’s original vision of interlinked and stable community and work spaces. Furthermore, as David Chapple notes, an unwanted importation was a vigorous New Zealand-inflected trade unionism, which he attributes to the mill traditions under which migrant British and Scottish workers had trained and learned.

Our initial foray into Kinleith’s history reveals that Henry’s model fractured in ways he could not have predicted, nor, perhaps, given the

---


contemporary social, cultural, and economic problems of the town, ultimately have been responsible for. After the Labour government came to power in 1984 and abolished trade protectionism, Kinleith, much like its deceased counterpart in Scotland—which closed in 1966 following the lifting of trade barriers and an influx of cheap Scandinavian produced imports—changed dramatically. Today, after several owners, radical restructuring, maintenance and engineering outsourcing, and the development of a new business culture and work ethic, the Kinleith papermill remains an essential component of the Tokoroa landscape as the town strives to reinvent itself for the twenty-first century.

Our longer-term project adopts the virtual onion metaphor, as well as Michael Gallivan and Mark Srite’s polycentric (ethnographic), geocentric (management and national culture study) and synergistic (‘intercultural exchange’ study) research strategies, in a comparative analysis of Scottish-derived organisational cultures, print culture technologies, and book trade practices reshaped in foreign settings, whether Australasian, South African, Indian, or Canadian. For example, other Scottish emigrant entrepreneurs founded New Zealand’s Otago Paper Mills and the Mataura Mill in Southland from 1876 and were instrumental in shaping the print culture and business infrastructure of early Dunedin. Tokoroa’s Kinleith Mill was not the only overseas mill inspired by its eponymous Scottish antecedent. Evidence exists of a similar exportation of the Kinleith mill model overseas by a band of brothers born and raised in Currie, Scotland. The Finlay brothers, members of the close-knit Water of Leith papermaking community, were involved in the establishment in 1900 of the Kinleith paper mill in St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada. Did these Scots, like David Henry, transplant and transmit

32 Three brothers, Edward (b.9 October 1846), James (b.9 June 1848) and William Gilroy Finlay (b.1851), were involved in setting up and managing paper mills in Canada, including the Kinleith Paper Company Ltd. in St. Catharine’s, Ontario; the Montrose Paper Mill in Thorold, Ontario, subsequently known as The Provincial Paper Company which became Canada’s largest bond and book paper mill; and the Toronto Paper Manufacturing Company, stationers in Toronto. They were born and resided at Esk Mill Bank, in the Water of Leith area. Their father, Richard Finlay, a mason, was born in Haddington, Chester; their mother was Ann Anderson, born Edinburgh, Newton. Edward as well as his sisters Agnes (b.1843) and Helen (b.1845) were listed as ‘worker at papermill’ according to the 1861 Scottish census [1861 Census 682/00 001/00 015]. Their brother Frank (b.1857) was listed as a ‘mill worker’ in the 1871 census, then in the Kinleith wages ledgers as a machine assistant from 15 May 1875 to 12 May 1877 [NLS MS. 20737 Kinleith Mill Wages Bill 1875–1880].
their tacit knowledge[^33] to a new environment and have the same kind of local, regional, and international effects?

**Conclusion**

Scottish emigration and attempts to implant Scottish-based social and organisational culture into New Zealand was still occurring well into the 1950s. New Zealand has older examples of towns turned into little Scotlands, but Tokoroa is unique in being part of a larger construct and experiment in ‘high pressure pioneering’. As a curious grafting of nineteenth-century paternalism onto twentieth-century industry, it functioned flexibly enough for a period to accommodate a range of both short-term and long-term working groups. Exposure to late-twentieth century globalised economies decisively demonstrated weaknesses in such social models that have since had negative impacts on community identity and aspirations. Yet Henry left a legacy behind, not only physically in the names of the streets he designed, the buildings he opened, and the communal infrastructure that still exists to this day, but also in the multi-generational and multi-cultural work force he drew to the New Zealand interior. For Scottish born workers such as Ewen Jardine, what they found on emigrating to Tokoroa was both strangely familiar and excitingly different—while reminding them of past cultural links, it also challenged them to adapt and change to fit new circumstances.

---


---

records of the Finlay brothers’ connections with the Canadian Kinleith Mill are very few, but they are mentioned briefly in George Carruthers, *Paper Making*, (Toronto, 1947), 703–7, where he notes that the mill operated until 1927, its demise determined by slackening demand for Canadian paper products and intense competition from United States rivals.
Michael Davitt’s Pacific World
Malcolm Campbell

In the last decade historians have sought increasingly to recast Ireland’s history away from the narrow confines of the island nation into new and more expansive currents. This tendency in Irish historical writing substantially mirrors a recalibration that is occurring in many other national historiographies, a move towards greater recognition of and engagement with transnational approaches to the study of history. For Ireland, this emerging trend has meant, among other things, renewed consideration of its relationship with the British Empire. Paul Townend was correct when he recently wrote that, for a generation or more, Irish history ‘has had little engagement with imperial history, particularly for the modern period’.\(^1\) However, due in part to the proliferation of new transnational histories, and also to heightened interest in the so-called ‘British world’, that detachment has become increasingly unsustainable. Issues of empire and colonisation have struck back with a vigour unimaginable a decade or two ago. The remarkable number of recent studies addressing aspects of the relationship between Ireland and India bears testimony to this development.\(^2\) For Townend, however, the rebirth of interest in the relationship of Ireland and empire is less a surprise than a recognition of the fundamental truth that, ‘by the nineteenth century, it was abundantly clear to Irish men and women that their realities were fundamentally bound up with English power and proximity. In that sense the Irish had long been a self-consciously and thoroughly imperial people’.\(^3\)

One implication of this reorientation from an island history to a transnational Irish history is that its telling destabilises existing narratives and their geographical boundaries. It brings into play, in new and unexpected ways, places, people and events that were previously considered peripheral to the telling of

---


\(^3\) Townend, 140.
Irish history. Many filaments draw together developments within the wider British Empire, and across the globe more generally, with the political, social and economic history of Ireland and its peoples. Simultaneously, Ireland’s history, including its experience of dispossession and subordination, may be seen to have had significant effects far beyond both Ireland’s shores and those of the New World destinations to which the Irish emigrated in greatest numbers.

This is certainly true in the case of Ireland’s contact with the Pacific World, defined here as the vast territory bounded by the Western Americas and the East Coast of Australia and including the islands in between. Significant British involvement in the Pacific dates from the 1760s when, in competition with France, the Royal Navy commenced to navigate in, chart, and initiate settlement in the South Pacific. In the next century-and-a-half, the presence of Europeans increased markedly across the region, profoundly disrupting existing cultures and initiating new political, economic and social structures. The Irish were from the very beginning participants in all these processes, arriving as crewmen on the first British ships to land in Polynesia and coming in greater numbers as the intensity of European trade and colonisation increased. The Irish who came—convicts, colonial governors, and men and women from all social grades in between—whether life-time settlers or short-term sojourners, were as remarkable for their diversity as for their geographic spread. Most came as contributors and collaborators in the exertion of a broadly-British influence across the Pacific World; more rarely, they acted in resistance to the intrusion of colonial power.

However, the Pacific World also exerted its own influence on Ireland. In addition to its power to capture European imaginations, the Pacific became a new site for Irish migration and settlement. By 1870–1, when adequate census data exists for most of the region, somewhere in the order of 300,000 Irish-born resided within the area bounded by the Western Americas and South Australia, a number roughly equivalent to one-fifteenth of Ireland’s population at that time. Most were on the periphery of the Pacific Ocean, participants in a process of rapid westward expansion after 1850 that the urban historian Lionel Frost termed the creation of the ‘new urban frontier’. Smaller numbers dispersed elsewhere, to the West Coast of South America and the islands scattered across the ocean.4

4 Comprised of Australian colonies approximately 200,000; New Zealand 30,000; California 55,000; Oregon, Washington Territory and British Columbia, approx 4000. On the urban frontier see Lionel Frost, *The New Urban Frontier: Urbanisation and city-building in Australasia and the American West* (Sydney, 1991).
The Pacific World also held a particular interest for nineteenth-century Irish nationalists engaged in campaigns for independence. A site of dispossession and colonisation, and of recent experiences of state creation and experiments in democracy, it offered fresh visions for a possible Irish future. John and William Redmond, John Dillon, and various other envoys from the Irish Parliamentary Party, toured the Australasian colonies in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, campaigning on Ireland’s behalf, raising funds for the Party’s campaigns, and observing with interest the achievements and challenges that confronted the self-governing settler colonies. However, probably no leading Irish political figure had greater exposure to the Pacific World, or so broad an interest in social, political and economic trends there, as the renowned Irish nationalist Michael Davitt. In 1895 Davitt travelled extensively through the Pacific World. He visited the six Australian colonies, New Zealand, Samoa, Hawaii and the western United States before returning to Ireland. Davitt described many of his experiences in New Zealand and Australia in his book *Life and Progress in Australasia* (1898). In particular, he commented on political developments and legislative achievements in the antipodean colonial societies and discussed subjects of longstanding interest to him, most notably the rise of the labour movement and prisons and prison reform. However, *Life and Progress in Australasia* did not extend to details of his crossing of the Pacific or time spent in Polynesia. Davitt’s observations on these parts of the tour were included only in his unpublished diaries. This article examines Michael Davitt’s Pacific experiences and explores the ways in which Davitt’s own outlook was affected and transformed by his exposure to Irish diasporic communities and the ideas he encountered the Pacific World. In doing so, it contributes to wider debates in Irish historiography about empire and colonisation.

Michael Davitt’s 1895 tour to the Australian colonies, New Zealand and the Pacific occurred at a time of considerable personal and professional anguish. In September 1890 Davitt began publishing his own newspaper, the *Labour World*. However, it fared poorly and eight months later the newspaper closed due to failing circulation. At the same time, Davitt was increasingly occupied with anti-Parnellite politics after the acrimonious Irish Party split. He stood for election in Waterford in December 1891 but lost to another former visitor to the Australasian colonies, John Redmond, by 1775 votes to 1229, suffering a physical mauling from a mob in the process. Another distressing defeat followed in North Meath in July 1892, although that result
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was subsequently overturned on petition because of what was deemed to be inappropriate clerical influence. Frustrated in politics and confronted following his newspaper’s closure with unmanageable debts and no regular income, Michael Davitt declared bankruptcy. Francis Sheehy-Skeffington’s biography of Davitt records of this time, that ‘everything he had went in the smash—even the dwelling house which had been presented to his wife. And dark times followed, borne with his customary fortitude, till his never-resting pen once more placed him in a position of comparative security’.

Despite his disappointments, parliamentary politics continued to beckon, and when Michael Davitt was elected MP for Northeast Cork the following year his opponents used his recent bankruptcy as grounds to have him disqualified from sitting in the House of Commons. Although the Court of Appeal subsequently affirmed Davitt’s right to stand for election—initially in Britain, then in Ireland—the financial strain and legal anxieties of the turbulent early 1890s provide a critical backdrop to his decision to embark on the 1895 tour of the antipodes. So too did his attempts in 1893 and 1894 to mediate the anti-Parnellite party’s relationship with Britain’s emerging labour movement. Touring through northern British constituencies, Davitt found himself increasingly in sympathy with the policies espoused by labour or socialist parliamentary candidates while ostensibly campaigning for Liberal Party candidates, sympathetic to the anti-Parnell faction. His mounting interest in the potential of labour politics is strongly evident throughout the journal of his tour of the colonies and in his subsequent book.

Michael Davitt’s arrival had been long anticipated by the Irish in Australia. In 1883, shortly after the completion of John and William Redmond’s well-known mission to the Australasian colonies, rumours swept through Ireland, the United States and Australia that Davitt had decided to walk away from the nationalist cause, retire immediately from public life, and relocate permanently to Australia. Much to the disappointment of the Australian Irish, however,

---


Michael Davitt’s Pacific World

Davitt did not follow in the footsteps of the Young Irishman Charles Gavan Duffy decades before and become one of them. A planned visit in 1885 also did not eventuate, Davitt making it only to the Holy Land before returning to Ireland. Carla King writes that ‘other projected trips were also abandoned, so as not to conflict with lecture tours by other Irish nationalist leaders, or in 1893 because he devoted his efforts to supporting the second Home Rule Bill’. Yet though still unknown in person, Davitt was familiar to Australian readers through his wonderful letters published in Joseph Winter’s Melbourne newspaper, The Advocate, from 1887, correspondence that covered Irish politics as well as a wide sweep of world affairs, including the scramble for Africa and the Dreyfuss Affair in France.

When Michael Davitt did finally arrive in the Australasian colonies his tour was, for the most part, enthusiastically received by Irish and non-Irish alike. The visits of previous Irish politicians had done much to erode colonial opposition there to the Home Rule cause and promote mainstream political support for a moderate constitutional settlement. By 1895, only the most vitriolic opponents of Ireland continued unflinchingly to reject the Parliamentary Party’s Home Rule agenda. Indeed, leading Irish Australians believed Home Rule now to be virtually inevitable. E. W. O’Sullivan, a New South Wales politician, was of the opinion that ‘the logic of their common enterprise in the Anglo-Celtic empire would lead the English and Irish of all parties to a compromise. The Irish could not in fact contract out of that compromise’. Davitt’s message for local Irish nationalists, which echoed closely those advanced during the earlier tours of the Redmond brothers and John Dillon, confirmed this opinion and continued to prove attractive to Australian and New Zealand ears: ‘What was Home Rule? Home Rule was what New South Wales, Victoria and twenty-three other colonies today enjoyed’. His paramount interest, however, was to observe developments in the New World rather than to agitate on Ireland’s behalf.

From the outset, Michael Davitt observed closely the operation of the colonial parliaments and the democratic tendencies of colonial politics. To
the student of popular principles of government and social and industrial legislation there are no more interesting countries in the world of practical politics than those of Australasia’, he wrote. In South Australia, his first port of call, Davitt noted in his journal ‘One man one vote. Next General Election it will be adult suffrage as women have had the franchise extended to them…. Present Govt. opportunistic. Leaning towards Labour and Democracy’.

South Australia had been at the forefront of labour politics in Australia when three Labour candidates won seats in the colonial parliament in May 1891. In contrast, he was unimpressed with the Crown’s decision to grant representative government to Western Australia when Ireland remained unable to attain Home Rule. To concede Home Rule to an area the size of Europe less Russia and possessing a population of only 45,000 was, Davitt considered, ‘as illogical, irrational and contradictory policy as could well emanate from a parliamentary debating society in Colney Hatch. But it is the Imperial statesmanship of England all the same’.

Davitt’s journal and correspondence confirm the extent to which he engaged with the leading figures in colonial politics across Australia. In Sydney, he was invited to dine with Edmund Barton, who would become in 1901 the Australian Commonwealth’s first prime minister. But ironically, in a decade that saw the flowering of Australian nationalism, the Irish nationalist Davitt remained a sceptic of the self-governing colonies’ movement towards Federation. Reflecting his intense interest in the possibilities of class-based politics, Davitt prioritised social reform over the achievement of a national parliament: ‘[i]t will add nothing to the present advantages they possess in colonies where the Labour parties hold the balance of parliamentary power’.

In each colony, in addition to meeting colonial politicians, encouraging local Irish sympathisers, and conducting a hectic schedule of public lectures, Davitt researched and commented upon topics of personal interest: legislative reforms, land ownership, the quality of local journalism, labour relations (including the use of Pacific Island labour on the Queensland sugar plantations), and prisons. In South Australia, he visited the Murray River Labour Settlements, local attempts to establish a self-sufficient yeomanry. As Val Noone has pointed out, Davitt saw experiments in alternatives to private ownership such as the Murray settlements as ‘of importance to the global
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14 Michael Davitt, ‘1895 Tour Notes part 1’, Trinity College Dublin TCDMS 9562, 43.
15 Davitt, *Life and Progress*, 27.
16 Ibid. 132.
labour movement’.17 He also visited the farming and copper mining region of Kapunda where there were ‘a good few Irish among the residents’.18 In the colony he found the people generally healthy and contented, the children comfortably clad, ‘strong of limb, bright and chatty’, in stark contrast to the shoeless children of the West of Ireland.19 Davitt’s visit followed tumultuous industrial disputes in the eastern Australian colonies earlier in the decade and unsurprisingly labour topics loomed large in his public lectures. His recent exposure to the increasingly influential role of labour in British politics ensured the popularity of his meetings and drew large numbers of trade unionists to hear his addresses.

The treatment of indigenous Australians and Pacific Island labourers recruited for the Queensland sugar fields proved to be of special interest to Davitt. Though his lexicon is very much that of the late-nineteenth century, he commented firmly and critically on the adverse effects of colonisation on the Aborigines, believing it was ‘to the credit of colonial Irishmen that they have produced, in more than one instance, courageous advocates of a humane treatment of the dying Aboriginal race of Australia’.20 More pressing to contemporaries, however, was the immediate challenge posed to the cherished ideal of White Australia by the importation of so-called ‘Kanaka labour’. Davitt travelled to Mackay in northern Queensland and researched at length the wages, rations and clothing available to the indentured workers recruited for the sugar industry. He spoke to local European farmers as well as the labourers themselves, taking care to do so in the absence of their masters. While Japanese inspectors attended the sugar districts to ensure fair treatment of their nationals, he judged that government inspections of the island workers were ‘a nominal affair’. The Pacific labourers were confined to the least skilled work, while ‘all technical work was done by white men’. ‘They are not “driven” in their task, as slaves would be’, Davitt observed, ‘but they look when at labour more like prison gangs than free workers’. Their desultory condition and high mortality rates were particularly striking. Consequently, he concluded, the current system of indenture ought to be terminated and replaced by one that recognised the aspirations of the small holder. ‘The best, if not the only way in which to rid Queensland of the reproach and dangers of the Kanaka Labour
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17 Noone, p.37; Davitt, *Life and Progress*, 73.
18 Ibid., 9.
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System, is to encourage homestead sugar cultivation’. Davitt’s meticulous investigation of the racial issues confronting the Australian colonies on the eve of Federation is significant and warrants renewed attention from Australian historians. It speaks also to present debates among Irish historians over Irish attitudes to indigenous and colonised minoritities.

Inevitably, nationalist politics stood large alongside Davitt’s other activities. Rallies and meetings took place in all the major cities. In Queensland he met and was photographed with Kevin Izod O’Doherty, the venerable Young Irisher, who had returned to Australia and entered colonial politics rather than tread in the footsteps of his comrades and return to settle permanently in Ireland or the United States. ‘You are about to visit undoubtedly the most democratic portion of the “British Empire”, O’Doherty had written to Davitt on 3 May 1895, shortly before his arrival in Australia, and in general there was little Davitt encountered to dispute this claim. In Melbourne, Davitt was reunited with a former Fenian colleague, Hugh Brophy, who had been transported to Australia in 1867. He met, socialised, and was photographed with the leaders of Melbourne’s Irish nationalist movement. Familiar with John Mitchel’s *Jail Journal*, Davitt wrote when he arrived in Tasmania ‘how often when young has this place with its convict history rung in my ears’. His itinerary was hectic, the pace gruelling, and the distances travelled vast. Significant sums of money were raised through his public lectures—Davitt remitted £900 to the Irish Party in July to meet expenses when an election was called—though this drained him of funds otherwise needed to support his family in Ireland.

On 31 October Davitt sailed for New Zealand. Among his fellow passengers was Mark Twain, and Davitt recorded in his journal the famed American writer’s opinions on Australia and its nascent literature. In Dunedin, Davitt was met by future New Zealand Prime Minister Joseph Ward and gave a labour lecture to an audience of 600, though not without regret: ‘Yes, but 1 hour and 50 mins and no compensation from these Irish who are not attracted by such a question’. His visit to Oamaru did little to improve his mood: ‘Lecture a
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failure. Mark Twain and other caterers for public patronage have been here lately and the people have become tired. Proceeds least of my lectures in tour except Ipswich Queensland’.  

As in Australia, Davitt met the big names of New Zealand politics and society during his time in the colony, including Seddon, Stout, and Pember Reeves, but flagging energy, and homesickness aggravated by the recent death of his seven-year-old daughter Kathleen, seem increasingly to affect the tone of his journal. Fifteen hundred attended his Auckland lecture that ‘went off well’. ‘But it was the last!! So farewell to this my second and as I most fervently pray my last lecture tour. May God grant I shall never again be compelled to resort to this hated work for the need of bread and butter. Amen!’

Michael Davitt sailed from Auckland on the Alameda on Saturday 30 November, traversing the Pacific en route to the United States. His sense of relief was palpable: ‘Oh, the blessed feeling, of heavenly rest one experiences, after such a tour to find oneself absolutely master of oneself and free of all worry and all thought of lectures, audiences, interviews etc etc=How weary and tired do I feel! I do not think I could have carried out two more engagements. My strength has lasted just up to the seventieth and final lecture. Thank heaven it is all over and has not been a failure’. The trans-Pacific voyage promised an opportunity for relaxation and reflection.

Davitt arrived in Samoa on 4 December. His observations and experiences of Polynesia were, like his experiences of Australasia, to mark his political consciousness in subsequent years. They also constitute a rich commentary on the late-nineteenth-century Pacific World, and are supported by a substantial photographic archive of in excess of 150 prints. Carla King has previously written about Davitt’s interest in photography. An avid collector of studio portraits and landscapes, Davitt’s memoir of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific was supplemented by his own series of photographs taken on an early model Kodak camera that he had purchased in the United States. In 1884 the Kodak founder, George Eastman, had patented the use of coated paper to replace glass plates, enabling greater mobility and durability in camera use than had been previously possible. Though they initiated a democratisation of photography, the early Kodaks were rare and expensive: how Davitt, so recently bankrupt, possessed one, remains puzzling. Mobile personal photography was then in its infancy—and not without problems,
as Davitt’s journal makes clear. He misplaced the camera once, and expe-
rienced technical difficulties in the humid climate. Travelling from Brisbane to
Maryborough he had complained ‘Kodak a failure up to Mackay. Bad film
and worse working the explanation. Refilled at Brisbane’.27 (Refilling was a
specialist, dark room procedure).

The Alameda’s arrival in Samoa provided Davitt with the opportunity to
play the tourist and pursue his hobby. Recent scholarship has shown just
how extensively Samoa was photographed in the late-nineteenth century.
Trans-Pacific travellers invariably stopped in Apia for a day or more as their
ships provisioned, this steady stream of visitors breeding a thriving photo-
graphic industry. The first resident commercial photographer in Samoa, John
Davis, was active from the 1870s until his death in 1893. A New Zealander,
Alfred Tattersall, arrived as Davis’s assistant in 1886 and continued the busi-
ness after his mentor’s death. These photographers produced landscapes for
sale, sold pictures of tourist attractions such as Robert Louis Stephenson’s
grave, and marketed highly popular prints of photogenic Samoans for pass-
ing travellers and European audiences. Nudes and semi-nudes, particularly of
young women, were a staple of the local studios. According to one account,
‘John Davis … told a visitor that “hundreds of native girls and youths pre-
sented themselves at his studio in hopes that they would make photographs
of commercial value for book illustrations and for selling to tourists”’. He
chose “only two, or three at the most, who possessed the thick lips and sens-
ual features which coincided with the stock European idea of the South Sea
type”.”28 Davitt’s photo collection, comprising purchased studio prints and
his own photographs, reflects all these trends and is an important but little
known component of the visual record of Samoa’s past.

Though Davitt’s stay in Samoa was brief he was not an idle visitor, and
he actively sought out people and the principal sights. Samoans, Davitt wrote,
were ‘the finest built men I have yet seen among “savage” people. Bodies giant
like, and in fine proportion. Limbs all splendidly developed. Males nearly all
tattooed on thighs down to the knee’. Girls ‘mature at ten and are old at twenty-
five’. People, he believed, were cheerful and happy, and unassuming. ‘Kodaked
several groups of men, women and children’. Like other visitors he sought out

27 Michael Davitt, ‘1895 Tour Notes part 2’, Trinity College Dublin TCDMS 9563, 57;
Davitt, Life and Progress, 112.

28 Alison Devine Nordström ‘Photography of Samoa: Production, Dissemination and
Use’, in Peter Messenhöller and Alison Devine Nordström (eds), Picturing Paradise:
Colonial Photography of Samoa, 1875–1925 (Daytona Beach, 1995, 12–35; Mary
the prized semi-nude of young local women: ‘Great fun while taking pictures of a few young girls who were induced to take off their make believe corsage. The old women urged them to put all their charms in the picture. Nothing in “civilised life” could compare with the modest demeanour of the young girls in question’. Food was plentiful, nutritious and cheap: ‘one is tempted to wish that we had such food for the labouring poor at home as a substitute for the waterful potato and the everlasting tea’.

Davitt found the time to visit the local Marist school, Robert Louis Stevenson’s house and grave, and the local newspaper office. He met local Irishmen, including Pat O’Ryan, the harbour pilot at Apia. ‘He has been there for a long time. Had a roving career. Was a dozen years in China. Staunch Home Ruler’. There was also the young son of a Dublin university professor, ‘on a voyage for his health among these islands’. ‘Says he likes Samoa very much … Told me a chief had given him a daughter to marry a la Samoan, I suppose, and waxed eloquent over her charms’.29

Unsurprisingly, Davitt was keenly interested in Samoa’s political position and the prospects for its future. He commented critically on the presence of three imperial powers, Britain, Germany and the United States, contesting control of Samoa, and firmly explained what he believed to be the deleterious effect of their competition on local government. ‘This is a grotesquely absurd arrangement. Leads to three post offices, three authorities practically and all which this implies … No body satisfied is but a natural and common sense comment upon this stage of things. It would be much better if two of the three ruling powers would clear out and allow the third to establish a protectorate (fairly defined) over the island’. His observation that ‘Most of the traders are German’ perhaps indicated his preference for the custodial power’.30 His concern with Samoan governance would continue long after he left its shores.

Davitt then sailed from Apia to Honolulu, ‘most delightfully situated, and a charming place’. He visited Oahu prison, the Molokai Leper Station (previously staffed by Irish priests) and interviewed Queen Liliuokalani. Ever the journalist, Davitt noted that Honolulu boasted ‘no less than 15 newspapers … one morning daily (The Pacific Commercial Advertiser) and three evening papers. Six weekly (English), 4 Native Hawaiian Weekly, 2 Chinese Weeklies; 2 Japanese weeklies and 2 Portaguese [sic]’. He also followed up his concern, strongly evident in Australia, with plantations and the use of indentured

29 Davitt, ‘1895 Tour Notes part 6’, 1–6.
30 Ibid. 5
coloured labour, an issue addressed in detail in his published account of the tour of Australia and New Zealand.\textsuperscript{31}

Davitt’s Pacific crossing ended in San Francisco. From the West Coast he crossed the United States for a family reunion with his sisters in Scranton, Pennsylvania, and meetings to discuss with American supporters the desirability of an Irish Race Convention. At long last came his return home to Ireland. He disembarked at Queenstown on 10 January 1896, avoiding speeches and the ubiquitous banquet. ‘Am beginning to think that I am commencing to be fortunate’. A visit to his daughter Kathleen’s grave followed soon after. ‘I almost wished to be with her and at peace. Possibly it may not be long before I am. God knows I have had little peace in my life so far’.\textsuperscript{32}

Michael Davitt visited New Zealand, Australia, and the Pacific only once, but his encounters with the Pacific World demonstrably influenced his outlook on a range of critical late-nineteenth century issues: empire and imperial governance, parliamentary government, labour migration, self-determination and labour politics. This was well demonstrated throughout the remainder of his political career. For example, he fought a vigorous campaign as a Member of Parliament during the 1899 crisis over the succession to the Samoan kingship. Writing to a German journalist, Davitt stated that he had visited Samoa and took a keen interest in Samoan affairs. ‘The whole present trouble in the island is the work of a body named the London Missionary Society which seeks to make English power predominant in Samoa’, he explained. He urged his colleague to impress upon German readers that fault for the crisis lay principally with Britain rather than the United States. ‘All this is just like the policy and conduct of those who rule and ruin Ireland. They try to breed bad blood between all other nations so that they can profit by this jealousy’. However, Davitt’s outspokenness raised the ire of opponents in London. ‘It is a public scandal that the House of Commons should tolerate among its members a man who having taken the Oath of Allegiance to the Queen, publicly poses as one of the Queen’s enemies’, editorialised the \textit{St James Gazette}. ‘Personally, I say you ought to be removed on the old Land League Methods’, wrote a correspondent to that publication, a member of the London Irish Rifle Volunteers. However Davitt was never one to be intimidated, and was not now deterred in his campaign to assist Samoa to overcome what he described as the

\textsuperscript{31} Michael Davitt, ‘Samoa and Honolulu etc’. Michael Davitt Papers Trinity College Dublin TCDMS 9544, 9–14.
\textsuperscript{32} Michael Davitt, ‘Tour Notes part 7’, Trinity College Dublin TCDMS 9567, 10 January, 22 March 1896.
‘drunkenness and diseases and other maladies’ that had followed European colonisation of the Pacific.\textsuperscript{33}

Theo Moody’s biography of Davitt observes:

The Irish nation of Davitt’s ideal was to be a tolerant, pluralist (he did not, of course, use the word), outward-looking, democratic, community, in which the separate strands of the past would be united, and the old sectarian and cultural divisions healed, in cooperative effort for the common good. In achieving that cooperation, nationalisation of the land was more important than nationalisation of the government. It followed from this concept of the nation, and from his awareness and growing knowledge of the world outside Ireland, that his nationalism was complemented by internationalism.\textsuperscript{34}

Though that ideal was to be long in coming to fruition, historians do well to remember the legacy of late-nineteenth-century-nationalists including Michael Davitt, whose keen awareness of and experiences in distant places far from Ireland’s shores did so much to instil that sense of the international, the diverse, and the tolerant.

Historians have recently explored the contentious issue of Ireland’s relationship to empire. As this article has shown, Davitt, like others of his ilk, was an active participant in wider debates about national rights and the tribulations of imperialism in the Pacific World. Though, as his photographs make clear, Davitt observed the Pacific very much through Western eyes, his abiding interest in the condition of indigenous populations, the use of coloured labour, and the deleterious effects of European rivalry on colonial territories, are indicative of the capacity of late-nineteenth century Irish nationalists to locate their own political situation in a broad global context and to offer support for those bearing the burdens of colonialism. Davitt’s experience as a traveller in and around the Pacific speaks in important ways not only to historians of the places he visited but also to the place of Ireland and Irish politics in a transnational setting.
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On 7 March 1872 the settlers of the lower North Island township of Wairoa (later Waverley) met to formulate a response to the perceived threat of displaced Māori returning to the locality after the recent cessation of military hostilities. The region had experienced violent conflict for over a decade. There had been a short outburst of fighting nearby in 1847, but an extended confrontation had erupted in the neighbouring province of Taranaki in 1860, hostilities then extending across much of the North Island throughout the 1860s. The conflict came close to Wairoa, and the locality’s major town, Wanganui, during 1868–9 when a local tribal leader, Tītokowaru, led armed resistance against further settler encroachment onto Māori land. Despite the longevity of the warfare, in 1872 many of the region’s European settlers were in no mood to compromise. At the culmination of what appears to have been a hot-tempered meeting, Wairoa’s European settlers issued the following warning to local Māori:

We, the settlers hereby warn you that we intend to prevent any Maoris from settling in these districts. Time will not change us. No passes or permits will alter our determination. We are always watching. We were once your friends. You destroyed the friendship. Be not misled by pakeha-Maoris [sic]. Keep out of our sight and live. We send you this not to cause trouble but to prevent it.
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5 *Taranaki Herald*, 16 March 1872, 2.
Despite condemnation in the press, the sentiment seems to have been widely shared amongst settlers living in adjacent settlements. Similar resolutions were passed on 18 March at a meeting in Hawera and on the following evening by forty-five settlers from Manutahi and Kakaramea. The settlers at all three meetings insisted that they had returned to their lands only as a result of a guarantee given to them by the then New Zealand Premier, William Fox, that Māori would not be permitted to resettle anywhere in the land between the Waingongoro and Okehu rivers.

This paper examines the relationship between early Irish-Protestant settlers in the Wanganui region and nascent Pākehā identity, largely through the experiences and relationships of two Co. Armagh-born brothers, Samuel and William Austin. It focuses on three agents of cultural and ethnic change, all with international parallels: the relationship between British settlers and Māori, the relationship between these settlers and ‘the frontier’, and the relationship of the settlers to their own transplanted culture. The paper suggests that despite these influences, any process of moving towards a coherent Pākehā identity was not linear, being complicated and animated by the persistence of old world identities, networks and affinities. The aim is not to provide an analysis of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, nor settlers and the land, even in the relatively confined setting of Wanganui’s rural hinterland. Rather it is to test the impact which these sporadically antagonistic and violent relationships had on the emergence of a pan-British Pākehā identity, and to establish where Irish Protestants fitted into this development. The processes by which settlers defined themselves as a distinct community, in relation to Māori, New Zealand and Britain, through these conflicts, were played out in the Wanganui districts.
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in the years after the cessation of military hostilities. The pressures on pre-migration relationships and communal identities, however, only represent part of the story, and the fragmentary extant evidence relating to Irish settlers suggests the persistence of old world connections. To be sure, processes of interaction and change can be distinguished, but to elide the ethnic aspect and pre-migration loyalties of New Zealand’s nineteenth-century European settlers would be to ignore a critical component of the period’s history.

The fall-out from the Wairoa meeting provides a telling insight into one section of Irish Protestant opinion on the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, which was highlighted in the editorial pages of Ulsterman John Ballance’s *Wanganui Herald*. The *Herald* was among the first papers to report the meeting at Wairoa, and alongside Wellington’s *Evening Post* was one of the few to comment favourably on the colonists’ actions. A bombastic editorial announced that:

The attempt to restore rebel natives to the district that they ravaged with fire and sword is met with the firm determination of the settlers of Wairoa to resist. Nor will resistance be in vain. British colonists have banded themselves together to preserve their lives and property against probable destruction by murderous cannibals… Donald McLean and his Philo-Maori myrmidons may reverse on paper the policy which was announced in the face of the Colony by the Premier, that no Maori fire should be lit between the Okehu and the Waingongoro, but he cannot trample upon a hundred armed men, animated by a unanimous and fixed determination to stand by the solemn compact upon the faith of which these men returned to their farms.

Born in Glenavy, Co. Antrim, in 1839, Ballance was the son of a modest but secure tenant farmer. He received his early education in Belfast before
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completing an apprenticeship as an ironmonger, and at 18 emigrated from Belfast to Birmingham, there working as a commercial traveller, while being exposed to the associational and political culture of the city.\(^\text{18}\) In 1866 Ballance migrated again, this time to New Zealand, in response to his wife’s ill-health. Settling in Wanganui, he operated a series of small businesses before becoming the founding editor of Wanganui’s *Evening Herald*.\(^\text{19}\) He went on to become the parliamentary representative for Wanganui, a minister in the Grey and Stout-Vogel cabinets, and later Premier.

Those trawling for signs of Ballance’s Ulster background might see in his endorsement of the settler position a reflection of the province’s covenanting heritage, and the playing out of the conditional loyalty of that tradition and its culmination in a right to bear arms.\(^\text{20}\) The *Herald* advised ‘the settlers to stand fast by their rifles, and the first cannibal that returns to force him back, or lay him low’.\(^\text{21}\) Whatever the philosophical root of Ballance’s position,\(^\text{22}\) and it may merely be coincidence that the other organ to enthusiastically throw its support behind the settlers was an Irish Protestant owned operation, the *Evening Post*, the incident suggests a continued defensiveness amongst the settlers of Wanganui and its hinterland.\(^\text{23}\) One by-product of this mentality is that the *Evening Herald* and its successor, the *Wanganui Herald* were critical of anything perceived as relating to Irish religious discord.\(^\text{24}\) It took this position on the basis that such attitudes were unbecoming of those engaged in the work of colonisation, and that the successful development of the colony depended on leaving such old world attitudes behind. Commenting on sectarian riots in Christchurch in late December 1879, the *Post* declared that:
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\(^{19}\) Ibid., 22–5.


\(^{21}\) Quoted in the *Wellington Independent*, 19 March 1872, 2.

\(^{22}\) Rob Stevens provides a more critical interpretation of similar attitudes, see ‘Land and white settler colonialism: the case of Aotearoa’, in David Novitz and Bill Willmott (eds), *Culture and Identity in New Zealand* (Wellington, 1989), 21–34.


One might have imagined that men coming out to a new country to engage in the heroic work of colonisation would at least leave behind them such out of date antagonisms as those between Orangemen and Roman Catholics, which belong wholly to old world prejudices, and are utterly absurd and unmeaning at the present day and at the other end of the world.25

Although this secular attitude anticipated and perhaps facilitated the inclusion of Irish migrants in wider Pākehā society, it does not necessarily follow that it led to older identities and affiliations being automatically subsumed into a new colonial one, even among the settlers’ loudest champions.26

Ballance’s view of Māori was not the only one to be expressed by Irish Protestant settlers.27 Even those directly engaged in combat with Māori occasionally provide glimpses of a more complex set of relationships between the area’s existing population and the its more recent arrivals. The memoirs of Samuel Austin, a Presbyterian from Tandragee, Co. Armagh, offer such an insight.28 Austin had arrived in Wellington with the 65th Regiment in mid-winter 1846, and continued to serve until 1859.29 On his discharge he settled in Wanganui, eventually taking up a leasehold farm outside the town.30 Insofar as he recalls any exchanges with local Māori between his discharge and 1865, the relations appear to have been positive. During these years, as he worked his land and ‘pushed along’, a ‘native planted one fourth of an acre in Potatoes of his own land and gave them to me also some Pigs and Fowl’.31

25 WTH, 31 December 1879, 2.
26 Thus Rollo Arnold’s description of Kaponga, in neighbouring Taranaki, implies differences with Māori and also within the settler community, Settler Kaponga: A Frontier Fragment of the Western World (Wellington, 1997), 56.
28 The Austin papers include two moderately different versions of the memoirs, combined with a third set of notes on the wars and a small collection of ephemera which provide insights into Austin’s views on issues beyond the details of military campaigns. To distinguish the memoirs they are referred to in this paper as Austin Memoirs 1, being the soft-bound copy, and Austin Memoirs 2, being the hard-bound volume, Queen Elizabeth II Army Museum Archives, Waiouru, Personal Recollections: Samuel Austin, NZ Cross, 1992.1005.
29 Austin Memoirs 2, 3–5. There is no pagination in this draft of the document; the page numbers quoted assume the first page of the document to be page one.
30 The memoirs do not record the exact location of the original farm, ibid., 6.
31 Ibid., 6.
In 1863 the land which Austin leased was sold, and he shifted his farming activities, settling in the Brunswick area. The following year he records that a great number of Māori, ‘passing and repassing [sic] between Wanganui and Taranaki’ frequently came within a few hundred yards of his house. Although this upset some of his European neighbours, Austin recalled that he ‘went and saw them pass and had a chat with the head chief [sic] Pehi and introduced me to the other chiefs [sic]’. Austin’s fortunes received a set-back in February 1865 when his neighbour, Capt. James Duff Hewett, was killed and mutilated by Māori. He was immediately called-up for volunteer duty, being stationed at the nearby Stewart’s Redoubt. If Austin was discommoded by the attack and the mobilisation of volunteers, he was outraged when prevented from returning to his homestead to secure his property, which was rapidly looted, prompting him to observe that ‘The Imperial Soldiers were a great deal worse than the Natives for both officers and men took whatever they could lay their hands on belonging to the settlers’.

Austin spent the next five years in military service, fighting against various Māori groups. During this time he was closer to some Māori than most settlers, being the quarter-master sergeant of the Wanganui Native Contingent, made up of kūpapa (Māori siding with the British Crown). Austin was occasionally critical of Māori, describing Te Arawa as ‘all bounce and great rougs [sic]’, also observing that ‘as in Island [sic], all natives are prone to thieve a little but the Arawas are the worst that I have met with since I came to New Zealand’. His sardonic criticism was not, however, confined to Māori. He described, Thomas Handley, a settler who had been appointed as a sergeant on account of his skills as a guide, as ‘about as much use as a Goat[,] in fact not so much…’ and was repeatedly critical of European officers, on one occasion complaining ‘these are the men who are put over good soldiers to lead us into action…’. At the same time, he was fulsome in his praise of the military prowess of young Māori soldiers in the Native Contingent,

32 It may be the case that Austin’s lease-hold property was also in this area, ibid., 7.
33 Ibid., 7
35 The account of Hewett’s death is significantly more elaborate in the second set of memoirs, see Austin Memoirs 2, 7 and, Austin Memoirs 1, 4–5.
36 Austin Memoirs 2, 7–8.
37 Austin Memoirs 1, 7.
38 Ibid., 37.
39 For example, Austin Memoirs 2, 10, and ibid., 25.
claiming that the ‘young lads I have often seen them when in action do what no European would have done that is put up the Rifel [sic] 3 or 4 times to their shoulder before firing and when they did fire Generally brought down their man … ’40 By the time Austin’s memoirs reach 1866, he usually qualifies any use of the words ‘we’ or ‘our’ as referring to the Native Contingent and separates their actions from those of what he regarded as the less competent imperial troops.41 Intriguingly, having very briefly described his enlistment at Banbridge, Co. Down, then his departure for England and later Australia, Austin’s memoirs make little if any reference to Ireland beyond brief mention of meeting with a Colonel Greer, who he described as a ‘country man of my own I knew him and his family at Home.’42 Yet for all of this, what will become clear as the paper progresses is that Austin’s life outside the military suggests his Ulster background, and the ties of family and friends, remained of crucial importance to him.

In addition to the interaction between European and Māori, there has also been considerable historical focus on the role of the frontier in shaping New Zealand settlers’ society.43 At its most vociferous, this view argues that the pursuit of land and employment drove New Zealand’s nineteenth-century settlers into the isolated depths of a rapidly expanding (European) frontier, creating a dysfunctional, bondless society lacking the potential foundations of community life.44 Prominent amongst the symptoms of this were high rates of litigation, transience, alcoholism and violence.45 Several striking illustrations emerge from the criminal prosecution in 1877 of Patrick Mahony and Patrick Grady for assault, their unlikely victim being the diarist and soldier Samuel Austin.46

40 Although prepared to concede the ability of young Māori in terms of marksmanship and bravery, he ignored the sophistication of their tactical and organisational talents, ibid., 8. In this regard Austin confirms Belich’s analysis, _New Zealand Wars_, 316–17.
41 Austin Memoirs 1, 49 and passim.
42 Austin Memoirs 2, 19.
46 Fairburn would no doubt reject the methodology employed hereafter see ‘A discourse on critical method’, _New Zealand Journal of History_, (hereafter NZJH) xxv, 2 (October, 1991), 158–77.
If viewed out of its ethnic context, as might occur in a statistical analysis of drunkenness or petty-criminal proceedings, the trial appears to confirm the existence of an atomised society, the absence of old world restraints facilitating, conceivably even encouraging, such dysfunctional behaviour. On the evening of 30 June 1877 Austin had been drinking at the Red Lion Hotel, Wanganui, where he met Mahony and Grady. Mahony, like Austin, lived on the Cherry Bank estate and solicited a ride in Austin’s horse and cart back to the farm. Austin, who acknowledged in court that he had known the defendant for some time agreed, and according to one of two boys also being given a lift, the journey commenced in good spirits. A little later, however, the mood soured. According to Austin,

Grady pulled me off the dray and struck me several times; he struck me in the mouth with his fist twice; he and his two friends kicked me when I was lying prostrate; while I was being held the boys cried out ‘murder’, ‘do not murder him’ whereupon they let me up … I am still under the impression that if the boys had not called out ‘murder’ I would certainly have been killed.

Austin’s testimony provided further evidence of chaos and lawlessness on the frontier, when he deposed that the incident was not the first time he had been assaulted on the same road.

Despite this, probing more deeply into the assault on Samuel Austin shows that in the late 1870s, at least, identities established in Ireland remained important. Tellingly, the incident also illustrates that not all old world identities and relationships necessarily constrained anti-social behaviour. William Duigan, the young witness at the trial, testified that the men had left the Red Lion Hotel in good spirits and on friendly terms as the journey to Cherry Bank commenced. Shortly thereafter Grady, Mahony and the third unidentified assailant began, according to Austin, to speak in Irish. Later again, Mahony approached Austin and enquired of him whether he was an
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Irishman, and if he believed in St. Patrick. Although Austin confirmed he was an Irishman, according to his evidence his refusal to endorse Ireland’s national saint provoked the assault:

[Mahony] asked me did I believe in St. Patrick;” I replied that I did not; “Well then,” he replied, ‘you cannot be an Irishman;’ he then held a conversation with the other two men in Irish when suddenly they all jumped out of the cart, Mahony exclaiming, ‘Holy Virgin Mary protect us, and we’ll murder Austin”

As the fracas proceeded, one of the assailants turned his attention to the horse and, demanding a knife from his fellows, claimed that he would cut her throat. Concerned at the threat to the animal, Austin told them that:

‘If you want to do anything more, you had better do it to me instead of the mare, as she belongs to Mr McGregor;’ one of them replied, “McGregor is a - - black Protestant, and if he were here we would serve him the same…”

Patrick Grady, the only defendant to present himself in court, unfortunately from an historical perspective offered no evidence in his own defence. He admitted the assault, but his lawyer argued that his actions were not premeditated, that the incident had broken out over the issue of religion, which in his words ‘had always been a bone of contention between colonised Irish men’. Furthermore, there was no evidence to suggest that the affray would be repeated. “[T]he assault…’, submitted defence counsel, ‘arose in hot blood between hot blooded people [and] was not of such a serious character as might have been expected before the evidence was heard…’ The judge agreed with counsel, fining Grady two pounds, as well as the costs of the case, with an alternative of seven days’ imprisonment, but threatening that should the defendant appear before him again punishment would be much more severe.

It would be wrong to extrapolate from this incident that nineteenth-century New Zealand was a hot-bed of sectarian unrest. Even considering
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its overtones, the affray could be dismissed as an irrelevant, alcohol-fuelled confrontation rather than as evidence of transferred Irish political and religious loyalties. Taken in isolation, the trial might permit such an interpretation. This would, however, involve ignoring some of the more interesting factors which seem to have been at play. Given that Austin and Mahony were fellow employees on McGregor’s farm, it is likely that Mahony was aware of Austin’s particular religious and political convictions. In 1875 Austin applied for, and obtained, a warrant for an Orange Lodge to be opened in Wanganui.\(^{57}\) This in itself may not have been known to Mahony, but it is hard to imagine that he did not realise that Austin was the Worshipful Master of the local lodge. Wanganui had enthusiastically marked the Twelfth of July 1876 with a soiree and an attendant rise in sectarian tension, with Austin’s role in the lodge being prominently recorded in the *Wanganui Chronicle*.\(^{58}\) Lest the level of sectarian animus be overestimated, it should be noted that ultimately the anniversary’s celebration passed without incident and ‘but with a few exceptions the behaviour of all was commendable; fun and frolic being the chief features observable…’\(^{59}\)

In examining the manner in which imported ethnic affiliations and identities played out in colonial Wanganui it is necessary to look briefly at the public discourse surrounding Orangeism which emerged in the town in the 1870s and 1880s. In this regard, the attitude of the *Wanganui Herald*, a bastion of colonial nationalism, liberalism, and a champion of home rule for Ireland, is of obvious interest.\(^{60}\) It assumes even greater importance in that Ballance, its founder and editor, was of Ulster Protestant and Orange extraction, if not sympathies.\(^{61}\) The *Herald’s* reaction to the public display of Orangeism in July 1876 was low-key, largely restricted to the publishing of letters in favour of and opposed to the establishment of a lodge in the town, before
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an abrupt declaration in early August that quite enough had been written on the issue.\textsuperscript{62}

In February 1877 the issue was raised again when the \textit{Herald} felt compelled to point to a mistake in the most recent edition of the \textit{Wanganui Almanac}, which had recorded that a William Austin was the ‘Grand Master’ of the Wanganui lodge. While Samuel Austin’s ‘Protestant feelings’, claimed the \textit{Herald}, ‘can find no other outlet than in such platitudes as the “Glorious, Pious and Immortal Memory”[,] Mr William Austin, happily, believes that his creed depends on no such fictitious safeguards, and as a true colonist sees the beauty of forgetting old world feuds and meaningless shibboleths’.\textsuperscript{63} The \textit{Herald’s} editorial conveniently neglected to mention that Samuel and William Austin were brothers,\textsuperscript{64} and that both were members of the local Orange lodge. Notwithstanding their fraternal affiliations, real and associational, the Austin brothers appear to have held markedly different views of Orangeism. On 13 July 1877, in a further editorial, this time excoriating the Orange institution, the \textit{Herald} described Samuel Austin as a ‘thoroughgoing Orangeman, who holds the sentiment typical of the institution, that a “papist” is not to be trusted out of your sight, and [is] to be watched with the greatest suspicion when he is in it’.\textsuperscript{65} The editorial cautioned its readers that it was ‘the duty of every colonist to prevent by every means in his power, the sowing of the seeds in this young country of those religious feuds which have been the curse of every nation in Europe’.\textsuperscript{66} William, as will become apparent, took a more open-minded view.

The Orange affiliations of William Austin were raised on two occasions in the \textit{Wanganui Herald} between 1877 and 1884, and with good reason. While John Ballance was not particularly enamoured with Orangeism, William Austin was both a friend and ally in local politics. In the February 1877 editorial, having condemned Orangeism in New Zealand as a ‘childish concern … breeding and perpetuating ill-feeling where none should exist’, the \textit{Herald} acknowledged that some of its ‘warmest friends [had] associated themselves with this anachronism’.\textsuperscript{67} William Austin’s joint links to the Orange Order and John Ballance were raised again in 1881, when the \textit{Wanganui Chronicle}, presumably
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in a mischievous attempt to gain electoral advantage for their preferred candidate, published a letter questioning how Austin, as an Orangeman, could support candidate Ballance, who the correspondent suggested, ‘if not a member of the land-league, [was] a prominent sympathiser with it’.\textsuperscript{68} William Austin responded personally, declaring that the \textit{Chronicle}’s correspondent was a ‘fawning lickspittle with no creed but implicit obedience to his lord and master, the man of means…’ and was frequently in demand in the office of the morning paper in ‘its effort to set class against class in Wanganui’.\textsuperscript{69} In contrast to the impression of his brother provided by the \textit{Herald}, William Austin claimed to have little suspicion of Catholics, declaring: ‘I am happy in the knowledge that I have many Roman Catholic friends, whom I love and respect; and, when we agree in politics, I shall be always found fighting with them—for their liberty is my liberty, and their rights are my rights’.\textsuperscript{70} True to his word, in 1889 William Austin donated ten shillings to the Parnell Relief Fund.\textsuperscript{71}

The full extent of the connections between Ballance and the Austin family were revealed on the third occasion that William Austin’s membership of the Orange Order arose as an issue of note. As the 1884 general election approached, Ballance faced a potentially difficult struggle to recover the Wanganui seat that he had lost at the previous election. As usual, he faced opposition from the town’s conservatives, and in 1884 this difficulty was compounded by the entry of George Hutchison to the electoral race.\textsuperscript{72} The Scottish-born Hutchison had developed a reputation as a supporter of Catholic education when standing in an earlier election in Hawera, and as the election approached it was expected that Wanganui’s Catholic voters would support him \textit{en masse}.\textsuperscript{73} While Ballance’s opposition to Bible-in-Schools had ensured Catholic support in the 1879 general election, he remained a supporter of free and secular state education until assuming the Premiership in 1891, and as a result was under pressure from Hutchison.\textsuperscript{74} Catholic voters, however, were not the only group with an interest in the candidates’ attitudes to Catholic
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education. Prior to the election the Auckland-based Grand Lodge of the North Island circulated a letter to candidates enquiring as to their position on issues in which the organisation took an interest, in particular the question of state-funding for Catholic schools. While Ballance refused to respond to the letter, Hutchison attempted to fudge his response so as not to alienate Wanganui’s Orangemen. His response signalled support for a bill that would mandate the government inspection of church-run orphanages.

Having replied in confidence, as requested, to Samuel Austin, Hutchison was no doubt distressed to discover his response made public in an anonymous letter to the Wanganui Chronicle on 16 July. Whether Hutchison’s response was exposed as part of an electoral plot, or simply to reveal perceived duplicity in the matter of education, at the nomination of candidates later the same day he insinuated that Ballance had orchestrated the ambush. Hutchison’s fruitless attempt to use the hustings to explain his complicated position on religious education only stimulated further questioning about his Orange connections. Asked if he had ever been an Orangeman, Hutchison admitted that he had once attended a lodge meeting, and had been initiated, but claimed not to have returned. At this point the Ulster pincer movement was complete, William Austin questioning Hutchison’s honesty in the matter:

Mr W. Austin—Do you say that was the only night that you were in the lodge room? Was that the only time you were in it?

Mr Hutchison—If Mr. Austin says I was there twice, I won’t contradict him. (Laughter). I don’t know what he is driving at.

A show of hands followed the nominations, Ballance defeating the other two candidates by a considerable margin, receiving eighty votes compared to Hutchison’s fifteen and the third candidate Watt’s thirteen. At the request of Mr Watt, a ballot was held the following week in which Ballance’s showing was equally strong, he securing 541 votes compared to the 205 of Hutchison and the 154 of Watt. It seems unlikely that Austin’s attempt to outmanoeuvre
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Hutchison made a significant contribution to such a comprehensive result.\textsuperscript{82} The \textit{Herald} nevertheless recorded that on the day of the count apprehension in the Ballance camp dissipated as word reached them that the town’s Catholic vote had been split, guaranteeing their man victory.\textsuperscript{83} Doubtless the triumph was doubly sweet for one of the \textit{Herald}’s printing staff, William Austin’s son Samuel, even if the \textit{Herald} had felt compelled, in the wake of the controversy, to include an editorial comment to the effect that the Samuel Austin of their office was not, and never had been, a member of the Orange institution.\textsuperscript{84}

Perhaps the most interesting point about this hustings clash was raised in a pseudonymous letter to the \textit{Wanganui Chronicle}, which sought to simultaneously defend Hutchison and attack Ballance as a ‘free thinker’. Mocking the Orange Order as a self-styled bulwark of Protestantism, ‘Vindex’ queried why Wanganui’s Orange Lodge appeared to have thrown its support behind a godless candidate who was ‘not content with denying his maker, but anxious to teach our children the tenets of a Bradlaugh or a Besant’.\textsuperscript{85} But a contrary question also needs to be asked: why was a progressive ‘free thinker’, a supporter of the Irish land league and home rule, relying on the support of Orangemen? The answer, if a little circuitously, provides the link between the building-blocks of an ethnic migrant community (kinship, friendship and formal association) and its more ephemeral manifestations (in things like political expression and identity): they were his mates.

Despite Ballance propounding an ideology in which old world identities were left behind, a number of his close Wanganui associates were from Ulster or claimed other Irish Protestant backgrounds, and of these the Austin family at least were Orangemen. Although John Alexander McKane Wallace, for example, did not play a prominent role in public life, he was, according to his obituary, intimately associated with Ballance on account of their common Belfast backgrounds.\textsuperscript{86} It is unlikely that Wallace’s brother, Arthur, who also lived in Wanganui, was a political supporter, as he predeceased Ballance’s first election to parliament by a year.\textsuperscript{87} The McMinns, Alfred and Alexander, were a second pair of Ulster-born brothers who supported Ballance and
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had close occupational and financial connections with him.88 Another Irish Protestant with whom Ballance had a long-standing connection was James Duigan, of Kingstown, Co. Dublin. Although the two had a tempestuous political relationship, by the 1890s Duigan had assumed editorship of the *Wanganui Herald* and appears to have been a reasonably close confidant and business associate.89 He also provided intelligence to Ballance on Wanganui’s local political scene while the latter was in parliament in the colonial capital, Wellington. In August 1892 he wrote to the Premier, informing him of the distress felt among local Liberal supporters at the question of female suffrage, it being believed by local members that women’s votes would be influenced by churchmen in league with conservatives. The threat to Ballance’s own position, warned Duigan, was particularly grave as he was consistently denounced as an atheist by James Treadwell, the local Presbyterian minister.90

Ballance’s political circle extended far beyond Ulster men and other Irish-born Protestants. James Boyle, an Irish Catholic printer at the *Wanganui Herald*, co-supervised the 1884 election count for Ballance, alongside William Austin. Similarly, not all Irish Protestants in Wanganui were necessarily on friendly terms with the Liberal leader. In his belated attempt to gain compensation for his injuries sustained in the Land Wars, William Lingard suggested that, because of personal animosity between himself and Ballance, he had been unable to pursue his claim during the latter’s premiership.91 Lingard’s referee in a related land claim, J.R. Sommerville, also fell afoul of Ballance in the 1890s.92 Ballance hardly built his political success on a network of Irish Protestants, only seventeen of the 117 Liberal party Members of the House of Representatives elected, between 1891 and 1912, being Irish-born, although the prominent Orangeman and land-nationaliser Richard Meredith was among them.93 Indeed, the extent to which Ireland influenced his political
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thinking is matter of some contention. While early investigation suggested the formative influences were his political education in Birmingham and his reading of liberal theorists, more recent histories suggest that his Irish youth bore heavily on his thinking, particularly his approach to the land question. His career nevertheless shows that despite his rhetorical commitment to an early colonial nationalism, both for himself and for some of his supporters connections, friendships and political allegiances based on old world identities and loyalties persisted.

Predictably, after his election as Premier, a number of Ballance’s correspondents referred to their common place of birth. J.D.R. Hewitt, brother-in-law of prominent Ulster-born Wellington merchant G. V. Shannon, wrote as a ‘Derry man’ to congratulate Ballance, ‘an Antrim man’, in attaining the position, observing that ‘knowing the country as I do I can appreciate the difficulties you have overcome’. A Fr Laverty of Lyttleton thanked Ballance for his position on Catholic education and addressed him as a ‘fellow countryman’ and, presumably in reference to his time in Belfast, ‘a Towney’. A most intriguing piece of correspondence in this regard was penned by George Vesey Stewart, founder of the Orange settlement of Katikati in the Bay of Plenty, who nobly offered to stand as a Liberal candidate in his local constituency, given the absence of other strong government candidates. Stewart magnanimously suggested that if his own candidacy was unacceptable Ballance might consider Galway Anglican G. M. O’Rorke as a suitable nominee.

Recent historians of nineteenth-century New Zealand have successfully challenged the complacent representation of the country as a series of tightly-knit, mono-cultural communities, highlighting the conflicts which went hand-in-hand with the processes of colonisation, mass immigration and rapidly expanding European settlement. This paper has contended that although these conflicts resulted in important social and cultural developments in the colony, they were balanced by old world identities and allegiances which repeatedly,
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if sporadically, surfaced, this being demonstrated in the personal histories of Irish Protestant migrants settled in Wanganui and its hinterland. The evidence from Wanganui suggests that, despite their occasional protestations to the contrary, old world identities persisted, at least for first-generation migrants to the area. Moreover, the timing of occasional outbreaks of sectarian violence and tension, and the development of Irish ethnic organisations from the 1870s, suggests their tenacity in outlasting the formative early colonisation.

Victoria University, Wellington
‘It is curious how keenly allied in character are the Scotch Highlander and the Maori’:  
Encounters in a New Zealand Colonial Settlement  
Brad Patterson

Let us travel back to the New Zealand summer of 2006, late January, blue skies, temperature around 30°C. The setting is Turakina, a small lower North Island settlement cluster of insufficient size to now be considered more than a village. Situated on State Highway 3, about midway between the township of Bulls and the city of Wanganui, its resident population is less than 100. Superficially, there is not a great deal that is striking about Turakina, one of those sleepy little New Zealand main road settlements, relics of an earlier era that motorists pass through scarcely noticing. Yet for one day in each year Turakina is temporarily transformed: traffic streams into the village from both north and south; people congregate at the Turakina Domain, the adjacent fields being packed with cars; for a few hours the population soars, on occasion up to 2000. The attraction is Turakina’s Highland Games, in their 142nd year in 2006.

All the traditional ingredients greet the visitor: dancing boards, piping and drumming boards, clan tents, equipment for the field events, stalls offering a range of ethnic goods. By mid morning the Domain is a scene of colourful bustle and a cacophony of sound. Yet there is one feature that sets these games apart from others, in New Zealand and elsewhere: a demonstrable Maori presence. Amongst the spectators, whether in Highland costume or more skimpy summer attire, there are curious blends of dress, kilts blending with bush singlets and thongs, several burly males sporting elaborate shoulder tattoos. Young Polynesian women dominate the field events, whether tossing the sheaf, putting the stone or the women’s caber. Parking is under the supervision of polite young uniformed Maori men, resplendent in blue tunics and white caps, while the liquor booth is also under Maori supervision. The

1 For a review of the scattered past writings on the village and district see Jessie Annabell, Smoke in the Hills? Representations of Turakina’s Past (BA Hons research essay, Massey University, 1993).
modest entry fees are levied by cheerful, middle-aged Maori matrons, seemingly already known to most attendees.

How has this mingling of races and cultures come about? This paper reflects on the historical interactions between Highland Scots and Maori in one New Zealand settlement. While the findings may be suggestive, it is not claimed that they should be considered representative of relations between these groups elsewhere in New Zealand, even in adjacent districts. As yet, there is insufficient in-depth research to justify wider generalizations. Despite the fact that Scots made up nearly a quarter of all migrants to New Zealand to 1914, they have arguably been the least studied of all the country’s major migrant groups. It was recognition of this lacuna that motivated the launch of the ‘Scottish Migration to New Zealand’ project in 2005, an international research team funded by the Royal Society of New Zealand subsequently probing many aspects of migration, settlement and cultural legacies. From the outset the relations between migrant Scots and New Zealand’s indigenous people have been acknowledged as a major underlying area of inquiry, and as a consequence a number of exploratory shafts are currently being sunk in several parts of the country. From these collective efforts it is hoped that a much clearer picture will emerge.

The title for the paper comes from an early 1891 leader in the Rangitikei Advocate, a small local newspaper serving that district, its English-born editor musing at some length upon the apparent affinity between the races. At that point Highland Scots and Maori had been neighbours in the Rangitikei for just over four decades, the systematic colonisation of New Zealand having commenced in late 1839 with the activities of the New Zealand Company, a London-based joint stock enterprise, whose business was the trading of land and the introduction of immigrants. Partly as a result of the venture’s activities, the British government resolved to establish sovereignty over the islands of New Zealand, this objective being validated in 1840 through the Treaty of

3 Brad Patterson, ‘Stirring the Porridge: Turakina and the Study of New Zealand’s Scottish Communities’, unpublished paper, New Zealand Historical Association conference, University of Auckland, November 2005.

4 In addition to the present study, Angela Wanhalla and Tom Brooking have worked on intermarriage in the south of the South Island, while Rosalind McClean is supervising a study of race relations in the Hokianga district at the top of the North Island.

5 Extract from Rangitikei Advocate, cited Bruce Herald, 27 March 1891.

Waitangi, signed between the British Crown and the New Zealand tribes. The Treaty purported to extend equal citizenship to Maori in the new colony, and to guarantee them possession of their lands and resources, which could only be alienated through the Crown. Port Nicholson, or Wellington, at the foot of the North Island, had been selected as the New Zealand Company’s ‘first and principal settlement’, with some 4200 immigrants being introduced between 1840 and 1844. What soon became evident, however, was that it would be quite impossible to accommodate all of the migrants in the vicinity of the first settlement nucleus, this leading to the planning of satellite Company settlements, at Wanganui, around 120 miles to the northwest, and at Manawatu, roughly midway between Wellington and Wanganui. Actually planting settlers at the satellite sites, however, was not without difficulties. The New Zealand Company claimed to have purchased the lands in question from the resident tribes before the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, but this was vigorously disputed and, when unilateral incursions were attempted, armed conflict broke out. It was not until late in the 1840s, and then only with the colonial administration taking the lead, that agreements were negotiated with Maori to yield up land at Wellington and Wanganui, the claim to Manawatu having to be at least temporarily abandoned.

Given the pressure on both the Company and the Crown Colony administration to secure land for the introduced settlers, it was probably inevitable that Pakeha (European) eyes would soon fall on what were viewed as near empty lands lying between the disputed Manawatu and Wanganui blocks, the Rangitikei-Turakina district. Bounded to the south and north by the valleys of the Rangitikei and Turakina rivers, there were large tracts of flattish land in the district, with swamp and sand hills predominating towards the coast, while further inland there were low rolling hills. While there were isolated dense forest stands, the dominant vegetation cover was scrub, tree ferns and
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flax. Regardless of wishful settler thinking, however, the land between the two rivers was far from uninhabited. Indeed it constituted a major part of the tribal area (or rohe) of Ngati Apa, a tribal grouping of relatively recent origin. Estimates suggest that in the 1840s around 300 Ngati Apa were located in the district, scattered in fortified settlement or pa, three of them in close proximity to the Turakina river valley, the focus of the present investigation. Prior to the 1820s these people had been a loose grouping, linked to adjacent tribes and sub-tribes, but an aggressive push south in that decade by tribes from the north of the island, armed with muskets, in particular Ngati Raukawa, Ngati Toa and Te Atiawa, radically changed the situation. These incursions were not just random raids, such being commonplace, but a sustained bid by the intruders to secure new lands and resources. Eventually, after extended skirmishing, an accommodation with the newcomers was reached, but nervousness undoubtedly fostered solidarity amongst the long-standing occupiers of the district. Ngati Apa received de facto recognition of its new status when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed by three local chiefs at the mouth of the Rangitikei River in May 1840. The more than symbolic importance of this was to become fully apparent when the dispute over the adjacent Wanganui purchase was finally settled in 1848. Although not directly involved in the conflict, Ngati Apa’s interests were recognised, ‘all the lands between the rivers Turakina and Wangaehu’ being set aside as ‘a place for all the members of the Ngatiapa [sic] tribe to collect and settle on’. It was the forerunner of an even more significant transaction.

In May 1849, after further negotiations, the Crown purchased almost the whole of the 225,000 acre Rangitikei-Turakina block for £2,500 (around 2.6d per acre). While the apparent inequity of this transaction is evident to modern eyes, what is striking is that at the time it was unquestionably a case of eager buyers and willing sellers. For the Crown, it was an opportunity to quiet the clamours of purchasers from the New Zealand Company, many of whom
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had been waiting nearly a decade for delivery of purchased lands; for Ngati Apa, willingness to sell was spurred by a belief that the permanent presence of Europeans would guarantee their longer term security. Two individuals bestrode the transaction. On the Crown side, the official delegated to negotiate the purchase, Donald McLean, born on Tiree in 1820, initiated the first significant Highlander/Ngati Apa links. He was to become almost certainly the most influential of all nineteenth-century New Zealand civil servants. A fluent Maori speaker, well versed in Maori custom, he already had a track record, having been responsible for the resolution of the Wanganui dispute. Although McLean never actually took up residence in the district, he was to maintain a keen interest in the affairs of both Ngati Apa and the settlers until his death in 1876, corresponding regularly with both, ever ready to help resolve misunderstandings. For Ngati Apa, the lead figure was Aperahama Tipae. As far as can be established, at this date Aperahama was already near fifty years of age. He had thus experienced, at first hand, the traumas of the northern invasion and, despite a close family tie with Ngati Raukawa, retained deep suspicion of their inclinations. Recourse to McLean’s extant contemporary correspondence suggests that Aperahama had been urging purchase of the Rangitikei-Turakina lands from at least late 1847. In September 1848 he wrote somewhat impatiently to McLean: ‘You are holding the prize in your hand. Will you not quickly arrange the matter’. He was even more insistent a few weeks later: ‘Let it come soonest … so that there would be many Pakeha [Europeans] for me. Lots to cover my land’. McLean’s instructions had been to ‘reserve such tracts for the natives as they may now or at a further time require’, but he chose to interpret this rather narrowly. Arguing that the 30,000 acre tract previously set aside across
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the Turakina River as part of the Wanganui block settlement was ample, he restricted the reserves to 900 acres at Turakina and 1600 at Parewanui in the south, both sites of major pa, also setting aside a number of smaller lots such as traditional burial grounds.\(^{23}\) With the way now clear, in early 1850 the New Zealand Company announced that lands purchased on its behalf at Rangitikei-Turakina were open for selection by holders of land orders and compensation scrip.\(^{24}\) Keen interest was exhibited by past purchasers at both Wellington and Wanganui, and especially prominent amongst the early takers was a group of Scottish settlers, almost exclusively Highlanders, who had embarked for New Zealand on the *Blenheim* at Greenock in August 1840. Numbering around 200, most had been recruited at Fort William by Donald MacDonald, a senior Invernessshire official commissioned by the New Zealand Company to lead the party.\(^{25}\) Arriving in December 1840, they received the unhappy intelligence that their Wanganui lands were unavailable and likely to remain so for some time. Consequently, for most of the 1840s they formed what was termed ‘the Scots settlement’, at Kaiwarra, on the northern outskirts of the infant town of Wellington.\(^{26}\) Although certainly some of the younger members of the community sought to improve their lot by moving elsewhere, the group remained remarkably cohesive until the death of MacDonald in early 1849, at which point the bonds began to weaken. News that land was now available at Turakina therefore came at precisely the right time. With selections made off maps in the Wellington Land Office, a series of foot treks up the West Coast beaches ensued, and by mid-1850 a number of Highland families had taken up land at the northern end of the block.\(^{27}\)

The identity of the first Scottish settler in the lower reaches of the Turakina River valley need not detain us, but there were a number of Cameron families, Grants, Fraser, McKenzies, McQuarries, MacDonalds and MacFarlanes.\(^{28}\)
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Turakina became the settlement nucleus for the whole of the block, a number of families stopping there briefly before taking up lands further to the south.\textsuperscript{29} The first years were hard: crude huts had to be built; lands had to be cleared and burned off; grain had then to be sown in the ashes and chipped in. In all of these activities the settlers’ Maori neighbours lent a hand, the newcomers being actively welcomed, guided and supported. A child at the time, Eliza Rockel later recorded her fond impressions of ‘these restless and incredible people who [were] never still’.\textsuperscript{30} What must be noted, however, is that for most of the Highlanders these were not their first encounters with Maori, many who had lived at Kaiwarra, with a pa hard adjacent, having already come to know Maori ways, and firm friendships had developed. Rockel further notes that at Turakina Maori frequently had meals at their house and moved freely in and out of the dwellings, while there were occasional return visits to Maori homes.\textsuperscript{31} To be sure, there were sometimes misunderstandings, she writes, but generally these were overcome by mutual goodwill. By 1858 a ribbon of village, backed by developing farms, had emerged along what was already known as the Great North Western Road. At this point the European population was 168, around 789 acres had been fenced, there were 84 acres in wheat and 85 in oats, while 2825 sheep and 1550 cattle were being grazed.\textsuperscript{32} Alongside, Ngati Apa were themselves switching to farming on European lines.

In contrast to this apparent harmony, elsewhere in the North Island the 1860s opened with interracial tension, tension destined to soon morph into hitherto unprecedented armed conflict.\textsuperscript{33} The epicentre was further to the north, in the Province of Taranaki, and once more the conflict was over the acquisition of Maori land. The first shots were fired in March 1860, and within three months there were rumours of a pending attack on Wanganui, the panic inevitably spreading the few miles south to Turakina, bringing calls to establish a local force of volunteers.\textsuperscript{34} To help allay fears, Aperahama Tipae convened
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a meeting at Turakina pa, which was attended by Ngati Apa from throughout the block and Wanganui, support for the settlers being unanimously pledged.  

From early 1861 to 1863 an uneasy truce prevailed on the North Island’s western coast, but in May of the latter year fighting again broke out in Taranaki, soon spreading to the Waikato and other upper North Island districts. This time the threat was far more real. In response, the settlers established a company of Turakina Rifle Volunteers, contributed to the Rangitikei Cavalry and set about erecting a redoubt on the perhaps aptly named Cemetery Hill, near the centre of the village. The alarm became even more acute in 1864, when conflict actually reached the northern outskirts of the town of Wanganui, but at Turakina the entente remained. Significantly, following a public meeting held in Turakina in May 1864, the Wellington Independent reported that Aperahama Tipae, ‘the principal Turakina Chief’, had ‘expressed himself in a more loyal manner than ever he had before’. Very soon after it was reported in the same newspaper that Ngati Apa had expressed their ‘readiness to do any amount of fighting for the Queen … (on the understanding) … the Government would supply edibles, wearables, arms and ammunition’.

While the offer was no doubt appreciated, it is likely other reasons also influenced the apparent Ngati Apa willingness to take up arms. Tensions between the Rangitikei Maori and the tribes further to the south had again built up, the dispute this time being over the adjacent Rangitikei-Manawatu block. When the Rangitikei-Turakina block had been sold in 1849, opponents of the sale (in particular Ngati Raukawa and Ngati Toa) had been adamant that no further acreage south of the Rangitikei River would be alienated, irrespective of Crown wishes or further Ngati Apa claims. Yet there was never much prospect this would be accepted by a colonial government eager to acquire the land, or by Ngati Apa, determined to uphold ‘rights’. The upshot was squabbling for more than a decade, the tribes being on the brink of their own private war by 1863, the flashpoint being the distribution of returns from renting lands in the retained block to European squatters. It was in this heated atmosphere
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that Ngati Apa unilaterally offered their interests in the Rangitikei-Manawatu block to the Crown.\textsuperscript{40} Taking this unilateral step was one thing, securing the consent of the other tribes was quite a different matter. It took a further three years, with violence a constant prospect, to persuade all concerned to meet together at Parewanui in December 1866 to finalize terms. The occasion has been described in detail by an unexpected attendee, Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, the English Liberal and reformist politician, in his \textit{Greater Britain}, first published 1868. His description of the Ngati Apa, prominent amongst the ‘thousand kilted Maoris … [clad in] brilliant tartans and scarlet cloth’ is especially appealing.\textsuperscript{41} Despite the vigour of the proceedings, which extended over several days, there was little prospect of a degeneration into combat. ‘We had previously been told’, Dilke recorded, that ‘the Maoris never fight upon a sudden quarrel: war is with them a solemn act, entered upon only after much deliberation’.\textsuperscript{42} However reluctantly on the part of Ngati Raukawa, the assembly concluded with a decision to sell, a further 220,000 acres passing to the Crown for a consideration of £25,000 (£15,000 to Ngati Apa, £10,000 to Ngati Raukawa).\textsuperscript{43} The roughly 2/6 per acre was at least an advance on the 1849 rate.

There was to be only one further scare in the course of the 1860s. By early 1868 most thought the hostilities were over, but this illusion was to be dispelled by what was termed the Titokowaru outbreak, fighting once more stretching down towards Wanganui.\textsuperscript{44} When rumours of a war party approaching the settlement from inland began to circulate, Turakina was again ‘thrown into a state of painful excitement’.\textsuperscript{45} Once more Ngati Apa stood alongside their pakeha neighbours. In the words of Kawana Hunia, described as having ‘the appearance of a great Highland Chieftain’: ‘We will remain on the side of the Europeans, whatever the consequences … we will live with the white people and die in their defence’.\textsuperscript{46} Fortunately, there was to be no need for Ngati Apa to make that sacrifice. By March 1869 the war on the West Coast of the North Island was at an end and, despite the traumas, by the close of
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the 1860s Turakina was seemingly facing a bright future. Whereas settlements further to the north had felt the full destructive force of the fighting, Turakina was physically unscathed. Indeed it had actually benefitted from the unsettled times, serving as a centre for rest and recreation when 2,000 Imperial troops were stationed in Wanganui, while detachments of Armed Constabulary had also been periodically stationed in the settlement.

As early as 1867 the *Wellington Independent* was impelled to observe that what had been a quiet and rather primitive little village in the 1850s was fast becoming a bustling township: ‘the grating of the saw and the tap of the hammer everywhere indicates the rapid progress of the settlement’.

Buildings and businesses were springing up on all sides. Turakina was viewed as a clear leader over Marton and Bulls further south in the block, and for more than two further decades this district ascendancy continued. By the mid-1870s Turakina accommodated three hotels, a boarding house, three grocers, three butchers, a shoemaker, two bakeries, two blacksmiths, two saddlers, two saleyards, a courthouse, a police station and three churches.

It serviced a growing European population of around 600, while the Maori population still hovered around 300. Moreover, the adjacent countryside had assumed a more developed appearance, with neat fields, the roads bounded by sod banks topped by gorse hedges. There could be ‘no snugger locality in which to live’, wrote one visitor. ‘Here a man could be extremely happy were he the possessor of a good-tempered thrifty wife and a clutch of a dozen children’. And, at least on the surface, it was not only the Highlanders and their families who were doing well. In May 1876, Resident Magistrate James Booth reported that during the preceding year ‘the Natives have grown larger grain crops than I have noticed for many years past. They are also improving their stock … Many of them own small flocks of sheep, and at every village may be seen ploughs, harrows, carts etc … They seem on the whole, to be prosperous and contented’.

In the following year Booth’s successor, Robert Ward, ventured that ‘the natives at Turakina have some of the finest grazing farms in the district’. Most now lived in European-type dwellings, while strong drink had been banned from
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the villages. In marked contrast to the tribes to the north and south, their numbers were actually increasing.

A constant theme from contemporary observers was the apparent harmony between the races at Turakina, the settlement being advanced as a model for other districts, with the close affinity between Ngati Apa and the Highland settlers especially noted. Yet, while there was certainly a propensity for the former to adopt European ways, the cultural traffic was by no means always one way. The case of Alexander MacDonald evidences the degree of respect that existed between the Scots and their Maori neighbours. Born in the Highlands, the son of Donald MacDonald, leader of the Blenheim migrants, he was just twelve years of age when he arrived in New Zealand. As a youth Alex struck up friendships at Kaiwarra pa, becoming fluent in language and steeped in Maori customs, which was to stand him in good stead. As he was to later write, in his experience ‘Highlanders who have learnt to speak the Maori tongue can enter into the feeling of a Maori … better than most Europeans’. While post-1850 MacDonald was to lead a peripatetic life, variously making his home at Wanganui, Rangitikei and Manawatu, the fact that he married a Turakina Cameron effectively anchored him to that settlement. What sets MacDonald apart from most of his fellow Scots settlers is that he left extended manuscript reminiscences, and the passages therein may be taken as indicative of mindsets. The Maori, he argued, were a strong, brave and honourable people. Anticipating arguments that were to be advanced more than a hundred years later, he made a strong case that the Treaty of Waitangi had never been honoured. Maori had been guaranteed possession of their lands, which could only be alienated through fair and honest purchase. This, he stated, had never been the case, and land had been the catalyst for most of the hostilities in the colony, something that Scots were well placed to understand. Unusually, MacDonald was prepared to act in conformity with his beliefs, a willingness clear from his involvement in the aftermath of the Manawatu-Rangitikei purchase. At that point a government-appointed Sheep Inspector, he was approached in 1867 by a group of Maori (‘as honest and straightforward people as God’s sun shone on’) whose claims to reserve lands...
in the sold block were being ignored by the Crown.\textsuperscript{56} For a half dozen years MacDonald variously appeared for them before the Native Land Court and paid for their representation before higher tribunals, in the process being dismissed from his public employment. When all legal efforts failed, he adopted a more direct approach. Destroying survey stations on the disputed land, an earlier protest, was small beer, but when the Crown sought to legitimise the passage of coach traffic across the block he brought the situation to a head by shooting the leading horse of the first team to attempt to cross.\textsuperscript{57} Arrested and tried, he was sentenced to three years penal servitude. MacDonald went to jail with his resources exhausted, his family near destitute, and, as might be expected in a close Highland community, family and neighbours rallied round. But the most touching gesture was the transfer by Maori of around 800 acres from their remaining lands to his wife and family, together with a sum of money for their support raised through mortgage.\textsuperscript{58}

It would probably be too much to suggest such strong bonds, such mutual support, were the norm in Turakina, but there is sufficient evidence to indicate sturdy and wide ranging interracial links. At Turakina, as in Scotland, church and school were bound together, the Highlanders in the main being Free Church of Scotland folk who clung strongly to their non-conformist faith.\textsuperscript{59} Initially their spiritual needs were attended to by itinerant clergy, but it should not surprise that within a half dozen years a church and manse had been erected and a resident Presbyterian minister secured.\textsuperscript{60} It is surely significant that while Catholic and Church of England churches were subsequently built, in 1868 and 1883 respectively, at no point in the nineteenth century was there a resident priest or vicar. At Turakina the Free Church ethos prevailed, and successive ministers were the guardians, none more so than the Rev. John Ross, a Caithness man, who served the parish from 1871 to 1903.\textsuperscript{61} A distinguished graduate of the University of Edinburgh, his influence was evident in regular services in Gaelic, stress on the importance of education, and a commitment to the temperance movement. A sign of
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his stature is that in 1881, notwithstanding his backblocks domicile, Ross was elected Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. Amongst Maori, however, the Presbyterians were slower in establishing a pastoral foothold. Indeed the Church of England, through what it termed its Native Missionaries, held greater sway in the 1850s and 1860s, and it was not until the 1870s, then conceivably at the instigation of Ross, that the Presbyterian missions adopted a more proactive approach. While there were itinerant Presbyterian missioners from the 1850s, it was not until 1889 that a full-time Presbyterian missioner took up residence at Turakina pa. What is without question, however, is that, regardless of denomination, Turakina acquired a reputation as a God-fearing settlement, and the preoccupations tended to be the same for both races.

Schooling was slower getting under way. Through the 1850s attendance was fee-paying and voluntary, a disincentive in an establishing settlement, and by 1861 the Turakina Common School, one of several in the first decade, still catered for no more than 25 pupils. But the numbers grew when the Wellington Education Board assumed responsibility in 1865, with the roll climbing to around 100 in the ensuing decade. Little attention was initially given to the provision of schooling for Maori children. Several high-born individuals were sent to an Anglican Church School in Wanganui, but it was not until the mid-1870s that a school for Maori, associated with the Presbyterian Church, opened. In 1877 an Inspector noted that some 20 pupils were enrolled in the Native School, that considerable progress was being made, and that it was ‘a source of pleasure to hear them singing Sankey’s hymns’. Yet the Native School lasted little longer than four years, children from both races then combining in one school for the first time. In 1881, fourteen Maori children were attending the government school, their diligence was described as ‘unbounded’, and they were said to have a ‘lively sense of discipline’. A common member of the various school boards, the Rev. Ross was instrumental in offering a combined educational stream, but his influence extended well beyond the primary institutions. It was through his initiative that a secondary boarding school was founded in Turakina in 1878, at first co-educational, but
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soon evolving into a ‘Ladies Classical School’.\(^{68}\) In the latter guise it attracted boarders from across the North Island, winning a high reputation. At the same time the Rev. Ross operated what amounted to a \textit{de facto} theological college at Turakina, offering tuition to candidates for the Presbyteritarian ministry before they completed their studies at the Theological Hall in Dunedin.\(^{69}\) Despite its modest size, Turakina was a hub of North Island Presbyteritarian activity.

The seemingly free mingling of the races was also evident in a number of leisure activities. A prime example was Maori involvement in the annual Turakina Caledonian Games, first placed on an organised basis in 1864.\(^{70}\) Maori, predictably, lacked the training to participate in the piping and dancing competitions, but they soon made themselves felt in the athletics contests. In the second year the games were held, the field events were won by recent migrant William Ritchie, but the \textit{New Zealand Spectator} noted, with surprise, that he had been pushed hard by a half-caste, James Rutherford, who had also featured in the jumps.\(^{71}\) A Maori identified only as Blackie had won the 600 yard flat race. Such results were far from uncommon. Young Maori did especially well in the running events, while in the late 1870s Colin, surname unstated, but also a Maori, won distinction in the caber tossing.\(^{72}\) This pattern continued in the 1880s, with greater emphasis being placed on athletics than traditional Highland competitions. By this point, despite the disapproval of some settlement leaders, Maori and Pakeha were jointly indulging in a new passion: horse racing. The unsettling character of what was generally hailed as ‘the fête day of Turakina’, was observed both by Rev. Ross and the teacher at the Native School, but to little avail.\(^{73}\) Race meetings had been held earlier in adjoining settlements, but the first in Turakina was in March 1878.\(^{74}\) Although at every meeting there was a race for horses owned, trained and ridden by Maori (the Ngawiriki Stakes), generally for a purse of twenty sovereigns, Maori horses competed freely throughout the race cards. In 1884, for example, Maori-owned horses placed second in the Handicap Hurdles, first and second in the Maiden Plate, third in the District Handicap.\(^{75}\) The meetings remained a highlight of the Turakina year until the first decade of the twentieth century.
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century. Mixed rugby football also became a Turakina feature in the 1880s. Clubs had been formed in Wanganui in 1872 and further south in Marton and Bulls in 1876, with Turakina being considered a handy intermediate point for matches.\footnote{\textit{Wanganui Herald}, 28 August 1876, 8 September 1876.} Indications are that a Turakina club was formed several years later, but it was not until the mid-1880s that the local team participated in regular competitions, principally with teams from the Wanganui district and Fielding. Nevertheless, the Saturday matches soon became considerable local events, great interest being exhibited by both communities. In July 1890 a visitor from Wanganui noted, if somewhat sniffily, ‘the ground being crowded, the native element predominating, as the Maoris… rolled up to see their dusky brethren play’.\footnote{\textit{Wanganui Chronicle}, 9 July 1890.} He was even more surprised that ‘several of the Maoris played without boots’. What puzzled him was how they ‘managed to kick the ball with their bare feet’, and the way in which they ‘rushed into the scrums quite regardless of their nude understandings’. Whatever, Turakina triumphed on the day, by 6 points to 2. After the game was over, a haka was danced and all adjourned to the Ben Nevis Hotel.

On the evidence advanced so far, it might be suggested that, after the traumas of the 1860s, in this one New Zealand settlement there was a certain complementarity of economic endeavour between the Highland settlers and Ngati Apa (even if the resources were far from equally shared). Equally, there was shared religious commitment and appreciation of the value of education, and there was ready social mixing and joint pursuit of at least some avenues of leisure. What, then, of more intimate relations? What, for instance, was the incidence of intermarriage between settlers and Maori at Turakina? It must be conceded at once that properly answering these questions will require a great deal more research, in particular a careful study of extant marriage registers that have yet to be accessed.\footnote{I am grateful to Gerard Horn for information as to the possible location of registers for the Turakina district.} For the moment, all that can be offered are first impressions, based on anecdotal evidence and isolated newspaper reports. A knowledgeable local historian, a descendant of one of the original Highland families and the holder of a degree in history, strongly suggests that scarcely one of those families was devoid of a Ngati Apa connection, whether through marriage or less formalised congress.\footnote{Pers. com. Bruce Cameron, 10 July 2006.} A current Ngati Apa kaumatua (or Elder) endorses this proposition: at Turakina, he states, a close-knit and
racially intermingled community developed. In his words: ‘We formed in our own minds a whanau (or extended family) of Turakina – a whanau of Maori, Scots and some other settlers’. Mute evidence of this sits on Cemetery Hill, overlooking the village, the site of the 1860s redoubt. There, on a thin scatter of stones, Maori Christian names offer prima facie confirmation of the closeness of family links. If further be needed, in the mainly European hilltop cemetery eight Ngati Apa kaumatua rest alongside their Scots contemporaries, testimony to mutual respect and friendship.

It may well seem that the account of Highlander-Ngati Apa interactions that has been presented is an almost idyllic one. Further, if the reconstruction be accurate, the harmony and special character of the settlement would ideally have been carried through well into the twentieth century. Sadly, this was not the case, or only to a limited degree. As early as 1914 it was possible for James Glenny Wilson, native of Howick, Roxburghshire, a migrant to New Zealand in 1873, subsequently a substantial landowner in the south of the Rangitikei-Turakina block, to lament that Turakina had largely lost its Highland flavour. Turakina will never have the same fascination for me’, he wrote in his now classic memoir Early Rangitikei. ‘The old people are all being replaced by ordinary Colonists’. The early settlement leaders had almost all passed on; no longer were every day conversations in Gaelic the norm; the hold of the church was weakening; scions of the settler families were increasingly making their lives elsewhere. But it was not just the Highland flavour that was disappearing. Ironically, the Maori presence in the immediate vicinity of the settlement was also greatly reduced. The 1907 Stout-Ngata Commission, investigating Maori land tenure, might well praise the standard of Maori farming in the district, but the numbers so engaged were relatively few. The Turakina Maori were by now largely confined to remnants of their reserved lands. To all intents dispossessed, Ngati Apa were becoming invisible in their own rohe, young Maori steadily drifting away to low status jobs in other districts.

It might be argued that this blurring of ethnic origins was a natural outcome of the passing of the first and second contact generations, and this no doubt was a major contributing factor, but there were other underlying forces
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82 J. G. Wilson, Early Rangitikei, 115.
83 Wanganui Herald, 26 March 1907.
at work. For a start, the advent of the railway in 1877, linking Turakina first to Wanganui, then to settlements further south, ultimately to Wellington, the colonial capital, undoubtedly reduced its distinctiveness. Turakina was no longer a destination, more a place to be passed through. Further, while locals initially anticipated that rail access would provide a boost to the township and environs, this proved not to be the case. Symptomatic of the misplaced confidence was the surveying out for sale of 140 residential sections in the vicinity of the railway stations by local landowner George Yates Lethbridge. Two decades later most remained unsold. Mr Lethbridge’s speculative actions nevertheless highlight a phenomenon which hitherto has largely gone unrecognised, the passing of more and more Turakina land into fewer hands as the late nineteenth century decades passed. As early as 1876 the Wanganui Herald railed against land monopoly, the activities of those it termed ‘the great land gourmands’. As in the old country, sheep were taking the place of human beings, thereby stunting the growth of the district. Any who doubted this were invited to ‘traverse the main road from Turakina to Bulls … [for up to seven miles], see on one side of the road the absence of homesteads, … [and then] … realise the fact that upwards of 30,000 acres belong to one great monopolist’. This estate, Heaton Park, was the property of leading Wellington merchant Capt. W. B. (Barney) Rhodes, a Lincolnshire man, one of the richest men in the southern North Island, arguably in the colony, a classic absentee landlord. Heaton Park had been meticulously assembled over a quarter century through compensation grants, Crown purchases and aggressive acquisitions from earlier selectors. Heaton Park ran from the main road line to the coast. To the north of the road George Yates Lethbridge was in the process of pulling together a comparable, if less consolidated, estate. A Devonshire man who had made his fortune supplying Imperial troops in Taranaki in the early 1860s, he secured his first foothold through the purchase of 2000 acre Ann Bank from James Wilson in 1867. Unlike Rhodes, Lethbridge was a resident, and he set about establishing himself as the squire of Turakina (it was
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84 Evening Post, 18 May 1877; David B. Leitch, Railways of New Zealand (Newton Abbot, 1972), 46–7.
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89 See obituary Wanganui Chronicle, 25 September 1894.
no coincidence that the Turakina Highway Board soon became the Lethbridge Highway Board). By 1892 he and his sons held 13,000 acres in the district, as well as extensive holdings elsewhere. Collectively, critics charged, these landowners exerted a ‘withering and blighting influence’ on Turakina. Original smaller landholders were hemmed in, then squeezed out. With no room for settlement expansion, family members were forced to try their luck elsewhere. The large pastoral estates effectively precluded subdivision for closer settlement, at least until the spread of dairying in the early twentieth century made it profitable. And there was another consideration; properties such as those held by Rhodes and Lethbridge almost constituted village settlements in their own right, and there was a propensity for the landowners to seek cheap outside labour. ‘Turakina … was originally, we believe, a Scotch settlement’, commented an 1883 traveller, ‘we should almost say the Hibernian element is now predominant’.

The pressure on Turakina land also had another destabilising effect. Under the Native Lands Acts 1862 and 1865, the reserve lands earlier set aside for Maori were steadily whittled away. To the mid-1860s these totalled some 30,000 acres between the Turakina and Wangaehu Rivers, and a further 3,000 acres within the Turakina-Rangitikei block itself. With only a portion of those lands in cultivation at any one time, there was an initial willingness on the part of Ngati Apa to negotiate leases for some of the acreage with settlers, an arrangement that was seen to be mutually advantageous. In July 1869 it was stated that almost £4,000 annually was being paid to Turakina’s Maori landlords. Yet it was always likely the fortunate leaseholders, in particular the major district landowners, would ultimately seek a more secure form of tenure, and the Native Land Acts, with subsequent amending legislation, provided the means. When first surveyed out, the reserves were held under customary tenure, that is, they were vested in the tribe. The 1860s Native Lands Acts, and subsequent amending legislation, however, sought the individualisation of title after hearings in the Native Lands Court, but there was little dissent

90 Further Report by the Commissioner of the Land and Income Tax Department, 16 September 1892, AJHR 1892, B20A, Table 5; see also ‘Lethbridge and Sons’ in The Cyclopaedia of New Zealand, Vol. 1, Wellington Provincial District (Wellington, 1897), 1338–9.
91 Feilding Star, 9 June 1883.
93 Wellington Independent, 1 January 1869.
when ‘ownership’ was reposed in tribal leaders.\footnote{Wellington Independent, 24 July 1869.} The problems arose when kaumatua, including it must be said, Aperahama Tipae and Kawana Hunia, agreed to sell lands that were essentially held in trust. Attempts to block the sales in the 1880s and 1890s by dissident tribal members proved fruitless.\footnote{Wanganui Herald, 9 August 1887, 6 December 1888.} By 1907 no more than a few thousand acres remained in Ngati Apa hands.

On the eve of World War One, James Glenny Wilson, now comfortably ensconced on his Bulls property, considered Turakina to be ‘a very picturesque village, with many beautiful trees and neat hedges’,\footnote{J. G. Wilson, Early Rangitikei, 114.} but it was a settlement which had regressed as the more southerly townships of Marton and Bulls had forged ahead. In his view, Turakina was likely to drift further into comfortable obscurity, becoming indistinguishable from most other small New Zealand rural settlements. Yet closer examination suggests there were to be several important ongoing legacies from the mid- and late-nineteenth century encounter years. For a time Turakina continued to be a centre of Presbyterian education. With the retirement of the Rev. John Ross in 1903, the Turakina Ladies Classical School closed. This loss, however, offered an opportunity. Supported by Ross, the Rev. H. J. Fletcher, Maori Missioner at Turakina, proposed the opening at the manse of a secondary school for Maori girls, who would be trained in the Christian faith and homecrafts as well as being given a general education.\footnote{M. W. Wilson, Story of a Country Parish, 53–6; Otago Witness, 25 November 1903.} Launched with thirty pupils in April 1905 by Prime Minister Richard Seddon, the Turakina Maori Girls School soon acquired a colony-wide reputation,\footnote{Wanganui Herald, 6 July 1907; Evening Post, 26 March 1910.} and was to be a feature of Turakina life for a further twenty-three years before, despite strong opposition, its relocation to Marton, still as the Turakina Maori Girls College. Conceivably also influenced by the deep religious feeling fostered in the district, the Ratana movement took root just across the Turakina River in the 1920s.\footnote{Keith Newman, Ratana Revisited: An Unfinished Legacy (Auckland, 2006).} Born near Bulls in 1873, Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana, a Maori farmer, experienced a vision in 1918 in which the Holy Spirit instructed him to preach the gospel to Maori people. Celebrated as a faith healer, he initiated a sweeping religious revival in the 1920s, his New Zealand wide adherents numbering nearly 12,000 by 1926. In consequence, a makeshift village on the Ratana farm speedily metamorphosed into a modern township, up to 600 being in residence at any one time. By the 1930s the religious dimension was matched by a pan-tribal political initiative,
Ratana candidates, in alliance with the New Zealand Labour Party, taking all four Maori seats then available in the New Zealand Parliament. Ratana was to remain a force until the present day. Meanwhile, Turakina’s Highland heritage was kept alive, if sometimes fitfully, by the Turakina Caledonian Society.\(^{100}\) Inevitably, the membership, largely drawn from the early settler families, attenuated, the Society’s most significant contribution being the annual staging of the Highland Games, a proud boast being that the Games went ahead notwithstanding war, depressions or adverse climatic conditions. Even so, attendances shrank and the gatherings came to bear little resemblance to those of earlier years.

How, then, to conclude? What I have presented is no more than a vignette, a case-study of one set of Highland-Maori encounters. What the evidence does suggest is that both major race relations interpretations so far advanced by New Zealand historians are a little too simplistic to satisfactorily encompass the situation. The first, which held sway until the 1970s, and is still embraced by some, stressed that, certainly in comparison with other former settler colonies, race relations in New Zealand were relatively benign and beneficial.\(^{101}\) The second, which has gathered strength in recent years, emphasises the adverse impacts of colonisation on Maori, wilful dispossession and cultural genocide.\(^{102}\) Arguably, the Turakina experience falls between the two. Yet even this conclusion must be considered interim. The study to date has been essentially based on European (settler) sources, on printed and manuscript records. To be fully balanced, Ngati Apa tribal traditions, oral history, must also be taken into account. This will be the next step in the investigation.

A modern-day footnote is in order. Under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 Maori tribal groups may seek redress for historical actions and omissions by the Crown deemed to have breached promises made in the 1840 Treaty. With the great majority of Ngati Apa now living outside the tribal area, the tribal Council (Te Runanga o Ngati Apa) has sought compensation for the historical loss of around 500,000 acres, as well as recognition of significant cultural sites. After extended negotiations, a draft agreement between Ngata Apa and the Crown was signed in October 2008, with a bill to be placed before the New
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102 For instances see essays in Giselle Byrnes (ed.), The New Oxford History of New Zealand (South Melbourne, 2009).

103 A draft of the Ngati Apa (North Island) Claims Settlement Bill is available from the New Zealand Parliamentary Counsel’s Office website [URL http://www.legislation.govt.nz]. See also Ngati Apa’s Tribal Council website [URL http://www.ngatiapa.iwi.nz].
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On the morning of 25 January 2008, New Zealanders awoke to news of renewed conflict in Northern Ireland. What made this story somewhat different from other tales from the troubled province, however, was that the conflict in question was over a statue of a New Zealand Prime Minister: William Massey. According to the news stories, the nationalist-dominated council in Massey’s birthplace of Limavady, County Derry, was proposing to remove the statue of Massey from its position outside the council building. The reason for the proposal to remove the statue, along with other items with royal or military connections, was that Massey had been a member of the Orange Order. His statue could, therefore, be seen as sectarian.¹

The prevailing tone of the coverage in New Zealand was one of amusement, mixed with condescension. On Radio New Zealand’s ‘Morning Report’, presenter Sean Plunkett suggested to a Limavady Sinn Féin councillor that the dispute would do nothing to change New Zealanders’ perceptions of the Irish as people who love a good fight.² Political historian Michael Bassett declared that ‘You’d have thought a little town in [Northern] Ireland would be rather proud that one of their people went off to New Zealand and became Prime Minister … [I]f multicultural politics involves destroying the history of a place, well then it has no future’.³ The New Zealand Herald editorialised under the heading ‘Healing rifts won’t start with removing statues’: ‘Massey’s career provides a valuable lesson for those trying to heal the wounds of decades of sectarian strife … When accused of being a sectarian, he once famously replied: “I am Prime Minister, and my duties as Prime Minister come first.” That’s not a bad lesson for the councillors of Limavady to learn and a good reason for
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³ Houlahan, ‘Irish target NZ PM’s statue’.
them to keep the Massey statue as a reminder.\(^4\) National Party Member of Parliament Paul Hutchison, whose Hunua electorate covers Massey’s former electorate of Franklin, wrote to the Limavady council offering (probably tongue in cheek) to take the statue off their hands: ‘I’m sure the offer will weigh heavily on their minds’, he remarked.\(^5\) When news of the story’s coverage in New Zealand made its way back to Northern Ireland, Limavady mayor Edwin Stevenson declared himself saddened and embarrassed by coverage of the dispute halfway around the world. ‘[T]he people of New Zealand are amused that trivial things such as mugs and statues are making serious news coverage over here’, he said. ‘I personally find it sad that Limavady Borough Council is dragging itself through the mud’.\(^6\)

This article sets out the background to the conflict over the Massey statue in Limavady itself, and situates the dispute in the wider context of debates about symbols and public space in Northern Ireland. It argues that it is not helpful to simply dismiss such debates as trivial. Symbols are important in Northern Ireland, and can be extremely divisive, as the controversy in which the Massey statue featured shows. It is precisely for this reason that communities in Northern Ireland are recognising the need to search for new strategies for dealing with symbols in public spaces.

**Commemorating Massey’s Ulster origins**

William Ferguson Massey was born in Limavady in 1856.\(^7\) He arrived in New Zealand in 1870, following his family who had left Ireland in the previous year. He farmed in the Auckland region before entering Parliament in 1894,
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\(^5\) Paul Hutchison to the Councillors, Limavady Council, 12 February 2008; ‘MP offers to solve an Irish problem’, 26 February 2008 (New Zealand Press Association story). Copies of the letter and news story were kindly provided by Dr Hutchison’s office.


and was Prime Minister of New Zealand from 1912 until his death in 1925. Massey returned twice to Limavady during his term as Prime Minister, while on official tours of Ulster in 1916 and 1923. His connection with Northern Ireland was officially commemorated before he died when, in 1925, the avenue leading to the Northern Ireland Parliament at Stormont was named Massey Avenue in his honour. During a tour of New Zealand in 1929–30, Northern Ireland Prime Minister Lord Craigavon said that the road had been named after Massey because he was ‘the greatest living Ulsterman of his day’. When Massey died, Craigavon made a statement in the Northern Ireland Parliament in which he referred to Massey as ‘one of our most distinguished sons in any part of the globe’. He continued: ‘Our Province may be proud of those it has sent forth to all corners to uphold British traditions, and in that long roll of names none stands more honoured in our hearts than that of the late Prime Minister of New Zealand’.

Despite this recognition of Massey during his life and immediately after his death, there seems to have been little attempt to commemorate him in Northern Ireland until relatively recent times. In Limavady itself there is a Massey Avenue (which, perhaps significantly, intersects with Protestant Street); one of the first post-war housing estates was named after him; and a plaque was put up at the location of his family home. It was not until 1995, however, that a statue of Massey was erected in the town. The statue, which stands outside the offices of the Limavady Borough Council, was the work of Belfast-born sculptor Philip Flanagan, and was funded by the Limavady Borough Council and the Arts Council of Northern Ireland. The project to
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9 Massey’s 1923 visit to Northern Ireland is discussed in Keith Jeffery, ‘Distance and Proximity in Service to the Empire: Ulster and New Zealand between the Wars’, Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 36 (2008), 460–2; his visit to Limavady is specifically discussed at 461.


erect the statue had been initiated by the former mayor, Ian Grant of the Ulster Unionist Party, but by the time the statue was unveiled Barry Doherty of the nationalist Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP) was mayor. Speaking at the unveiling, which was performed by the New Zealand High Commissioner, Mayor Doherty ‘said that it was fitting that they should erect a statue in memory of one of their most illustrious sons’. It seems, then, that there was at least a degree of cross-party and cross-community support for the erection of the statue.

In the first decade of this century, Massey’s memory in Northern Ireland appears to have been claimed more assertively by the Orange Order. The extent to which Massey engaged in sectarian politics in New Zealand has been the subject of some debate, but there is little dispute about the fact that he was a member of the Orange Order in New Zealand. Between 2003 and 2006, a Massey Festival was organised in Limavady by the Limavady District Orange Lodge. In 2003 the festival lasted for two weeks and included a display on Massey’s life, the dedication of a plaque honouring Massey at the entrance to the lodge, and the placing of an orange sash on the Massey statue during the Orange Order’s 12th of July parade. Interestingly, the festival received funding from the Limavady Borough Council and in 2004, despite one SDLP councillor’s concerns about the festival committee being


14 Bruce Farland, Farmer Bill: William Ferguson Massey and the Reform Party (Lower Hutt, 2008), 16, 18–19; Patrick Coleman, ‘Who Wants to be a Grand Master? Grand Masters of the Orange Lodge of the Middle Island of New Zealand’ in Brad Patterson and Kathryn Patterson (eds), Ireland and the Irish Antipodes: One World or Worlds Apart? (Spit Junction, 2010), 96. Farland notes that Massey’s descendants do not believe that he was an Orangeman, but Coleman, who has researched the history of Orangeism in New Zealand, writes that ‘Massey was definitely a Grand Master’ of the Loyal Orange Institution.

controlled by the Orange Order, funding was approved with the support of a Sinn Féin councillor. In 2006, the 150th anniversary of Massey’s birth, the Massey Festival Committee planned to commemorate Massey throughout the year. Following the Limavady statue controversy, and perhaps as a result of it, Massey was included as one of the ‘Heroes from History’ in the Orange Order’s 2009 calendar (based on an exhibition that ran at the Order’s Belfast headquarters). The Orange Order’s director of services, David Hume, said of Massey and the other ‘heroes’: ‘we believe that the Orange Order was at the heart of what motivated them’.

The development of Limavady’s ‘neutral public space’ policy

The origins of the controversy over the Massey statue do not, however, lie with the statue itself. Instead, it was part of a wider dispute about emblems and commemorative items on Limavady Borough Council property.

Limavady town, where the statue is located, is predominantly Protestant and unionist, but the Limavady Borough Council area has a Catholic and nationalist majority. The town has acquired a reputation as a centre of conservative Protestantism and Orangeism, and in the early 1980s it gained some notoriety when a Presbyterian minister in the town was forced out of his church for being too friendly with the priest of the Catholic church across the
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16 Minutes of the Leisure Services Committee, Limavady Borough Council, 12 May 2004. Three nationalist councillors voted against funding the festival, while two abstained. All minutes and other Council documents cited in this article are available on the website www.limavady.gov.uk.


18 ‘Heroes of Orange Order to feature on new calendar’, Belfast Newsletter, 15 October 2008, http://www.newsletter.co.uk/news/Heroes-of-Orange-Order-to.4591338.jp, accessed 7 January 2010. Massey has also been claimed as a ‘Great Ulster-Scot’ in a pamphlet produced by the Ulster-Scots Agency: Great Ulster-Scots: People and Events in History: William Ferguson Massey – Prime Minister of New Zealand 1912 – 1925 (Belfast, undated). While not so obviously sectarian as the attempt to claim Massey for Orangeism, this also has the effect of claiming Massey for the Protestant tradition, since the Ulster-Scots language and culture movement is associated with that tradition.

19 In the 2001 census, 56 per cent of the population of Limavady Borough Council area said they were Catholic by background, and in the 2005 local government elections, 54.5 per cent of the vote went to nationalist parties: Limavady Borough Council, Equality Impact Assessment: Policy on Neutral Public Space (2007), 11 (hereafter ELA: Neutral Public Space).
However, the demographics of the wider Council district have changed in recent decades, with the proportion of Catholics in the district’s population increasing. Although Limavady Borough Council was formerly unionist-controlled, nationalists have had a majority on the Council since 1993. The Council is made up of fifteen councillors. Since the 2005 local government elections, nine of the councillors have been nationalist and six unionist. Of the nationalist councillors, six are from the republican party Sinn Féin.

In 2003–4, Sinn Féin councillors successfully campaigned to change the Council’s policy with regard to the flying of flags from Council buildings, from a policy of flying the Union Jack on certain specified days to one of flying no flags at any time. It appears that, in bringing up the issue of emblems and memorabilia on Council property, Sinn Féin councillors saw themselves as continuing their campaign to create a neutral environment. At a Council meeting in August 2005, Sinn Féin councillor Paddy Butcher proposed a motion calling for the Council to remove all British military memorabilia from the Council offices, in keeping with the Council’s ‘policy of [having] a neutral building and not fostering division’. Unionists on the Council strongly opposed the motion, calling it sectarian, divisive, and another attack on unionists’ British identity. In reply, a Sinn Féin councillor said that there was very little in the Council that reflected his culture or identity and that ideally the council would accept symbols of everyone’s culture, but since this was not going to happen a policy of neutrality was the best solution. In the end, an amended motion was passed affirming the Council’s commitment to equality, and agreeing to the establishment of an all-party Working Group to consider whether the Council’s policy in relation to symbols should be one of neutrality or of parity between the symbols of the different communities. Unionist councillors voted against the motion.
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23 See the comments of Sinn Féin councillor Marion Donaghy: ‘The emblems project was really the second half of the game … The final score is two-nil for equality and mutual respect for each other’s culture’. ‘Limavady Council adopts neutral public space policy’, *Northern Constitution*, 6 July 2007, 4, on file in ‘Buildings—Limavady’ clippings file, Limavady Public Library.
24 Minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Committee, Limavady Borough Council, 17 August 2005. The minutes record only a 9–6 vote, but that split makes it clear that voting went along nationalist-unionist lines.
The Working Group was duly established, and proposed what became known as the ‘neutral public space’ policy: ‘That the public areas within the Council Offices building and grounds be maintained as a neutral environment with regard to how they reflect religious or political opinion’. The Council accepted this as a policy in principle in 2006, and also accepted a recommendation that the draft policy be screened for consistency with the Council’s obligations under section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.\(^\text{25}\) This section requires public authorities (including local councils) to have regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity between various specified groups, and the desirability of promoting good relations ‘between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group’.\(^\text{26}\) Like other bodies in Northern Ireland, councils also have obligations as employers to promote equality of opportunity. According to the Fair Employment Code of Practice, this obligation includes promoting a harmonious working environment by, for example, prohibiting ‘the display of flags, emblems, posters, [or] graffiti … which are likely to give offence or cause apprehension among particular groups of employees’.\(^\text{27}\)

An Equality Impact Assessment of the proposed neutral public space policy was undertaken. It considered the possible differential effects on the Protestant/unionist and Catholic/nationalist communities of the Council’s policy on the display of emblems, and whether the policy could create a ‘chill factor’ that could inhibit some people in their dealings with the Council.\(^\text{28}\) As part of the assessment, a concerted attempt was made to consult with the community and with Council employees, but the response was very poor. Only a few written submissions were received, and no members of the public turned up to meetings organised to discuss the issue.\(^\text{29}\) It is hard to know what to make of the lack of response to the consultation. Given that the proposed policy had originated with concerns about items associated with the unionist tradition, it may be that most nationalists were happy enough with the policy but did not feel strongly about it, while unionists were unhappy but felt they

\(^{25}\) _EIA: Neutral Public Space_, 8–9.

\(^{26}\) See Good Relations Associates, _Embedding Good Relations in Local Government: Challenges and Opportunities_ (Belfast, 2007).


\(^{28}\) _EIA: Neutral Public Space_, 10, 18–19.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 23–7.
could have no influence on the nationalist-dominated Council.

After considering various alternative policies the Council could adopt, the Steering Group for the Equality Impact Assessment concluded that the proposed neutral public space policy would help to produce a more harmonious working environment by reducing the potential for conflict over symbols, but that it would probably have an adverse impact on the Protestant/unionist community, as most of the contentious items on display in the Council offices would be from that tradition. The Steering Group recommended an extended neutral public space policy which would apply to all Council-owned and -managed buildings and facilities. It was felt that this approach would help to minimise the impression that the policy was directed against the Protestant/unionist symbols located in the Council offices and grounds. In June 2007 the Council approved the extended neutral public space policy, and agreed to set up a cross-party forum to consider implementation of the policy. Implementation issues would include questions of definition: what constitutes a ‘neutral space’, and how were objects to be judged as to whether they were contentious or not?30

The Neutral Public Space Forum was to consist of three nationalist and two unionist councillors, reflecting the composition of the Council, with an independent chair. However, unionist councillors refused to take their allocated places, arguing that the Forum should have equal representation of nationalists and unionists. Nonetheless, the Forum went on to draw up a list of items that were inconsistent with the neutral public space policy, and it is at this point that the Massey statue enters the picture. The list included the Massey statue, a Union Jack flag in the Mayor’s Parlour, a Charles and Diana mug presented by the Royal Irish Rangers, and various other commemorative items associated with the British Army. The only item on the list that was associated with the Catholic/nationalist tradition was a memorial to a republican hunger striker; all of the other items could be seen as being more associated with the Protestant/unionist tradition. The Forum recommended that items on the list could be offered to a ‘like-minded organisation’ or a museum, returned to the donor, put into storage or relocated to an appropriate site.31

The Forum’s report to the Council meeting in January 2008 led to a heated debate. Unionist councillors complained that the Forum had been made up entirely of nationalists; noted that some items on the list were historically significant, and that Catholics had also served in the British Army so some

30 Ibid., 19–22, 28–32.
31 Minutes of Limavady Borough Council meeting, 22 January 2008.
items were cross-community; and observed that there had been no complaints about the items on the list from either the public or Council staff. Nationalist councillors stated that unionist members had been invited several times to join the Forum; that there was no desire to take away anyone’s culture or history, but rather to ensure that all those working in or visiting Council buildings felt comfortable; that items on the list would be viewed in a better light in a museum, together with other artefacts; and that the ideal situation would be one of inclusion rather than exclusion, with both traditions being fairly represented. The meeting eventually voted to put adoption of the Forum report on hold in an attempt to find common ground. At the time of writing, some two years later, it appears that no further progress has been made.

When the list of items for possible removal was reported in the media, unionists reacted with anger to what they saw as an attack on their tradition. A loyalist crowd gathered outside the Council meeting at which the neutral public space policy was being discussed, and nationalist councillors were abused as they left the building. Subsequently, a petition opposing the removal of the contentious items was signed by more than 1000 people.

Mayor Edwin Stevenson said that a number of items on the list for possible removal were ‘quite historical and it would be a shame to see them go’. Referring specifically to the Massey statue, the unionist Member of Parliament for the area said ‘We should be celebrating history and not trying to re-write it’. The question of what to do about items that were of historical interest,


35 Weir, “Contentious” symbols row; Dempster, ‘Plan to purge town of Protestant symbolism’. 

but were associated with a particular religious or political tradition, was one that the Steering Group for the Council’s Equality Impact Assessment had recognised as raising particular difficulties. They were aware that in Northern Ireland historical items could ‘be symbolic or iconic for only one section of the community and could be considered to provide a “chill factor” for the other’.36

The Massey statue was mentioned frequently in coverage of the dispute, and its inclusion on the list was a particular focus for unionist outrage. Among other things, unionists were concerned about how talk of removing the statue would look to tourists from New Zealand.37 The Massey statue is listed among sites for New Zealanders to visit in Ireland, and Massey features in the Limavady Visitor Guide, albeit in the section on ‘Folklore, Myth and Legend’.38 Unionist councillor George Robinson claimed that the statue was a big tourist attraction: ‘I have met relatives of Mr Massey who have visited Limavady just to see the statue’.39

There was some disagreement about how well-known Massey is in Limavady itself. It was claimed that the councillors who drew up the list of contentious items had to do an internet search to decide whether Massey was contentious or not, and Mayor Stevenson said ‘the question I am most often asked about [the statue] is “who’s he”? He can’t be that contentious’. On the other hand, Councillor Robinson claimed that Massey was ‘a man held in very high esteem’. The statue, according to Robinson, was ‘a tribute to one of the town’s most famous and successful sons’.40 Certainly Robinson himself was aware of Massey and of his identity as an Orangeman, as he had opened the Massey Festival in 2003 at the Limavady Orange Hall, where the District Lodge had prepared ‘a display on the life and times of Bro. William Ferguson Massey’.41 It was during this same Massey Festival that an Orange sash was placed on the Massey statue on 12 July, a point specifically mentioned by nationalist councillors during the Council debate on the Neutral Public Space Forum report.42

36 EIA: Neutral Public Space, 22.
37 Minutes of Limavady Borough Council meeting, 22 January 2008.
40 Weir, ““Contentious” symbols row”; McKevitt, ‘Limavady row causes Kiwi storm’; Dempster, ‘Plan to purge town of Protestant symbolism’.
41 ‘Successful Massey Festival at Limavady’.
42 Minutes of Limavady Borough Council meeting, 22 January 2008: points raised by
Symbols and public space in Northern Ireland

The Limavady dispute is part of a wider pattern of controversy over symbols in public places in Northern Ireland. There is a long history in Ireland, and particularly in Northern Ireland, of using flags, banners, memorials, parades, and other commemorative and symbolic practices to claim territory, intimidate or antagonise. More recently, however, the Northern Ireland ‘peace process’ has led to recognition of the need to find new ways of dealing with conflict over symbolic questions. The Good Friday Agreement, endorsed by voters in both parts of Ireland in 1998 as a framework for resolution of the Northern Ireland conflict, explicitly recognises the sensitivity of the public use of symbols. It talks of the need, in creating new institutions, ‘to ensure that such symbols and emblems are used in a manner which promotes mutual respect rather than division’. The people of Northern Ireland are still working through what this means in practice, and much of this work is happening at the local level.

In a society like Northern Ireland, where territory is contested and communities are still segregated to a remarkable degree, the creation of truly public space is one of the major challenges for the future. Without spaces in which people from different communities (including new migrant communities as well as the more established Catholic and Protestant communities) can meet and mix without feeling alienated or intimidated, it is hard to see how a more harmonious and integrated society can develop. In 2005 the Northern Ireland Government released its framework for good relations in Northern Ireland, entitled A Shared Future. This document

nationalist members included ‘Massey statue had been misused when the Sash or other garments were draped over it’.


recognises the importance of ‘reclaiming shared space’ by ensuring that city and town centres are ‘safe and welcoming places for all’. As part of this aim, the Government proposes action to remove or control unofficial flags and emblems that are used to mark territories, exclude and intimidate.\footnote{Northern Ireland Government, \textit{A Shared Future: Policy and Strategic Framework for Good Relations in Northern Ireland} (Belfast, 2005), 19–22.} There will be significant challenges for the Government, councils and communities in implementing this strategy, but it is undoubtedly an important part of creating public spaces that are open to all.

This still leaves the question of what to do about civic spaces like council buildings, and the use of symbols in and around them. Civic spaces are part of the wider public space, but they also occupy a special position. They are supposed to represent the community as a whole, and there is a particular obligation to ensure that they are inclusive and accessible so that everyone feels able to participate in decision-making and to access public services. Is it necessary, then, for such spaces to be ‘neutral’, in the words of the Limavady Council policy, and for all emblems that might be associated with a particular political or religious tradition to be removed? Or is it better to think in terms of ‘shared’ spaces? In theory at least, a shared space in which everyone can feel included and represented sounds more inviting than a neutral space from which all potentially contentious emblems have been banished. When Belfast City Council considered its approach to memorabilia in the City Hall it recognised that it would not be helpful to simply remove some or all of the items on display on the grounds that they were predominantly associated with the Protestant/unionist tradition. Instead, it asked an advisory panel of experts to report on how to achieve a more balanced and inclusive display, and the panel’s recommendations were approved by the Council.\footnote{Belfast City Council, \textit{Good Relations Strategy} (Belfast, 2003), 40–1; minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee, Belfast City Council, 21 February 2003. For more recent decisions on the implementation of the policy, see minutes of the Memorabilia Working Group, Belfast City Council, 15 September 2009; minutes of the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee, Belfast City Council, 18 September 2009; minutes of the Belfast City Council, 1 December 2009.} In its 2007 \textit{Good Relations Plan}, the Belfast City Council talks of opening up the City Hall for use by all communities, and seeking to transform cultural symbols ‘from seeming apparently “threatening” to “interesting” examples of a city with diverse cultures’.\footnote{Belfast City Council, \textit{Good Relations Plan} (Belfast, 2007), 12.}

Of course, such aspirations are easily stated, less easily achieved. The past decade has seen remarkable changes in Northern Ireland, and the challenge
now is to build on the historic political settlement by moving towards a society that is inclusive, tolerant and pluralistic, one in which people can express their differences without promoting division and discord. This means there must be dialogue about questions of symbolism and use of public space. There is no doubt that such issues will remain divisive for some time to come, and will be used by political parties to gain political capital, but they cannot be ignored or treated as a diversion from ‘real’ politics. Symbolism is inseparable from politics, and particularly from the politics of nation and community: it is through symbols that we imagine ethnic and national communities. Through dialogue about symbols, then, it may be possible to build more inclusive communities, though the difficulty of doing so should not be underestimated.

The decision of the Northern Ireland Executive to amalgamate councils as part of a reorganisation of local government means that questions of symbolism and public space may be revisited by new councils. The local government reorganisation could be an opportunity for a new start in thinking about how to create shared public space in Northern Ireland. It is also possible, however, as a committee that was part of the local government reform process noted, that discussion of symbolic issues ‘could result in meltdown’ of the new councils.

At the time of writing the local government reform programme is in limbo, and will not proceed in 2011 as originally planned, but some kind of local government reform still seems likely. It was proposed that Limavady would form part of the new Causeway Coast and Glens District Council. This district would be likely to have a unionist majority, so if amalgamation goes ahead the new council may overturn Limavady’s neutral public space policy. At the same time, the main offices of the new council might well be located somewhere other than Limavady, leaving the Massey statue standing outside what might be only a satellite office.


49 Report back from Governance Sub-Group, recorded in minutes of Local Government Taskforce Working Group, 4 July 2006, 4.


The building of a new civic centre in Limavady, which will include the tourist information bureau currently housed in the Council offices, is also likely to diminish the importance of the building outside which the Massey statue stands. The William Massey Centre was not among the names shortlisted for the new centre, which will instead be called the Roe Valley Arts and Cultural Centre.\(^5\) While Massey was suggested as a name for one of the rooms or spaces within the centre, this name was not one of those finally chosen by the Council.\(^6\) Despite all the controversy in 2008, however, the Massey statue still stands in Limavady, and there seems to be no suggestion now that it will be removed.

It remains to be seen whether communities in Northern Ireland can find ways of working together to create a ‘more inclusive symbolic landscape’,\(^7\) a landscape in which different identities are recognised by allowing space for a multiplicity of symbols and narratives. William Massey’s statue should be able to find a place in such a landscape, but this may require seeing him as more than simply an Orangeman or even an ‘illustrious son’ of Limavady. Recognising that Massey was a contradictory figure, one who was shaped by the prejudices of his background but was also pragmatic enough to look beyond them when necessary, may be more valuable for Limavady and Northern Ireland generally than celebrating, denigrating or ignoring his memory.

---

\(^5\) Minutes of Limavady Borough Council meetings, 14 January 2010 and 2 February 2010.

\(^6\) Minutes of Development Services Committee, Limavady Borough Council, 13 April 2010 and 29 June 2010.

\(^7\) Marc Howard Ross, *Cultural Contestation in Ethnic Conflict* (Cambridge, 2007), 324–5; see also Marc Howard Ross (ed.), *Culture and Belonging in Divided Societies: Contestation and Symbolic Landscapes* (Philadelphia, 2009).
‘In habits, in character, in fact [in] everything except language … like the Norwegians’:¹
New Zealand’s Shetland Immigrants
Rebecca Lenihan

Arriving at the Shetland Family History Society in Lerwick in November 2007, the last thing I expected was that almost everyone met would claim a personal connection to New Zealand. Evidence that a large number of Shetlanders had left the Islands for New Zealand in the later nineteenth century was the reason for my being there, but that these migrants were still remembered by the descendants of those who remained behind was striking, and certainly not a phenomenon encountered elsewhere in Scotland. While it is likely this was partly due to the small population of Shetland relative to the rest of Scotland, it became clear that it was also an indication of the maintenance of relationships with those who had left the islands for New Zealand, and of a persisting Shetland identity among the migrants post-migration. If the degree to which connections with ‘home’ were maintained set the Shetlanders apart from other Scots, it was not the only point of difference; New Zealand’s Shetland immigrants also differed from their Scottish counterparts in terms of the timing of their departures, their demographic characteristics and their occupations. The present paper outlines some of the findings of a recent study of the quantifiable characteristics of the Shetland migrants to New Zealand, and explores aspects of this discrete migrant flow.²

Brief background and overview to Shetland migration

If ‘Scottish’ is defined in a strict and purely cultural sense, it might fairly be argued that Shetland is Nordic, or at best ‘Shetlandic’. The Shetland Islands belonged to Denmark and Norway until 1469, in which year King Christian pledged first the royal estates in Orkney, then those in Shetland, to the Scottish

¹ Robert Stout to Colonial Secretary, 18 September 1871, IM 6–10–1, Stewart Island, Archives New Zealand (hereafter ANZ), Wellington, 1.
Crown as a dowry for his daughter upon her marriage to James the Third of Scotland. Notwithstanding the several hundred years in which the islands have been in Scottish hands, language and cultural differences arising from this Nordic heritage have been maintained, in large part due to the geographical distance of the islands from mainland Scotland and the consequent relative isolation of Shetland from ‘Scottish’ language and culture.

The distinctive character of the Shetland Islanders has been significantly shaped by another geographical factor, the fact that the islands have never been well suited to farming. While crofts have traditionally provided just enough food for individual family needs, there has been little scope for additional income to be made from the land. Instead, the traditional mainstay of many Shetland families has been fishing. Indeed, ‘the lottery-like gains of a fisherman’s occupation’ are noted in the Statistical Account of Scotland (1845) as one of the reasons for the ‘versatile and sanguine’ character of the Shetland people, ‘more apt for desultory and adventurous, than for regular and continued exertion’.3

Dependence on the sea for their livelihood meant that Shetland men were frequently absent from the home for long periods of time; moreover, many of those who earned their living at sea also died there. The high death toll at sea arguably helps explain why the Shetland population was disproportionately female in the nineteenth century, and also why there was a high proportion of unmarried and widowed women. Preparedness to seek employment elsewhere was another reason for the gender imbalance. The Statistical Account of Scotland observes that the attachment of Shetland males ‘to country is not very strong, an effect which may, in some measure, arise from the love of a wandering life, induced by sailor habits, and which so many of the young men imbibe, by going annually in the whalers to Greenland’.4 The Statistical Account further records that because Shetlanders ‘make good sailors, and their practice at the oar is as near to perfection as this elegant exercise can approach…most of the men that leave Shetland enter the merchant navy, and few eventually are heard of’.5 Shetlanders, in common with their Scottish mainland contemporaries, were migrating to England, Europe, and North America in relatively large numbers from the seventeenth century. Shetland emigrants, as well as their Orcadian counterparts, were frequently employed

4 Ibid., 159.
5 Ibid., 155–6.
by the Hudson Bay Company from the eighteenth century. Shetlanders were among the small number of Scots transported to Australia as convicts, while in 1850, in an attempt to address the gender imbalance in Shetland, Lady Franklin and her associates in Lerwick sought to assist young Shetland women to emigrate to Australia.  

Though there were a few Shetlanders among the early whalers and sealers to New Zealand, and several Shetland folk settled on Stewart Island and in Dunedin in the 1860s, the primary Shetland-New Zealand flow began in the 1870s. The population of Shetland had reached its peak of 31,670 people in 1861. Even at this point, however, Shetland accounted for only 1.03 per cent of the total population of Scotland. For this reason, the Shetland Islands supplied a similarly small proportion of New Zealand’s Scottish immigrants over the eighty years to 1920, just 1.9 per cent of migrants in the New Zealand Society of Genealogists (NZSG) dataset and 3.58 per cent of the Peopling New Zealand (PNZ) migrants. These figures raise two important questions. Firstly, given that the distribution of Scottish migrant origins among those arriving in New Zealand between 1840–1920 from nearly every part of mainland Scotland was proportionate to the population distribution of Scotland itself, why was the proportion of Shetland immigrants to New Zealand higher than the county’s share of the Scottish population? Secondly, why is the proportion of Shetland migrants in the PNZ data compared to the whole sample considerably higher than is the case with the NZSG data?

The proportion of Scottish migrants to New Zealand from Shetland ranged between 0 and 2 per cent in all but one decade between 1840–1920 in the NZSG data, and between 3 and 6 per cent of the migrants in the PNZ data. However, in the 1870s the proportions for Shetland were 6 and 10 per cent respectively. The number of Shetland migrants bound for New Zealand in this decade alone accounts for the proportion of Shetland migrants to New Zealand being higher than the county’s share of the Scottish population over

---


7 For information on the construction of the two datasets utilised—the ‘PNZ dataset’, a random sample of post-1876 New Zealand death certificates created for the New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage’s ‘Peopling of New Zealand’ project—and the ‘NZSG dataset’, a self-selected sample created by the present author, based upon the New Zealand Society of Genealogists Scottish Interest Group’s ‘Register of New Zealand Immigrants of Scottish Birth arriving before 1 January 1921’, see Lenihan, ‘From Alba to Aotearoa’, Appendix 1.
the full eighty years of the study. The most detailed prior investigation of New Zealand’s Shetland migrants suggests that approximately 1,200 Shetlanders arrived in New Zealand in the 1870s. This outflow of migrants equates to 15 per cent of Shetland’s net population decrease between 1861 and 1881 and 3.8 per cent of Shetland’s total 1861 population migrating to New Zealand in the 1870s.

The variation between the NZSG and PNZ datasets is explained by the criteria adopted for selection of migrants in the two samples. While the compilers of the PNZ data identified all Shetland-born migrants as Scots, most descendants of Shetland migrants living in New Zealand continue to assert their Nordic heritage. This assertion of cultural difference is clearly evidenced by the longevity of the Wellington Shetland Society, formed in 1922. Until the eve of World War Two the society had little to do with Scottish societies, preferring to celebrate a Norse identity over Scottish background. Even today relatively few descendants of Shetland migrants consider their forebears to have been ‘Scottish’. With the NZSG sample being based upon on a register of ‘Immigrants of Scottish Birth’, it is possible more descendants of Shetland migrants may have contributed information if the register had been entitled ‘Immigrants to New Zealand born in Scotland—including Shetland’.

The surge of Shetland immigration to New Zealand in the 1870s was influenced by factors at both the sending and receiving ends of the flows, primarily clearance in the islands and New Zealand Government’s assisted migration schemes respectively. Though Shetland had not been exempt from the widespread evictions throughout the Scottish north in the first half of the nineteenth century, this process of removal accelerated in the islands from the late 1860s. In 1874 twenty-seven families were evicted from Quendale, Dunrossness, their houses being stripped and sometimes burned by those officiating to prevent future habitation. Though in his evidence to the 1883 Napier Commission James Garriock of Reawick noted that

---

8 Susan Butterworth, *Chips off the Auld Rock: Shetlanders in New Zealand* (Wellington, 1997), 64.
9 Ibid., 136
10 However, it must be noted, the outflow from Shetland was generally high at this time, due to a longer standing problem of over-population and consequent unemployment in the islands. J. Laughton Johnston’s forthcoming book notes similar flows to that received by New Zealand in the 1870s arriving in Vancouver especially but also other parts of Canada, the United States and Australia throughout the 1860s, 70s and 80s.
the approximately twenty families from Walls who had emigrated to New Zealand had done so of their own accord, it is clear, given the context of the testimony, that they were compelled to leave by the actions of their landlord.\textsuperscript{12} Though Garriock does not state precisely when the migration of the twenty families occurred, it was almost certainly between 1874 and 1876, for it was in these years that Shetland–New Zealand migration peaked. For over two years ‘the islands were stumped by emigration agents from New Zealand, and a great many people were induced to take advantage of the assisted passages, and went out to that colony’.\textsuperscript{13}

Under the assisted immigration schemes of the 1870s, the New Zealand Government offered not only passage to New Zealand, but also the cost of transportation to the port of embarkation. This was an important consideration, as many would-be Shetland emigrants were hindered by the truck system (a barter system) prevalent in the islands from independently making their way to the port of departure to take advantage of other schemes of assisted migration.\textsuperscript{14} Of the various assisted migration schemes devised by the General Government of New Zealand, none was more attractive to Shetland migrants than the policy of free passages introduced in October 1873. Under this policy passages were offered to both married and single agricultural labourers, navvies, shepherds and mechanics, and to single women who were cooks, housemaids, nurses, general servants or dairy maids, all between fifteen and thirty-five years of age. Migrants were also required to be ‘sober, industrious, of good moral character, of sound mind, free from bodily deformity, in good health and must be going to the colony with the intention to work for wages.’\textsuperscript{15} Yet, even before these free passages were offered, there had been recommendations from several quarters that Shetlanders would be ideal migrants to improve New Zealand’s fishing industry.\textsuperscript{16} In consequence, immigration agents specifically targeted Shetlanders for the first time. The first and perhaps best known group

\textsuperscript{12} James Garriock, ‘Minutes of Evidence, James Garriock, Reawick (49)–examined’, \textit{Napier Commission}, 1883, transcribed by Angus Johnson, Shetland Archives, 22391, 1416.


\textsuperscript{15} Regulations for free passages, \textit{AJHR}, 1874, D–3, 33.

\textsuperscript{16} Colonial Secretary from Robert Stout, 18 September 1871, 1.
specifically recruited for this purpose was a party of thirty-one migrants carried to Stewart Island in June 1873, whose experiences will in due course be discussed.

**Demographic Characteristics and Occupation**

Given the already acknowledged cultural differences between the Shetland Islanders and their Scottish mainland contemporaries, it might reasonably be anticipated that these would also be reflected in the demographic characteristics. The available evidence suggests this was the case.

In 1881 61.34 per cent of the Shetland population was female, compared to 53.27 per cent in Scotland as a whole. Yet, while Shetland consistently had an excess of females in the population greater than the ‘excess’ exhibited by the rest of Scotland, as shown in Table 1, no other county sent a more even number of males and females to New Zealand. Half of the NZSG Shetland migrants were female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Showing the ratio of females to every 100 males in Scotland and in Shetland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census year</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>131.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>111.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Population, Ages, Conjugal Condition, Orphanhood, Birthplaces, Gaelic-speaking, Housing, Scotland, Table 34, 1921 Census of Scotland, 164*

This gender parity among Shetland migrants is most probably due to the family nature of the Shetland migration. A tendency for a large number of the Shetland migrants to come to New Zealand in family groups, nuclear and extended, rather than as single men or women, ensured that the gender ratio was far closer than was the case in respect of those parts of Scotland from which family migration was less common. In addition, the period during which most of the Shetland migrants arrived—the 1870s—was a period of greater gender balance among migrants to New Zealand generally (not only Scots), heavy emphasis having been placed on the recruitment of single females and families.

In terms of the age profile of Shetland migrants, the PNZ and NZSG data samples are too small to facilitate reliable analysis. As Table 2 suggests,
dividing the Shetland sub-sample further into age cohorts creates very small sub-samples, rendering the results potentially misleading. That noted, it may be inferred from Table 2 that, while the majority of Shetland female immigrants to New Zealand were over fifteen years of age, the majority of Shetland males were children at arrival.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Proportion of each age range of Shetland migrants that was female or male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>38.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35</td>
<td>62.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*age is unknown for 4 Shetland females and 10 Shetland males

Source: NZSG data 1840–1920

While 44.46 per cent of females over fifteen years of age across all of Scotland were married, just 33.46 per cent of this group were married in Shetland. Despite the equal gender ratio among Shetland migrants, the NZSG data suggests that in terms of marital status there were not only more single females than males, but also that there were more married females than males. Females constitute 57.89 per cent of Shetland migrants aged over fifteen years who were single at arrival, and 57.69 per cent of married migrants. Table 3 compares these gendered marital status figures for Shetland to those for Scotland as a whole.

17 Appendix Tables, Table LXI, 1881 Census of Scotland, 1.
Table 3
Showing the percentage of the NZSG Shetland migrants of each marital status by gender compared to Scotland total figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shetland</th>
<th>Scotland Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>44.19</td>
<td>55.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>42.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>42.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Marital status is unknown for 6 females and 11 males in the sample
** Marital status is unknown for 287 females and 542 males in the sample

Source: NZSG data 1840–1920

Shetland contributed one of the highest proportions of single females for counties in the NZSG sample for the full eighty years; 34.92 per cent of female migrants from Shetland were single at arrival.18

Table 4
Showing the percentage of the NZSG Shetland migrants of each gender by marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shetland</th>
<th>Scotland Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>30.16</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Marital status is unknown for 6 Shetland females and 11 Shetland males in the sample; unknown for 287 females and 542 males from Scotland in total

Source: NZSG data 1840–1920

Comparing the proportion of migrants from each county of Scotland who were married at arrival, Shetland had the smallest proportions for males and females, just 23.81 per cent of Shetland females and 17.46 per cent of

---

18 Nairn, Clackmannan and Peebles had a higher proportion of single females in their samples, but the samples on which this evidence is based are too small to indicate clear patterns.
Shetland males (see Table 4). The high proportion of single females, also the low proportions of male and female migrants from Shetland who were married, may be explained by the very high proportion of unmarried and widowed women in Shetland, due in part to the high death toll at sea of Shetland men, and the consequent high ratio of females to males in the county (61.34 per cent of the 1881 population). This, together with the familial nature of the Shetland migration to New Zealand, meant that a much higher proportion of the Shetland females than females from the rest of Scotland over fifteen years of age were unmarried and emigrating with their immediate or extended family. They are thus counted as single migrants. Single females constituted 27.72 per cent of the NZSG Shetland migrants. The tendency to migrate in family groups ensured that a large proportion of the Shetland migrants were children—54.18 per cent. This, combined with the high proportion of single females in the migrant cohort, created a proportion of married males and females among the Shetland migrants smaller than from any other county of Scotland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Proportion of Shetland migrant totals employed in each occupation sector in Scotland*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes ‘unknown’, ‘indefinable’ and ‘other’

Source: NZSG data 1840–1920, migrants with only one occupation in Scotland.

Significant differences between the profile of the Shetland migrants and that of migrants from the rest of Scotland are very clear. The proportion of
migrants who had been involved in building and labouring is approximately the same as for the rest of Scotland, but the proportion employed in mining is comparable only with the Western Lowlands. Due to the limited viability of Shetland for farming, the comparatively small number of Shetland migrants with occupations in the agricultural sector recorded pre-migration is unsurprising. However, it is in the ‘transport and commerce’ sector that the main contrast is evident. While less than 5 per cent of migrants from all regions in Scotland, with the exception of the Far North, had been employed in this sector, the Far North recording 11.21 per cent, 30 per cent of Shetland NZSG migrants were from this occupational background.

Of the 126 Shetlanders in the NZSG sample, just sixty-nine were aged sixteen or over at arrival in New Zealand. Forty of these sixty-nine had an occupation listed in Scotland and sixteen of these forty were female. Twenty of the migrants, 50 per cent of this NZSG occupation sub-sample born in Shetland, had a sea-oriented occupation listed among their occupations in Scotland, with only one female. (Table 6.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shetland Occupation</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master Mariner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour Master</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor/Seaman/Ship Builder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ships Carpenter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor/Seaman</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman/Seaman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman &amp; farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Curer*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of whom was female.

Source: NZSG data 1840–1920

While the majority of Scottish migrants remained in the same sectors of work post-migration, this was not so among Shetland migrants. This was
the combined result of the prevalence of fishing and other sea-oriented occupations in Shetland, and the relative scarcity of such employment in New Zealand. While nineteen of the twenty-eight males in the sample were in sea-oriented occupations in Shetland, only four continued to earn their living in this way in New Zealand. In contrast, fourteen of the sixteen female migrants in the sample were employed in the home, in domestic service or in dressmaking in Shetland. All of the women with an occupation recorded in New Zealand were in similar lines of work to those they had followed prior to migration. Due to the size of the sample from which this data is extrapolated, the results from the NZSG Shetland sub-sample may at best be considered suggestive, however they clearly reinforce the differences between the Shetland migrant occupational profile and those of the migrants from the rest of Scotland. Perhaps more than with any other county of origin, it was the nature of the islands they came from that shaped the occupational background differences of the Shetland migrants.

Origins

The small population of Shetland facilitates a clear examination of migrant origins within the boundaries of the county, makes the tracking of migrants and the noting of connections between individuals and groups prior to and after migration a plausible task, and permits a consideration of the importance of travel companions and chains of migration. Caution is nevertheless required when examining migrant origins within county boundaries, since such a study inevitably depends on small sub-samples from which it may be misleading to draw too explicit conclusions. In a sub-sample as small as that for the NZSG Shetland migrants (126 migrants), and from a county in which large families migrating together was the norm, there is little value in statistical analysis at parish level. For example, ten of the migrants in the NZSG Shetland sub-sample belonged to Morgan and Mary Laurenson’s family. Only seven individuals in the sample were born in Northmavine, and they were all children of Morgan and Mary. Only four NZSG migrants were born in Delting, and this included Morgan and two of his children. A more qualitative approach has thus been adopted to investigate Shetland migrant origins, with a separate database being created for that purpose.19

---

19 This Shetland migrant database takes as its core the 126 Shetland-born migrants, with additional Shetland-New Zealand immigrants included based on information from
The 553 individuals in this extended Shetland migrant database belonged to 195 different immediate family groups. Of these, 104 families had five or more people in the family group, while twelve of the families had twelve or more people migrating. While large families migrating to New Zealand together from Scotland was by no means a phenomenon limited to Shetland migrants, there is evidence to suggest that as a proportion of the migrants migrating from the county of origin, immigrants from Shetland were more likely than their counterparts from other parts of Scotland to migrate in large family groups.

Though chains of migration to New Zealand are evident among migrants from elsewhere in Scotland in the NZSG data, these are nowhere more obvious than among the Shetland migrants. Such chains are most apparent in the 1870s, as subsequent migrants, having received news and encouragement from friends or relatives who had migrated earlier in the decade, took advantage of the assisted passages, but chains spanning several decades can also be distinguished. Isabella Robertson, born in Sandness, Walls, appears to have come alone to New Zealand in 1872, as an assisted passenger on the *Christian McAusland*, but within two years her parents and six siblings joined her in Dunedin, having themselves travelled as assisted passengers on the *Invercargill*. Grace Nicolson also came to New Zealand as an assisted passenger on the *Christian McAusland*. Grace’s sister Mary followed two years later, arriving on the *Auckland* in 1875, and their mother migrated that same year. A maternal uncle, William Davidson, joined them in 1876, together with his wife, three children and mother (Grace and Mary’s maternal grandmother). In 1894 the sisters’ youngest brother Samuel migrated, and he was followed eleven years later by their brother William, his wife and their eight children. This migration chain spanned thirty-four years.\(^{20}\) The migration of Williamina Robinson (formerly Fordyce, née Spence), together with her husband and four children in 1860, began a chain of migration that included fourteen members of her extended family and spanned fifty-one years, her grandson Robert Bruce Fordyce arriving in Wellington Harbour in 1911. The three interconnected
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20 Extract of email from cousin Les, William Ogilvy Duthie and Grace Nicolson, family history material Val Petrie.
families of Flaws, Henderson, and Harper/Mouat/Anderson/Priest included more than sixty-four individuals arriving in New Zealand in a chain spanning nearly fifty years beginning in 1874.

An examination of the origins within Shetland of the migrants indicates that there was virtually no part of the islands that did not send migrants to New Zealand; however the island parish of Unst was very clearly the most significant source parish. The extended Harper/Mouat/Anderson/Priest family noted above was a part of a wider chain of migration from Unst to New Zealand. Unst, Scotland’s most northerly island, is about nineteen kilometres long, eight kilometres wide, with an approximate land area of 120 square kilometres. At its maximum population in 1861, the parish of Unst comprised 3,060 people. Between 1871 and 1881 the population decreased by 599—nearly 20 per cent—and much of the decrease was due to emigration.21

Nicol Priest left Unst in 1868 with Magnus and Barclay Mouat, Gilbert Harper, William and Gilbert Anderson and John Johnson, bound for the Australian goldfields. Approximately twelve months later Magnus Mouat and Gilbert Harper made their way to Westport, New Zealand, to try their luck there. In 1870, finding profit in beachcombing for gold, they sent for their companions still in Australia and for friends and relatives in Unst. Gilbert Harper was Nicol Priest’s brother-in-law (the brother of Nicol’s wife Robina), Magnus and Barclay Mouat were Gilbert Harper’s cousins, as were William and Gilbert Anderson, and Magnus Mouat’s brother-in-law was John Johnson, making this ‘exodus’ from Norwick, Unst to New Zealand a distinctly family affair.22 Nicol’s daughter, Nicolson, was born in 1869 and this may have been why his wife Robina did not come with her four other siblings to join her husband and relatives in New Zealand. Nicol Priest was gold mining on Nine-Mile Beach when he died in Nelson in 1873, aged only 37. It was not until 1913 that his daughter Nicolson left Unst for New Zealand with her family. The chain of migration set in motion by these seven men from Norwick included more than thirty migrants.

The Clarence, sailing for Napier, New Zealand, in 1874, carried at least another forty-five migrants from Unst, all recruited by the New Zealand immigration agent Peter Barclay, the majority of whom remained in the

21 Return of population of Scotland at each decennial period, Section III, 1881 Census of Scotland, 39.
22 ‘Some History Notes’, William Robert Henderson and Nicolson Priest, family history material provided to the author by Elizabeth Angus.
Hawkes Bay region. All of the Unst migrants on the Clarence for whom more precise place of origin information has been traced were born and lived within approximately five kilometres of each other in the north of Unst—in Burrafirth, North Dale, Norwick and Skaw. Considering that the population of Unst never exceeded 3,060, together with the close proximity of these families to one another, it seems certain they were at least known to each other before they were recruited by Barclay. Whether the decision to leave was jointly made, or whether the families took advantage of the available passages on the Clarence separately, of their own volition, remains unclear. Given that this was also the area of Unst that the friends and families of Nicol Priest and his companions hailed, it is possible that their example had some influence on the later migration of other Unst families.

Given the Shetland propensity for chain migration and the large number of migrants from Unst arriving in the 1870s, it is not surprising that migrants from Unst continued to flow to New Zealand for many decades afterwards. Though it is possible that migrations of extended family groups, of large sections of communities, of chains spanning up to five decades, may well exist among migrants from other parts of Scotland migrating to New Zealand, such movements appear to have been especially pronounced amongst Shetlanders. Indeed there is no evidence that this degree of cluster migration occurred among other Scots migrants to New Zealand. That it was so evident from Shetland is perhaps attributable to a specific combination of push and pull factors working simultaneously to bring Shetland migrants to New Zealand from the 1860s, but especially during the 1870s. With such a large proportion of the Shetland population coming to New Zealand in that decade, and encountering mostly favourable conditions, those remaining behind inevitably received positive reports of the country from a greater than usual range of personal testimonies, from siblings, cousins, friends and former neighbours. With familial and community support potentially awaiting them in New Zealand, and with assorted schemes of assisted migration to New Zealand available at various times through to the 1960s, there was incentive enough for generations of Shetlanders to prefer New Zealand over other migrant destinations.

---

Barclay had previously recruited approximately seventy migrants from Plockton, Lochalsh, Ross-shire for the Hawkes Bay, in 1871–2. Peter Barclay, ‘Report of Emigration work during the last six months’, 11 June 1872, ACFQ 8226 IM 6/1/1 General 26/03/1873–6/06/1876, ANZ, Wellington. There are migrants from Shetland on the Clarence for whom no parish information has yet been traced. Ninety-six of the passengers on the Clarence were from Shetland.
Patterns of Settlement

Notwithstanding the inclination of Shetland migrants and their descendants to claim their Nordic rather than Scottish heritage, they tended to follow a Scottish pattern of settlement within New Zealand. However, while migrants from elsewhere in Scotland appear to have settled in almost every part of New Zealand, case study evidence suggests that Shetland migrants did not spread throughout the country to the same extent. As with Scots generally, there was a clear preference for the lower South Island as place of New Zealand residence among Shetland migrants: Invercargill, Dunedin and surrounding areas, areas with a relatively high concentration of Scots. Beyond these southern locations, only Auckland City and environs, Hutt County and Hawkes Bay appear to have received significant numbers of Shetland migrants. That the Shetland migrants did not spread so evenly throughout New Zealand is probably attributable to the smaller numbers involved. Were the population of Shetland itself larger, and therefore the actual numbers involved in Shetland-New Zealand migration also larger, it is reasonable to assume that Shetland migrants would also have been distributed throughout New Zealand.

From the 1860s Stewart Island, the most southerly of New Zealand’s three principal islands, attracted independent migrants from Scotland’s most northerly county. Robert Scollay arrived on Stewart Island with his wife and three children in 1861, initially was occupied in sawmilling, later involved in the fishing industry in the area, also running his own schooner on the coast until 1899. James Robertson Thomson, born in Tingwall in 1848, arrived in Port Chalmers on the *Jessie Readman* with his Shetland-born wife Barbara and one-year-old daughter Robina in 1873. He and his family settled on Stewart Island in 1876. Purchasing land there, he farmed, fished and mined, and in 1886 opened the Greenvale Accommodation House at Half Moon Bay.

Beyond such unregulated transfers, Shetland migrants were singled out as ideal for the ‘special settlements’ launched in the 1870s by the New Zealand Government. Conceived as a means of promoting rapid settlement and development, the ‘special settlements’ promoted under the Immigration and Public Works Act 1870, were not the first of their kind in New Zealand.

---

previous group settlements including Waipu, Albertland, Puhoi and military settlements in the Waikato.\textsuperscript{26} As well as promoting infrastructural growth in the regions in which the migrants were located, another purpose of the 1870s ‘special settlement’ scheme was to populate parts of the colony that were relatively remote and generally less attractive.\textsuperscript{27} The first, and perhaps best-known, group of Shetland settlers to be specifically recruited for New Zealand was the group of thirty-one who arrived in June 1873, secured to settle at the Port William special settlement site in Stewart Island.

In late 1871 Robert Stout, a Dunedin lawyer, later Minister of Lands and Immigration, ultimately Premier, himself a Shetland migrant, wrote to the New Zealand Government suggesting that, in light of the recent Government-sponsored recruitment of Scandinavian immigrants, it might perhaps also be inclined to assist the migration of some British migrants who were ‘in habits, in character, in fact [in] everything except language … like the Norwegians’—that is, Shetland migrants, or those from Orkney.\textsuperscript{28} Stout noted that a ‘large number’ of such people, in Shetland especially, were ‘anxious to change their address’ as a result of a recent spate of ‘extensive evictions’.\textsuperscript{29} As well as highlighting their expertise in fishing, an underdeveloped industry in nineteenth-century New Zealand, he assured the Government of the suitability of the migrants, noting particularly the scarcity of liquor in Shetland and the need for only two policemen for a population of 33,000.\textsuperscript{30} Less than a month later Stout was asked for further details and suggestions regarding the prospective migrants. Replying, he outlined the criteria he believed should be addressed if a special settlement of Shetland migrants was to succeed. He placed particular stress on the careful selection of migrants in Shetland, on ensuring at least one boat builder and one blacksmith were among the colonists, with many ‘Jacks-of-all-Trades’ among the rest. Further, he urged that migrants be picked up directly from Lerwick Harbour, thus reducing the cost of the transfer to the migrants themselves and increasing the likelihood that a greater number would apply for passage. In a postscript, Stout emphasised ‘the evil that the barter or as it is called “truck” system has wrought in Shetland’.\textsuperscript{31} Realistically, he outlined the potential problems the migrants would face if settled on Stewart Island.


\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 68.

\textsuperscript{28} Robert Stout to Colonial Secretary, 18 September 1871, 1.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 1.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 2.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 1–3.
as was proposed, noting their lack of experience in clearing bush, there being no ‘timber’ whatsoever in Shetland. Further, they would need provisions for the first two years, and he recommended that some land should be cleared for them in advance of their arrival.\footnote{32}{Ibid., 5–7.}

Stout’s recommendations encouraged the Government to act. In December 1871, responding to a request from the Otago Provincial Superintendent James Macandrew, Walter Pearson, the Commissioner of Crown Lands at Invercargill, submitted a report that comprehensively described Stewart Island and the seemingly endless opportunities it presented to intended colonists.\footnote{33}{W. H. Pearson to Supt Otago, 11 Dec 1871, IM 6–10–1, Stewart Island, ANZ, Wellington. This overblown account of the island lead to later reference to Stewart Island as ‘Pearson’s Paradise.’ Basil Howard, \textit{Rakiura: A History of Stewart Island, New Zealand} (Wellington and Dunedin, 1940), 242.}

Though the existing settlers of Stewart Island had managed to ‘subsist’ on fishing, Pearson noted that they laboured under several disadvantages unlikely to be shared by the Shetland migrants. The Shetland migrants were ‘men whose life training has rendered them adepts at the occupation, masters of the position’ and so ‘the undertaking could be conducted to a most successful issue’.\footnote{34}{Ibid., 10.}

This comment is interesting, given that there were already several Shetland migrants settled on Stewart Island and involved in the fishing industry.\footnote{35}{Butterworth, \textit{Chips off the Auld Rock}, 46–51.}

Pearson believed that, although the curing of fish was still in its infancy in New Zealand, these enterprising and highly skilled colonists would quickly raise it to the level of a great and lucrative industry, supplying product in great quantities to the local (Invercargill and Dunedin) and Australian markets.\footnote{36}{W. H. Pearson to Supt Otago, 11 Dec 1871, 13–17.}

It would not be necessary, however, for the future colonists to confine their attention to fishing. In their spare time they could set their hand to building ‘vessels of any tonnage’, there being ample standing timber on the island to provide raw materials. Those who sought to escape from the sea in their leisure time would find profit in prospecting and mining, or in the loading of Otago wool-ships.\footnote{37}{Ibid., 8, 14, 21–2.}

In fact, Pearson continued:

\begin{quote}
Stewart Island is so singularly favourably situated for the proper class of settlers, that it is difficult to determine what they could not do … While
trawling, if he sees a whale he can, if prepared give chase, and if he gets his monster fish, tow it home and try it out at his leisure: if he loses it, go on trawling; always sure of a return of some sort. He lives in a genial climate, with a means of subsistence, nay wealth at command, and surrounded with such comfort as few of his calling experience, either in the home country or in the bitter winters of Nova Scotia.\(^{38}\) On the back of this most favourable description, Macandrew proposed to settle at least 1,000 migrants on the Island.\(^{39}\)

Not everyone was as easily convinced as Macandrew that the settling of Shetland migrants on Stewart Island would be so effortless or successful. In July 1872 the Resident Minister for the Middle Island, William Pember Reeves, wrote to Macandrew on behalf of the New Zealand Government. He recognised ‘a considerable amount of extra care and assistance’ would be necessary, and asked if the necessary surveys were going to be carried out. Reeves further noted that ‘before undertaking the grave responsibility of introducing population to these settlements, the government would be glad to be definitely informed what steps [Macandrew] propose[d] to take, to supply the various wants of the people, until such time as they can reasonably be expected to provide shelter for themselves and to carve their own living’.\(^{40}\)

Issues raised by the Minister included: the extreme poverty of the migrants the government proposed to recruit; the fact that they would be out of the reach of private employers; that there would be no public works offering supplementary employment nearby; and that the settlers would be highly dependent upon their own efforts. They would not only have to clear their allotted land and build their own houses, they would also have to rapidly begin to make a living, as government provisions were to be allocated for one year only.\(^{41}\) Despite the raising of these concerns, Macandrew persisted with his plans. The recruitment of suitable migrants went ahead, although initially only thirty-one migrants, rather than 1,000, were enticed to the Port William settlement.

The thirty-one who arrived in 1873 comprised six families and three single adults. Twenty-six of the thirty-one settlers almost certainly knew each other
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38 Ibid., 24, 26–7.
40 W. Reeves to Supt Otago, 25 Jul 1872, IM 6–10–1, Stewart Island, ANZ, Wellington.
41 Ibid.
before they departed for New Zealand. Twenty of the twenty-six traceable settlers were from Dunrossness: sixteen were from Scatness, and four from Virkie, and, although the other six settlers are recorded as being in Wilhoul, Sandwick, in the 1871 Census, the mother/wife of this family was the sister of the head of one of the Scatness families. Laurence Garriock and Laurence Young, the two traceable single men, were both boarders with the Mail family of Scatness in 1871. Garriock was the brother of Janet Gilbertson. Eighteen of the twenty-six travelled to New Zealand on the *Euterpe*, the eight members of James Harper’s family following six months later on the *Dover Castle*. The gender split was near even (fifteen males and thirteen females), as was the age distribution (nine males and six females were over fourteen and the oldest adult was just thirty-eight.) ‘Fisherman’ was the recorded occupation of every head of household bar one, James Harper, who worked as a house carpenter in Shetland.

Nevertheless, despite the contingent being an apparently well-mixed and seemingly well-suited group of settlers, there were significant problems from the very beginning, arguably the most considerable being difficulties with fishing. The method of fishing that the Shetlanders had employed successfully at home, set line fishing, was of little use in Foveaux Strait, the settlers reportedly regularly returning to their lines to find that sharks had eaten most of the catch, leaving only heads.42 Moreover, despite there being an abundance of fish when other fishing methods were eventually used, the only means of preservation was time-consuming salting or smoking. Ultimately, the return was not worth the work involved. Some 800 pounds of fish shipped to Melbourne brought just £1 in payment to each of the four men involved, while no payment at all was received for the several boatloads of fish sent to Bluff. Howard notes ‘their attempts to obtain money from their agent [for the boatloads of fish] were fruitless, and the impossibility of dealing with the matter satisfactorily from their isolated village induced them to give up all hope’; fishing was soon abandoned altogether by the group.43

A further pall was cast on the new settlement when Robert Thomson became ill and had to be taken to Invercargill Hospital, where he eventually died. Shortly afterwards Henry Gilbertson ‘suffered a severe tooth abcess [sic] and also had to be transferred to Invercargill hospital’, meaning a population loss to the settlement of seven people within the first few months as families
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42 Olga Sansom, *In the Grip of an Island: Early Stewart Island History* (Invercargill, 1982), 128.
43 Ibid., 128; Howard, *Rakiura*, 249.
followed their men folk to the mainland.\textsuperscript{44} Within fourteen months of arrival every one of the migrants had left the island for the mainland. Though the local press insisted that this was because they were ‘a very lazy lot’, only remaining so long as the government provisions lasted, several houses had been built by the settlers within six months of their arrival.\textsuperscript{45} They had cut the timber themselves, imported doors and sashes from the mainland and, in at least one case, employed a labourer to help with the construction.\textsuperscript{46} Having spent such energy and finances in attempting to settle on the island, it seems unlikely that the migrants would have easily decamped. An account by one of the children in this group captures its mood: ‘The final straw was when my father’s violin gave up singing. It hung on the wall damp and useless like the harp on Tara’s walls. The whole place seemed damp all the time. Severe illness forced one family then another to the mainland. No one felt much like singing any more since the violin had gone dumb’\textsuperscript{47} The extent to which the families stayed in contact with each other after the break up of the settlement is unclear, although it is known that Christina Thomson married one of the single men—Laurence Young—after the death of her husband.\textsuperscript{48}

Three further special settlements, all on the West Coast of the South Island, attracted a number of Shetland migrants. While approximately fifty Shetlanders joined the Karamea settlement, the Jacksons Bay and Martins Bay settlements attracted rather fewer. Martins Bay, formed prior to the passing of the Immigration and Public Works Act 1870, was the first of the settlements mentioned here but remained small due to its isolation—fifty settlers at its peak population in January 1871, and just twenty remaining by 1880. Jacksons Bay, proclaimed a ‘special settlement’ in February 1875, was arguably the most troubled of all, a primary difficulty being the mixed origins of the migrants and the consequent communication difficulties that arose. Settlers hailed from England, Ireland, and Scotland, as well as Germany, Italy, Poland and Scandinavia. From a peak population of 402 in 1878, the settlement had been reduced to just 160 individuals by 1881 and by 1884 only twenty-four families remained. How many were originally from Shetland is unknown.\textsuperscript{49} The anecdote of the Dalziel family, formerly of Shetland, who left the Martins Bay

\textsuperscript{44} Butterworth, \textit{Chips off the Auld Rock}, 70.
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\textsuperscript{47} Laurence Young, Junior, quoted in Sansom, \textit{In the Grip of an Island}, 128.
\textsuperscript{48} Butterworth, \textit{Chips off the Auld Rock}, 70.
\textsuperscript{49} Hargreaves and Hearn, ‘Special Settlements of the South Island New Zealand’, 68–71; Butterworth, \textit{Chips off the Auld Rock}, 76.
settlement for Jacksons Bay in 1878, provides a further example of the New Zealand Shetland community taking care of its own. Jeremiah Dalziel and his son James were among the seven men lost at sea on a trip to Jacksons Bay in June 1878, leaving Mrs Dalziel—the only woman remaining at the Martins Bay settlement—to support her four remaining children. A collection was taken to send the family to Dunedin where they remained, under the care of Robert Stout.\textsuperscript{50}

Whether or not Shetland migrants were more likely than their Scottish mainland counterparts to keep in touch with family and friends at home, thereby encouraging other family and community members to emigrate, merits deeper investigation. Yet, due to the relative ease of tracing Shetland migrants, both pre- and post-emigration, some impression of their activities post-migration is possible. A letter from Nicolson Henderson (nee Priest) to her ‘ever-Dear Cousins’ in 1932 provides evidence that Nicolson kept in touch with her mother’s cousins’ children—who had been born in New Zealand after the migration of their parents in the 1870s—after her own arrival in 1913, writing to them and speaking of a trip she and her husband had been long anticipating to the West Coast to visit them.\textsuperscript{51} This suggests that Nicolson’s mother Robina had kept in contact with her siblings and cousins who departed Shetland for New Zealand in the 1870s though Robina herself remained in Unst.

In a letter home in 1862 Laurence Mathewson wrote that ‘Magnus Williamson’s Son William’ [sic], who he had seen six weeks earlier, was doing very well on the goldfields, indicating that migrants sent home news not only of themselves, their family and friends but also of any other Shetlanders encountered, so that news might be passed on to the relatives of that migrant.\textsuperscript{52} It was also common for wedding and obituary notices involving Shetland migrants to be republished in Shetland newspapers. As examples, the obituary notice of Mrs Jane Fea Spence that appeared in the \textit{Hokianga County Times} on 27 January 1908 was republished in the \textit{Shetland Times} two months later, while that of William Sievwright, previously of Lerwick, was published in the \textit{Shetland Times} in 1909.\textsuperscript{53} On 21 February 1891 the \textit{Shetland News} published

\textsuperscript{50} Butterworth, \textit{Chips off the Auld Rock}, 75–6.
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‘Death of “Bob Sinclair”: A Shetlander’s Strange Adventure’, an article about a Lerwick-born migrant published by the *Taranaki Herald* in December the previous year, which had been sent ‘home’ by a Shetlander in New Zealand.54

Even when Shetland migrants felt New Zealand had become home, and knew that it would be their country of residence for the rest of their lives, Shetland was still ‘home’ too. When William Fraser of Invercargill North wrote ‘home’ to his uncle and aunt in Shetland in February 1923, he wrote that he had just returned home to Invercargill from having returned home to Shetland and noted that some fellow Shetlanders who resided in Masterton were also just returning home from having been home.55 It is suggestive of the enduring bonds that when Shetland migrants in Dunedin heard in 1881 of a fishing disaster in Shetland, in which many Shetlanders lost their lives and property, a subscription list was promptly circulated and every Shetlander in the district was reported to have given to it liberally.56

Maintaining relationships between the migrants and those who remained in Shetland appears to have been important not only to the migrants. The graveyards of Shetland exhibit numerous instances of headstones or memorials to Shetlanders who died in New Zealand, evidence that although the migrants were far from home, family and friends in Shetland considered it important that they be remembered at home after their death. This practice does not appear to have been so common in other parts of Scotland. Only nine monumental inscriptions in the cemeteries of Aberdeen, for example, the county that contributed 7.37 per cent of Scottish migrants to New Zealand, mention a person who had died in New Zealand.57 This is in striking contrast to twenty-five headstones in Shetland, most of which were for whole families, not just one individual. In hindsight, it was not astonishing that everyone I met at the Shetland Family History Society in Lerwick in November 2007 still had personal connections to New Zealand.
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Conclusion

Although it may fairly be said that Shetland was an aberrant part of Scotland and the Shetland Islander migrant experience peculiar among Scots, Shetland was not a nation within a nation and Stout’s 1871 pronouncement that the Shetland immigrants were ‘in habits, in character, in fact [in] everything except language … like the Norwegians’ was clearly overstating his case. New Zealand’s Shetland migrants were rather more like their fellow Scotland-born contemporaries in habits—character and language, in their tendency to settle near fellow Scots and in their enthusiasm for migration to New Zealand—than they or their descendants perceived. Nevertheless, in terms of the specificities of the migrant profile, for example the demographics, the specific way in which they were singled out by New Zealand Government schemes, and the way in which the migrants were (and are) remembered by those who remained behind, it is true that Shetland migrants were as different from their Scottish mainland contemporaries as Shetland was from Scotland itself. A sense of identity separate from a Scottish migrant identity is maintained in New Zealand to this day, most obvious manifestations being the continuance of Shetland Societies in New Zealand, an annual Viking ball—an adaptation of the annual Shetland ‘up helly aa’ festival—and a separate ‘special interest group’ for Shetland descendants within the New Zealand Society of Genealogists. Whether this Shetland identity has been maintained in the other parts of the world Shetland Islanders settled or if it is peculiar to the Shetland-New Zealand strand of this diaspora remains to be investigated.
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