

<TITLE>COLONIALISM AND THE HIGHLAND CLEARANCES<sup>1</sup>

&lt;AU&gt;IAIN MACKINNON

<T>This article considers the late modern Gàidhealtachd<sup>2</sup> as a site of internal colonialism where the relationship of domination between colonizer and colonized is complex, longstanding and occurring within the imperial state. It will build on criticisms of previous theoretical approaches that have been used to investigate internal colonialism in Scotland and elsewhere. These previous studies adopted a comparative approach. As such, they have been criticised for selecting for their analyses only those characteristics typical of colonial situations which could also be found in the proposed ‘internal colony’ and excluding other typical characteristics which could not be found there. Positive assessments of the existence of ‘internal colonies’ made on this basis have been described by the historian Robert J. Hind as arguably creating a misleading ‘artificial analogy’ of colonialism. Postcolonial scholarship on the Gàidhealtachd has sought to avoid this form of criticism by avoiding the question of historical colonization altogether. This article critiques the postcolonial position and elaborates on the criticisms of previous internal colonialism analyses in order to take a different approach to those of analogy or avoidance. It examines the historical record for evidence that promoters and managers of projects involving land use change, territorial dispossession and industrial development in the late modern Gàidhealtachd explicitly conceived of their work as projects of colonization. It also studies some of these projects to analyse whether the new social, cultural and political structures that they imposed correspond to different types of colony that have been delineated in a recent theoretical overview of colonialism. In addition, it examines some of the attitudes towards the indigenous population of the Gàidhealtachd by prominent racialist and racist ideologists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This examination investigates both whether these attitudes demonstrate

a sense of cultural superiority that, it has been argued, is integral to colonial situations, and also whether these attitudes were accompanied by policies that advocated removal of the indigenous people from their lands and their replacement with culturally different groups.<sup>3</sup>

\*

<T>In recent historical accounts of the late modern Gàidhealtachd the two conceptual terms most commonly employed as ways of understanding the reorganisation of the area's landholding patterns and concomitant dispossession of its indigenous population are 'clearance' and 'improvement'. 'Clearance' has been described as an omnibus term which has come to refer to 'any kind of displacement of occupiers ... by Highland landlords'. Although 1790 to 1850 is reckoned the most intensive period of 'clearance', according to Eric Richards the term does not seem to have been in general use until the 1840s.<sup>4</sup> By contrast, 'improvement' was in use from the mid-eighteenth century to describe systematic social and agrarian changes being implemented in the area. T.M. Devine has argued that 'improvement' refers to practices and principles connected to the 'new agronomy' of the period and has stressed that agricultural transformation and industrial development 'were two sides of the same coin' in Scotland.<sup>5</sup> Although 'improvement' is primarily described in such terms, agrarian change – particularly tenurial rearrangements – had acknowledged social implications and therefore political (and legislative) backing was necessary for its implementation. 'Improvement' was also informed by ideological principles capable of rousing evangelical fervour in its adherents.<sup>6</sup>

<NP>This article seeks to disclose some conceptual limits to the utility of 'clearance' and 'improvement' for describing radical changes in the governance of land and natural resources in the late modern Gàidhealtachd, and begins to delineate a third way of

understanding the tenurial, political and cultural changes that have taken place in the area during the period. Developing Allan MacInnes' assertion that 'the clash of perspectives between improvement and clearance was not just a Scottish issue and must be set within an imperial context', it will examine a concept that was at the heart of the British imperial project, one that has been less examined by historians of the Gàidhealtachd but that, like 'clearance' and 'improvement', was also widely used during the nineteenth century to describe plans and projects for land use change, territorial dispossession and industrial development.<sup>7</sup> The concept is that of 'colonialism' and the way of understanding is through the idea that the Gàidhealtachd can be understood historically as a site of colonization. From the outset this article emphasises a distinction between 'colonization' as a material practice and 'colonialism' as a set of ideas about colonization and a relationship between different groups within a colonial situation. Political theorist Barbara Arneil has argued that colonialism is 'the theoretical and ideological framework by which ... colonization is justified'.<sup>8</sup>

<NP>The idea that some parts of the early modern Gàidhealtachd were a site of colonization and colonialism is now quite well served by historiography. A clutch of analyses focusing on the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries – a period in which the Scottish Crown's desire to conquer and colonize parts of the area was being explicitly articulated – have been produced in the last fifteen years or so, including significant contributions from David Armitage, Julian Goodare, Martin MacGregor, Aonghas MacCoinnich and Alison Cathcart. This body of scholarship indicates that an increasingly sophisticated narrative is developing in Scottish historiography of internal colonialism in the early modern Gàidhealtachd.<sup>9</sup> However, the emergence of this narrative begs something of an existential question for late modern historians: if the Gàidhealtachd was an ongoing site of colonization in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, then what is going on in the eighteenth and

nineteenth centuries? Is it possible that colonies, colonization and colonialism have somehow simply gone away?

<NP>The work of Eric Richards and James Hunter, the two contemporary historians of the Gàidhealtachd whose research has perhaps most closely examined the far-reaching changes encapsulated by the terms ‘improvement’ and ‘clearance’, suggest not. Although both employ ‘clearance’ and ‘improvement’ centrally in their work, they have also suggested – albeit largely in passing – that these changes can be understood in colonial terms.<sup>10</sup> Recognised difficulties in conceptualising ‘colonialism’ might help explain why sustained analyses are not common. For instance, at the outset of his acclaimed theoretical overview of colonialism the German historian Jürgen Osterhammel argued that historians ‘have shied away from attempts at terminological precision of the term “colonialism” because of its myriad facets’. He added that colonial realities were ‘shaped by particular local features overseas, by the intentions and opportunities of the individual local powers, and by the broader tendencies in the international system’. In Osterhammel’s view even the most comprehensive of all world empires, the British empire, was ‘a patchwork quilt of ad hoc adaptations to particular circumstance’.<sup>11</sup> According to David Cannadine, it was ‘created and governed in an appropriately disorganised and unsystematic way’.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, this lack of clarity extended to the most basic matters, with J.G.A. Pocock noting that during the imperial crisis that led to the American Revolution it became clear that the British empire lacked ‘a clear concept of a colony as a subordinate political society’.<sup>13</sup> Lacking definitional clarity even among those by whom it was being imposed, colonialism, Osterhammel concludes, ‘is thus a phenomenon of colossal vagueness’. Postcolonial scholarship agrees with this assessment, Robert Young stressing colonialism’s ‘extraordinary diversity, even within the practices of a single colonial power’ such that it ‘troubles the possibility of any general theory’.<sup>14</sup> As this article’s analysis will draw out, the definitional issues are even more acute

for the Gàidhealtachd as a site of colonialism within an imperial state. Yet, if the language of colonialism forms part of the historical record of the late modern Gàidhealtachd and is being invoked in its historiography, then it is a phenomenon with which historians must come to grips, and it becomes incumbent on us to employ some theoretical perspective on colonialism in seeking to disclose and describe its place in our recent past.

<NP>This article will use Osterhammel's work as its primary theoretical source and augment his analysis by drawing selectively on postcolonial scholarship in order to test whether considering the late modern Gàidhealtachd as a site of colonization and colonialism can help us to better understand, and perhaps begin to resolve, differences of interpretation found in 'clearance' and 'improvement' accounts. Other perspectives, such as political philosopher James Tully's theory of 'internal colonization' in North America, the work of Barbara Arneil on liberal colonialism and 'domestic colonies' on both sides of the Atlantic, and the geographer Cole Harris' nuanced account of how colonialism dispossessed native communities in coastal British Columbia, also provide useful theoretical insights into late modern processes of colonization and colonialism.<sup>15</sup> Osterhammel's work has been chosen in this instance as a theoretical focus because of the breadth of its discussion of colonial situations and its historically rooted approach.

<NP>In his theoretical overview Osterhammel defines three aspects of the colonial situation: 'colonies'; 'colonization'; and 'colonialism'. A 'colony' is 'a new form of political organisation created by invasion (conquest and/or settlement colonization) but built on pre-colonial conditions'. Its rulers are 'in sustained dependence on a geographically remote "mother country" or "imperial center", which claims exclusive rights of possession of the colony'. He delineates three basic colony types: 'exploitation colonies'; 'settler colonies'; and 'maritime enclaves'. This article will include an analysis of whether land use change and territorial dispossession in the late modern Gàidhealtachd can be understood in terms of

either of the first two of these colony types namely, ‘exploitation colonies’ which involve a small number of colonists acting as a governing elite and supplying benefits to the imperial centre by exploiting the indigenous population, and ‘settler colonies’ which involve a large number of colonists with a focus more on developing the colony through the colonists and their culture at the expense of the indigenous people and their culture. Osterhammel cautioned that these types should not be too strictly applied to particular colonial contexts as colonies were often mixtures of different types ‘or moved from being one type of colony to another as circumstances changed’.<sup>16</sup> According to Osterhammel ‘colonization’ is ‘a process of territorial acquisition’ based on ‘the expansion of a society beyond its original habitat’.<sup>17</sup> He defines ‘colonialism’ as a form of relationship in which ‘an entire society is robbed of its historical line of development, *externally manipulated* and transformed according to the needs of the colonial rulers’ who believe they are working towards the ‘fulfillment of a universal mission’.<sup>18</sup>

<EXT>Colonialism is a relationship of domination between an indigenous (or forcibly imported) majority and a minority of foreign invaders. The fundamental decisions affecting the lives of the colonized people are made and implemented by the colonial rulers in pursuit of interests that are often defined in a distant metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromises with the colonized population, the colonizers are convinced of their own superiority and their ordained mandate to rule.<sup>19</sup>

<NP>This article’s case for the late modern Gàidhealtachd to be considered a site of colonization and colonialism is in three parts. The first part critiques Michael Hechter’s well-

known argument on ‘internal colonialism’ in Scotland, Ireland and Wales during the development of modern Britain, and also the approach taken by Silke Stroh in her recent postcolonial analysis of the Gàidhealtachd. This critique leads to an argument that proposes a method for analysing ‘internal colonialism’ in the Gàidhealtachd that does not proceed by way of ‘artificial analogy’ (as Hechter’s model is said to have done). The article here advocates an approach that augments the use of theoretical models based on limited empirical data, with an attempt to recover the point of view of those whose historical activities are being theorised – in this case the promoters and managers of tenurial change and industrial development. On the basis of this argument the article then makes two distinct but related historical analyses of the Gàidhealtachd in its second and third parts. The second part of the article demonstrates that proposals and projects to encourage internal or ‘domestic colonization’ and establish colonies in the area were prominent and recurrent in Scottish and British political discourse from the middle of the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth. The third part of the article then examines whether attitudes towards Gaels in Scotland during the period when ‘domestic colonization’ was taking place are typical of those found towards the colonized. The analysis in the third part first examines more generally held views about the nature and character of Gaels at this time; then it analyses views expressed by prominent estate and Government administrators who were active in the Gàidhealtachd.

<NP>In exploring the existence of colonialism in relation to the late modern Gàidhealtachd this article’s argument does not articulate indigenous perspectives on the historical events that it outlines, although such perspectives are essential for a fuller and more just picture of colonial relations. It concentrates only on the statements of those who came to govern the area’s land and natural resources, and on writers who may have provided ideological inspiration for the actions undertaken by those governors. This is because ideologically ‘colonialism’ is a concept developed within the political philosophies of

particular European and Western societies in the modern period to describe the means and manner by which those societies sought to impose their forms of rule, and their cultural, social, political, economic and juridical norms, on other societies and their resources.<sup>20</sup> In consequence, among those who experienced its imposition we should not expect to find, initially at least, the view they were being made subject to colonial relations. Colonized peoples encountered their colonizers from within their own conceptual and practical worldviews and it was from within those worldviews that they first attempted to make sense of the actions and attitudes of their colonizers. However, this article's conclusion does address a native point of view, relating perspectives made by Gaels in public life on some of the contemporary consequences of the historical processes that the article examines, and comparing those perspectives with contemporary views from the scholars of some externally colonized peoples.

#### <A>Internal colonialism as analogy, and as a reality

<T>Osterhammel specifically includes the study of internal colonialism in Scotland, Ireland and Wales in his suggestion that within the general concept of colonialism there might be 'colonialism without colonies' between 'dominant centers' and 'dependent peripheries' inside nation states or regionally integrated land empires. Drawing on Robert J. Hind's important review article which makes a general critique of the 'internal colonial concept' as used by Hechter and other scholars, Osterhammel considers that the idea of colonization internal to states might 'strain the concept of colonialism'.<sup>21</sup>

<NP>Hind's argument is that because the 'internal colonial concept' is used to describe situations where 'the colonizing and colonized sections of society live in the same country' it necessarily 'derives from analogies'. This comparative approach is necessary, according to Hind, because the internal colonial concept usually has to exclude traditional



features of colonialism such as the assumption of geographical separation and of an entire population imposing its will on an extraterritorial society. Instead, internal colonial theses focus on a more limited range of characteristics of conventional colonialism, such as ‘political subjection, economic exploitation, cultural domination and racial exclusion’. By doing so, he suggests, they arguably impose onto a society an ‘artificial analogy’ which can be considered ‘obscurantist and misleading’. By this he means that situations of conventional ‘external’ colonialism ‘can be clearly seen as they affect external communities’. However, for areas like the Gàidhealtachd ‘there can be no similar certainty that internal colonialism took place’ because the relationship of domination is unfolding within the sovereign territory of the dominant power. He adds that this lack of certainty creates a particular problem for historians engaging with the concept for they are accustomed to require documentary proof that something has in fact taken place.<sup>22</sup>

<NP>Postcolonial accounts of the Gàidhealtachd have sought to avoid the dilemma of addressing whether the area has actually been subject to colonialism by explicitly eschewing historical or political analysis in favour of examining ‘certain discursive and ideological patterns’ found in inter- or transcultural encounters which are not necessarily limited to colonial situations. However, despite taking this approach in her important postcolonial analysis of Scottish Gaelic poetry, Silke Stroh could nevertheless conclude that there is a special emphasis in ‘Celtic Fringe postcolonialism ... on deconstruction of traditional binarisms between (ex-)colonizer and (ex-)colonized’, and that ‘the struggle for the decolonization of the Scottish Gaelic world seems far from over’.<sup>23</sup> If these conclusions are to make sense, they must be taken to mean that some historical process of colonization has actually happened within Scotland. Without acknowledging and coming to grips with such a process it seems meaningless to claim that a struggle can currently be taking place for ‘decolonization of the Gaelic world’. Such conclusions require of Stroh the historical or

political analysis that she sought to avoid. One means of resolving her dilemma would be to avoid using terms like ‘colonize’ or ‘decolonize’ altogether, a strategy which would seem to remove the pith from the postcolonial approach. Another means is the approach taken in the present article which does not reject the comparative evaluations drawn out of theoretical frameworks such as Hechter’s and postcolonial research. Instead it seeks to augment them with a methodology rooted in trying to recover the beliefs and point of view of those people whose actions are being studied in a particular context.

<NP>This latter approach follows the exhortation by Anglo-Scottish historian of political thought Quentin Skinner that the historical task should ‘be conceived as that of trying so far as possible to think as our ancestors thought and to see things their way’. In terms of understanding the Gàidhealtachd as a site of colonization, this approach seeks to recover the point of view and beliefs of those historical agents who were responsible for promoting and implementing projects of land use change and industrial development (such as the establishment of fisheries that utilised the dispossessed population) in the area. In order to do so, Skinner argues, ‘historians have no option but to begin by assuming that what people actually talk about provides us with the most reliable guide to their beliefs’.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, this approach does not focus on evidence from the historical record as data to be selected by the researcher to assess the merit of an internal colonial or postcolonial theory for the Gàidhealtachd. Instead, it considers the evidence as publically available statements of the views of the historical agents being examined and which can be used to disclose whether those agents themselves believed that their work constituted acts of colonization.

<NP>By adopting this approach we can address the question that Hind’s critique raises in relation to internal colonialism in the late modern Gàidhealtachd: if social, political and cultural relations in the area at that time do conform to Hechter’s internal colonial model (and subsequent historical analyses appear to suggest they do), then is there documentary

proof to demonstrate that those who were responsible for promoting and managing radical changes in the ways that the area's land and natural resources were being governed believed that their agenda was to colonize the area?<sup>25</sup> If such 'documentary proof' exists, then it appears difficult in this case to sustain Hind's critique that internal colonialism works by way of 'artificial analogy' to external colonial relations. The existence of an explicit colonizing agenda would enable us to relate the actions and attitudes of those promoting and implementing the colonization of the Gàidhealtachd to more general theoretical perspectives about colonization and colonialism.<sup>26</sup> If such evidence of colonization as policy and practice exists, and it can also be shown that cultural attitudes typical of colonial situations were being employed against those being made subject to the colonizers' projects, then it seems reasonable to contend that the late modern Gàidhealtachd is a site of internal colonialism.

#### <A>Policies and projects to colonize the Gàidhealtachd

<T>There is some evidence that proponents and implementers of policies and projects of territorial redistribution in the first half of the eighteenth century believed that their work was for the development of colonies and colonization.<sup>27</sup> However, it is after the defeat of the Jacobite army at Culloden in 1746 that explicitly expressed proposals and projects for colonization become more apparent. The estates of prominent Jacobite supporters were forfeited to the Crown to be governed by the Board for the Annexed Estates. Andrew MacKillop has described this as 'the most ambitious and high-profile agency of government intervention in the Highlands in the second half of the eighteenth century'. Led by Andrew Fletcher, the former Lord Justice Clerk, the Board's commissioners had been set the task of 'civilising the inhabitants on the said estates, and other parts of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland'. One of the means by which they set about this task was to develop what the Commission's reports call 'colonies' of demobilised soldiers and sailors upon the forfeited

estates. On their Perthshire holdings the colonies included those at Streilitz, Auchterarder, Borland Bogg and several at Callendar.<sup>28</sup> MacKillop has argued that it is among the colonies of the Annexed Estates – which were equated to the *colonia* established by the Roman empire ‘in order to pacify local populations and act as recruiting stations for imperial defence’ – that the beginning of the crofting system of tenure can be found and that the Board’s ‘true significance’ is as a state intervention initiating policies of land tenure for settlement that foreshadowed the general move towards crofting tenure. One of the commissioners, the MP Gilbert Elliot, appears to have regarded these individual settlements as part of one larger colonial project, writing in 1755 that ‘we have opened the Commission for the forfeited estates and flatter ourselves that under our protection a loyal, well policed colony will flourish’. MacKillop concluded that internal colonization using demobilised soldiers and sailors failed in part because of poor planning and in part because the settlers were ill-prepared for their new lives as colonists.<sup>29</sup>

<NP>MacKillop’s argument that crofting tenure originated in the settler colonies of the Annexed Estates, and that military recruitment had a central role in its development, has been elaborated further by Fredrik Albritton Jonsson. He contests the idea that crofting tenure developed purely as an economic strategy and claims instead it has origins as a practical project based on an Enlightenment ideology of moral and natural improvement. In this view the introduction of the crofting system was as a means of organising processes of internal or domestic colonization to ‘improve’ society and nature. One of the most ambitious schemes along these lines was Lord Kames’ colonization project on Flanders Moss, a peat moss on his family estate near Blair Drummond, where he settled hundreds of Gaels, entrusting them with long leases and encouraging ‘hard labor’ among them to bring peat moss into cultivation from ‘waste’ land. Albritton Jonsson believes that it was Lord Kames’ experience of the crofting schemes on the Annexed Estates, of which he was a commissioner, that inspired the

project but that it was not so much targeted at ex-soldiers as at ‘the moral community of Highlanders’ generally. He concluded: ‘Internal colonization created a form of moral reservation, where Gaelic virtues could survive and flourish, even in the midst of fundamental agrarian change’.<sup>30</sup> Albritton Jonsson’s important analysis discloses the wide currency of these ideas among Scottish elites and the development of a range of practical projects of internal colonization in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The forfeited estates commission’s military settlements were just one project within the wider subjection of the post-Culloden Gàidhealtachd to internal colonization. Another was the creation in the 1750s of manufacturing and educational colonies at Lochcarron and Glenmoriston. Like the military project, both of these also appear to have been unsuccessful despite the Lochcarron colony being supported by the Manufacturing Board and the Society in Scotland for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge.<sup>31</sup>

<NP>However, the idea of colonizing the Gàidhealtachd was tenacious and attractive. It was raised again in the 1780s, both for land and for sea, its advocates playing on economic fears arising from the loss of British colonies in North America. For the sea, in 1786 the writer and advocate of improvement, John Knox, proposed the erection of fishing stations, claiming that these would establish ‘a thriving, populous colony in these extreme parts of our island’ benefitting commerce and national security.<sup>32</sup> His work helped inspire the creation of the British Fisheries Society in 1786 and their establishment of four fishing villages, of which one was at Ullapool in Wester Ross. The Ullapool development was trenchantly criticised by Sir George Mackenzie of Coul who said that the Society had been given ‘mistaken data’ which had led them to overinvest in a venture that, in his view, had turned Ullapool into ‘a nest of wickedness’. He added: ‘Thus upwards of L.20,000 have been, I may say, uselessly sunk; and this colony, which lately consisted of nearly 700 persons, has become a burden on the public’. Regardless of their views on the enterprise itself, MacKenzie

and Knox were in agreement that it was a colonial enterprise. Proposals and discussion on the merits of fishing colonies in the Gàidhealtachd continued throughout the nineteenth century.<sup>33</sup>

<NP>For the land, in 1785 a Perthshire farmer, David Young, with an optimism typical of many ‘improvers’, proposed ‘that a considerable number of new colonies might be planted among ourselves, as it is evident that Great Britain may be made so as to produce ten times the quantity of every-thing it does at present’.

<EXT>If there were a number of little houses built upon the corner of any part of an estate, with small enclosures behind each, managed with the spade ... they might turn out very much to the account of the proprietor, and tend much to population.

<T>Young claimed that if his ‘plan was put in execution, the Highlands and Islands might maintain more than double the number of inhabitants they do at present’. The population of these ‘infant-colonies’, he said, would not be full-time farmers. Instead, ‘all kinds of manufacturers’ should be encouraged to settle. Such settlements could also, he argued, be created in order to bring waste ground into cultivation. His book on the subject received more than 300 subscriptions, including from the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, Professor John Anderson of Glasgow University, the duke of Atholl, the earl of Breadalbane, senators of the College of Justice and many landlords and factors.<sup>34</sup> This was another iteration of ‘domestic colonization’ for agricultural improvement. Sir George MacKenzie of Coul also poured scorn on this kind of development. He condemned several methods of wasteland cultivation, including one he had tried himself by settling ‘eight or ten crofters on a piece of waste ground’ with ‘a promise of a lease without rent and a

guinea for every half acre they cultivated, on condition that they should improve at least half an acre every year'. They did not exhibit the enthusiasm he had hoped for and he was 'obliged to dismiss them'. Of such schemes, he concluded, 'the result in every case of this kind must be exactly the same'.<sup>35</sup>

<EXT>The crofting system, that is, the attempt to bring waste-land into cultivation, by means of our superfluous population, in any of the ways just mentioned, must be condemned, even supposing that, in a certain degree, success attended it, and that the land was broken up.<sup>36</sup>

<NP>Sir John Sinclair of Ulbster, one of the most prominent advocates of the principles of 'improvement' and the first president of the Board of Agriculture, established colonies for wasteland agriculture on his Caithness estate. In an appendix to the 1812 'General View of Agriculture' in Caithness he published an essay with advice – based on his own experiences – directed towards estates 'in the northern part of Scotland' on how to 'improve an extensive property'. He warned of significant challenges that had 'rendered it impossible, in many cases, to do more, than to lay the foundation of Improvement'. So strenuous were these circumstances that the venture 'resembles a system calculated for the establishment of a new colony, or the improvement of a great province, than a private estate'. Sinclair reported that poor climate and a lack of markets, roads and harbours all hampered his efforts, as did the need to make 'a total alteration to the situation, habits and prejudices of the former occupiers' of the land being improved. An initial part of his work, he wrote, had been to establish 'a new colony of farmers, on a barren waste' on the estate.<sup>37</sup>

<NP>Captain John Henderson, author of the Caithness report, noted that as sheep farming had increased on Sinclair's estate he had 'removed the tenants, who occupied the

inland parts of the Langwell estate, and placed them in new colonies near the sea shore, with small lots of land, where they were employed as fishermen or day-labourers'.<sup>38</sup> This is substantially the same policy as subsequently employed by the Sutherland Estate, which was under the control of Sir John Sinclair's first cousin the countess of Sutherland, even down to the 'two Scotch acres' offered by both landlords to the tenants who had been 'removed'. Whereas Sinclair had described the governance of an estate as being like that of a colony, James Loch, the commissioner of the Sutherland Estate, described his task in terms of the governance of 'a small kingdom'.<sup>39</sup> However, Eric Richards has concluded of Loch's attitude to his work that 'To Loch it was evidently a kind of colonization of the Highlands'. According to Richards, Loch's predecessor as Sutherland Estate commissioner, William Young, who was in partnership with Patrick Sellar, repeatedly referred to the Sutherland Estate as 'the new colony'.<sup>40</sup>

<NP>Sir John Sinclair had other, and bigger, colonial aspirations than wasteland reclamation, proposing to the Crown a plan for 'The Royal Colony of Scrabster' on common land there. The plan was to 'erect a village for labouring people, and to divide the remainder into small farms'. The village would be of 100 houses with three acres of land attached to each – enough for 'each settler to keep a cow'. The land would be worked by spade. There would be 250 small farms of 10 acres each and the people of the colony would also be expected to fish. Sinclair regarded his plans as part of a much greater regional project which the legislature was undertaking by its proposals to take forward the Caledonian Canal 'and for making roads, and building bridges, in the northern counties, under the direction of Commissioners appointed to oversee the expenditure of the money'.<sup>41</sup> 'A foundation has thus been laid for a new system, not of foreign, but of domestic colonization, which will be found infinitely preferable to the cultivation of distant settlements'.<sup>42</sup>

<NP>Perhaps on the basis of these experiences, his exhaustive 1814 report *The*



*Agricultural State and Political Circumstances of Scotland* explicitly equated ‘improvement’ with ‘colonization’. Parliament’s decision to attend to ‘the improvement of the more northern parts of the kingdom’ with roads, harbours and the Caledonian Canal, said the report, was ‘in other words...to colonize at home’.<sup>43</sup> Albritton Jonsson has concluded that ‘the fashion for peatbog moss improvement seems to have reached its height during the first decade of the nineteenth century’.<sup>44</sup> However, if anything, debate and practice on wasteland cultivation as a form of domestic colonization – and not only in the Gàidhealtachd – appears to have escalated throughout the first half of the century and was still being discussed in relation to the Gàidhealtachd in the 1880s.<sup>45</sup> Plans for penal colonies in the Westerns Isles were being made from at least the mid-nineteenth century and were still being mooted in the second half of the twentieth.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, the grand project that Sinclair had depicted in the Gàidhealtachd was examined and then proposed by successive British parliamentary committees on Ireland, and a programme of public works put into effect in Ireland in the 1820s, including ‘a domestic colonization of a population in excess in certain districts’.<sup>47</sup>

<NP>It is clear that the language of colonization was widely expressed by Government officials and agricultural improvers in the course of describing their plans and projects in the Gàidhealtachd. These words and actions demonstrate that industrial development and land tenure change in the area was being widely conceived and implemented as a project of colonization. In relation to Hind’s critique of the ‘internal colonial concept’, we do not need to look back at the evidence of promoters and practitioners of land tenure and industrial development in the eighteenth and nineteenth century Gàidhealtachd and interpret them *as if* they were lobbying for, creating and implementing colonization in the area. No ‘artificial analogy’ is required. They understood their work to be projects of colonization within a project of colonization proceeding with the support of the British imperial state.

<NP>This article's introduction also set the question as to whether land use changes and territorial dispossession in the late modern Gàidhealtachd can be understood in terms of the 'exploitation' or 'settlement' colony types delineated by Osterhammel. Where indigenous and non-indigenous landlords brought in permanently resident overseers and other employees from elsewhere to run their affairs they may be thought of as creating what Osterhammel calls 'settlement colonies' on their estates in the Gàidhealtachd. Where landlords employed temporarily resident Lowland administrators to utilise the remaining indigenous population for economic ends they can be seen as creating 'exploitation colonies'. The two forms might sit together on the one estate. For instance, to the degree that an improving landlord like the countess of Sutherland or Sir John Sinclair sought to expel the indigenous population from inland straths and replace them there with Lowland farmers they can be understood to have created 'settlement colonies' in those straths; to the degree that they wanted to move the cleared local populations to new areas within their estate for the reclamation of 'waste' ground, or to the coast in order to engage them in kelping or fishing, they may be thought of as creating 'exploitation colonies'.<sup>48</sup> Osterhammel observed that the logic of colonial policies in a territory might change in relation to circumstances local, national or international – the renewed availability of barilla in Britain after the Napoleonic Wars might be thought of as an example relevant to the Gàidhealtachd – and the particular type of colony required by those controlling the situation might therefore change in relation to these circumstances.

#### <A>Colonial ideology in the modern Gàidhealtachd

<T>It is clear that colonization existed as a policy and practice in the late modern Gàidhealtachd, albeit that policies and practices were subject to change. Such changes within colonies rest on what Osterhammel calls the constant that underpins variation: 'the

unchanging complex of rule, exploitation and cultural conflict in ethnically heterogeneous political structures that had been created by influence from without'. In his view at the heart of the conflict was a set of beliefs and attitudes among those in charge that they possessed different and superior cultural traits to those whose lives they were ruling and whose lands and resources they were exploiting.<sup>49</sup> For these changes applied to the land were not simply for economic exploitation; they were also deliberate attempts at culture change through the introductions of a group of people with one set of cultural assumptions, affiliations and habits to exercise power over and to change the way of living of another group of people who thought and acted differently. Such campaigns of cultural transformation were buttressed by ideological formations which regarded the colonized population as inferior, thus justifying the necessity of rule by the colonizers. Postcolonial scholarship has emphasised that in colonial situations where the subject people were of a different race or a minority indigenous people existed, 'the ideology of race was ... a crucial part of the construction and naturalization of an unequal form of intercultural relations'.<sup>50</sup>

<NP>Several studies have examined the development of a racial ideology towards Gaels in late modern Scotland and one important work, Krisztina Fenyö's, has linked this ideology to their removal from their lands. Colin Kidd's analyses of racialised discourse in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scotland distinguish between 'racialism' and 'racism'. For Kidd, 'racialism' is the belief that biologically or ethnically salient differences exist between groups of people to the degree that these groups can be construed as different 'races'. 'Racism', in his view, is prejudice about the relative superiority or inferiority of these groups that builds on the belief in racial difference.<sup>51</sup> Kidd believes that racialised understandings of human difference within Scotland can be traced to the late eighteenth century and the work of Lord Kames – who extensively practiced internal colonization on his own estates in order to regenerate agriculture and 'the moral community of Highlanders'.<sup>52</sup>

Partially in response to the Ossianic controversy, Kames 'depicted sentimental Celts as the founders of civilized, commercial Great Britain' and as the source of his aspirations for 'eighteenth century Britain's national character'.<sup>53</sup>

<NP>Shortly thereafter, John Pinkerton's *History of Scotland* proposed a starkly contrasting argument to Kames', but also based on a racial division between 'Highlander' and 'Lowlander' which extended from the 'Celtic' and 'Teutonic' past. If racism is defined in Kidd's terms – as prejudice based on a belief in ethnic or biological group characteristics – then Pinkerton was a racist.<sup>54</sup> Of Scottish Gaels Pinkerton wrote:

<EXT>But the Highlanders ... had been so contaminated with a Celtic mixture in Ireland, that ... in laziness, filth, and every species of savageness, they have been always hardly distinguishable from the savages of Ireland. In all ages of our history they are marked as the savages of Scotland.<sup>55</sup>

<T>Following a reference to the early seventeenth century colonisation of Lewis, Pinkerton proposes a policy for dealing with Gaels which is similar to the injunction to 'colonize at home' made in Sir John Sinclair's Agricultural Report a few years later. Pinkerton wrote: 'In vain would we excite industry among savages; the point is to colonize the country afresh'.<sup>56</sup> He is reiterating this policy from earlier in his inquiry where he adds to the centuries old trope among Lowland writers of describing Gaels as animals:

<EXT>Had all these Celtic cattle emigrated five centuries ago, how happy had it been for the country! All we can do now is plant colonies

among them; and by this, and encouraging their emigration, try to get rid of the breed.<sup>57</sup>

<NP>Attitudes towards ‘race’ changed in the course of the nineteenth century. Early in the century many believed that ‘racial’ characteristics were malleable. However, influenced by ideas in the natural science of biology, an alternative view developed later in the century that populations, or races, were ‘identifiable on the basis of inherent, invariable characteristics’.<sup>58</sup> One of the foremost theorists of this idea was the anatomist Robert Knox. He outlined his views in the *The Races of Men* where he wrote that the ‘possible conversion of one race into another I hold to be a statement contradicted by all history’.<sup>59</sup> Knox, a Lowland Scot, described himself as a ‘Saxon’ and throughout the book he positioned the ‘Celt’ as a foil for Saxon progress:

<EXT>To me the Caledonian Celt of Scotland appears a race as distinct from the Lowland Saxon of the same country, as any two races can possibly be: as negro from American; Hottentot from Caffre; Esquimaux from Saxon.<sup>60</sup>

<T>From his studies he believed he had uncovered the characteristics of the Celtic race:

<EXT>...idleness, indolence, slavery; a mental slavery, the most dreadful of all human conditions. See him cling to the banks of rivers, fearing to plunge into the forest; without self-reliance; without self-confidence ... I appeal to the Saxon men of all countries whether I am right or not in my estimate of the Celtic character. Furious fanaticism;

a love of war and disorder; a hatred for order and patient industry; no accumulative habits; restless, treacherous, uncertain.<sup>61</sup>

<T>Knox was not modest about the results of his work, claiming that ‘the character of the Celt is now fully understood’. Having established to his satisfaction the Celtic character he turned his thoughts to the future of Britain’s contemporary Celts. He argued that learned men were debating whether their future was one of assimilation or extinction. Knox’s own preference was for ‘the quiet and gradual extinction of the Celtic race ... As a Saxon, I abhor all dynasties, monarchies and bayonet governments, but this latter seems to be the only one suitable for the Celtic man’.<sup>62</sup> For Knox, the question was not whether but ‘how to dispose of them’? His answer: ‘The race should be forced from the soil’ and their lands sold ‘to Saxon men’.

It is a powerful measure. It has succeeded seemingly against some of the dark races of men, whom it has brought to the verge of destruction. Caffre and Hottentot, Tasmanian and American: why not against a fair race — the Celtic natives of Ireland, Wales, and Caledonia, for they must be classed together? They are one; the same fate, whatever it be, awaits all.<sup>63</sup>

<NP>Krisztina Fenyő’s investigation of Lowland perceptions of the Gàidhealtachd in the 1840s and 1850s argues that the rapid expansion of newspapers in the mid-nineteenth century made them a powerful force in helping to shape public opinion. Fenyő argues that by the middle of the century Scottish newspapers were helping to spread the idea that irreconcilable differences existed between ‘Highlanders’ and ‘Lowlanders’. She believes that

the ideas promulgated by Knox and others had been disseminated widely enough that by 1851, when the McNeill Report into the potato famine in the Highlands was published, a spate of virulent newspaper reports and editorials appeared proclaiming the ‘ethnic inferiority’ of the Celt who needed to be ‘improved out’ of the Highlands and Islands. These articles, she claims, amounted to a theory of ‘race decay’. Fenyő writes: ‘Practice soon followed theory. Extensive emigration schemes and unprecedentedly brutal evictions ensued, becoming the predominant features until the mid 1850s.’<sup>64</sup> The notion of Celtic inferiority was given the stamp of approval by Charles Darwin in the 1870s. In *The Descent of Man* Darwin characterised the Celt as ‘reckless, degraded and often vicious’ and approvingly quoted William Rathbone Greg, whose work inspired the eugenics movement in the UK:

<EXT>Given a land originally peopled by a thousand Saxons and a thousand Celts – and in a dozen generations five-sixths of the population would be Celts, but five-sixths of the property, of the power, of the intellect, would belong to the one-sixth of the Saxons that remained.<sup>65</sup>

<NP>Although this opinion does not prescribe what should be done with Celts who people a land, it makes clear that if given leave to remain they would generate a degraded society compared with that of the Saxons. Cumulatively, the foregoing analysis discloses that Gaels in Scotland, in the guise of their perceived ‘Celtic’ identity, were subject to a general degrading racialised discourse during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and that this discourse contained arguments advocating their removal and replacement on their lands. This conclusion raises more particular questions as to whether those who were administering land and natural resources in the area at that time also held race-based explanations of human

differences, and what connection these views might have had with the policies they enacted.

<NP>Most of the ideologists represented in the first part of this analysis of cultural attitudes were expressing their views based on little or no experience of conditions in the Gàidhealtachd. However, the perspectives of those analysed in this second part – the policy administrators James Loch, Patrick Sellar and Sir Charles Trevelyan – were based on significant experience on the ground in the area or of practical engagement in the area's politics. Osterhammel has argued that a key principle of colonialist ideology on the ground was the notion of cultural superiority which was engrained in the lay psychology of colonial expatriates. This psychology was applied on an everyday basis and based on 'a series of characterological generalizations: the "natives" were said to be lazy, shiftless, cruel, playful, naïve, dissolute, duplicitous, incapable of abstract thought, impulsive etc'. Their assumed cultural superiority, he contends, meant that the rulers of modern European colonies generally believed that they had 'two moral *duties*: to bring the blessings of Western civilization to [local] inhabitants ... and to activate neglected resources in backward countries for the general benefit of the world economy'. In this view, colonized peoples needed the colonizers' support 'economically, since work ethics and basic economic skills would have to be instilled in the populace, and culturally, since Africans and Asians would be incapable of freeing themselves of their usual bad habits, "superstitious" ideas, and misguided moral behaviour'.<sup>66</sup> James Loch's justification for his work in Sutherland bears striking resemblance. He wrote that his duties were also two-fold:

<EXT>...it was, in the first place, to render this mountainous district contributory, as far as it was possible, to the general wealth of the country ... and, in the second place, to convert the inhabitants of those districts to the habits of regular and continued industry.<sup>67</sup>



<T>The second duty was hampered because Gaels, in Loch's view, were 'not an industrious race' and, when not engaging in illicit distilling and other illegal pursuits, spent their time 'in indolence and sloth'. Moreover, he believed that the people's Gaelic language presented a barrier 'to the improvement and civilization of the district, wherever it may prevail'. They were also inured to living in 'filth'. Such was his view of their condition that he concluded: 'No country of Europe at any period of its history, ever presented more formidable obstacles to the improvement of a people' – and he made clear that he was not referring to obstacles of geography and climate but to obstacles of psychology and habit.<sup>68</sup>

<NP>However, Loch's view was apparently that 'race' was malleable rather than fixed and so, despite the formidable obstacles that Gaels' racial characteristics presented to him, he reckoned that it would only take a few years before 'the character of this whole population will be completely changed' such that the 'children of those removed from the hills will lose all recollection of the habits and customs of their fathers'. Loch's intention here seems similar to that of Sir John Sinclair who had argued for the need to make 'a total alteration to the situation, habits and prejudices' of the people subject to his removal policies. In parallel to the previously mentioned similarity in stated policies of land redistribution on the Sutherland Estate and Sinclair's estate, there also appears to be a similarity in stated intended outcomes – the transformation of a people. The idea that improvement was as much, in Loch's words, 'the improvement of a people' as the improvement of land and agriculture was common to internal and external colonization projects of the British Empire in the nineteenth century. Writing about the dispossession of indigenous people on the west coast of Canada in that century, Cole Harris has observed that a 'discourse that treated colonial land as waste awaiting development and its inhabitants as backward and lazy, was exceedingly

serviceable' because it enabled 'the improvement of a people's habits *and* land uses to become a cultural imperative.<sup>69</sup>

<NP>Osterhammel argues that the belief that colonizers were bringing the blessings of Western civilisation to the colonized sometimes developed into a doctrine of trusteeship or guardianship of the "responsibility" of the higher status minority ... toward the underdeveloped majority ... Colonial rule was glorified as the gift and act of grace of civilization, and was respected as humanitarian intervention'. At other points colonial ideology developed such that it became 'stylized grandiosely as the fulfillment of a universal mission: as a contribution to a divine plan for the salvation of the pagans, as a secular mandate to "civilize" the "barbarians" or "savages"'.<sup>70</sup> Such distinctly colonial attitudes may be discerned in the writings of Patrick Sellar. In 1816 he described the Gaelic language as 'barbarous jargon of the times when Europe was possessed by savages'. The Sutherland people's continued use of Gaelic made them in 'relation to the enlightened nations of Europe in a position not very different from that betwixt the American colonists and the Aborigines of that Country'. The cultures of both were, in his view, inherently inferior and required civilised intervention.<sup>71</sup> Eric Richards believes that Sellar's understanding of his work in Sutherland attained the level of a mysticism:

<EXT>Sellar invoked the inexorable forces of 'Improvement' for this great Enlightenment Project, all for the furtherance of human civilization. It was a gospel, the logic of which had sanctioned and ordained the clearances, and Sellar merely articulated its truth and beauty. It required the destruction of the last vestiges of the old feudal world, the liquidation of the old society.<sup>72</sup>

<T>For Sellar, then, the dispossession of Gaelic Scotland was ‘the fulfillment of a universal mission’; ‘a contribution to a divine plan’; a mandate to ‘civilize’ the ‘savages’.

<NP>Sir Charles Trevelyan, one of the key figures in the government’s famine relief efforts in the mid-nineteenth century subsequently led the Highlands and Islands Emigration Society. His proposed ‘final settlement’ for the area was to transport some 30-40,000 of its people to Australia. Krisztina Fenyő believes that this plan had ‘a clearly racist motivation’. In place of the Gaels Trevelyan proposed to introduce ‘orderly, moral, industrious and frugal’ Germans who would be, he wrote, ‘less foreign to us than the Irish or Scotch Celt’ and assimilate more readily with ‘our body politic’.<sup>73</sup> T. M. Devine has characterised the Emigration Society that Trevelyan led as a ‘quasi-governmental organisation carrying out a substantial programme of emigration which the government of the day was unwilling to undertake officially and directly because of constraints of both ideology and cost’.<sup>74</sup> Devine has also argued that, from today’s perspective, Trevelyan’s approach to the Gàidhealtachd ‘might be described as a strategy of ethnic cleansing’.<sup>75</sup> It appears that, for Sir Charles Trevelyan, James Loch and Patrick Sellar, racist and nationalist ideologies were integral to their worldviews and were utilised by them to justify policies and practices of internal colonization in the Gàidhealtachd.<sup>76</sup>

\*

<T>This article has demonstrated that promoters and managers of projects involving land use change, territorial dispossession and industrial development in the late modern Gàidhealtachd conceived of their work as internal or ‘domestic colonization’. It has also shown that the territorial and social relations established by those projects are consistent with the characteristics of exploitation and settlement colonies delineated by Osterhammel in his

overview of colony types. Finally, it has disclosed that attitudes of cultural superiority typical of colonial situations were being expressed by prominent racialist and racist ideologues towards the Gàidhealtachd's indigenous population in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and that these attitudes were also displayed by land administrators on the ground as they implemented policies to remove the native people from their lands, often replacing them with culturally different groups.

<NP>There is little reason to doubt that those who prepared and carried out these radical changes to land arrangements in the late modern Gàidhealtachd genuinely believed that their work would improve the lives of a benighted people and integrate them into a better society. However, neither 'clearance' – which simply refers to the displacement of people from their lands – nor 'improvement' – if the term is considered primarily as principles and practices of a 'new agronomy' – are conceptually sufficient to apprehend the nature and the consequences of this process of integration. Even when considered in its wider ideological sense, a historiography of 'improvement' cannot help but privilege the perspectives of those who considered themselves the bearers of that term's values. The meaning that inheres in the term itself – the strength of the ideas and beliefs it has generated and their power to transform history – may predispose Scottish historians to be dazzled by the Enlightenment project of which 'improvement' became part, and to be blind to its many shadows. Relatedly, we may become predisposed to imagine that policies and projects for governing land and natural resources unfolding in the late modern Gàidhealtachd were primarily part of a process of social integration, thus eliding the fact that, when considered within their racist and imperial contexts, these were policies and projects that colonized, marginalised and expelled an indigenous people from lands which constituted their home and a great part of the meaning of their lives. Holding this 'improvement' predisposition we may not fully apprehend the human cost of the fact that these policies and projects were also founded on the belief that the

meaning of those people's lives was, itself, unimproved and required, in Sinclair's words, 'a total alteration to the[ir] situation, habits and prejudices'. Disclosing such a predisposition may help us come to see that the internal colonization of the Gàidhealtachd was not, primarily, a process of integration but, instead, was a major contribution to a historical process of social and cultural disintegration. According to the ethnographer John MacInnes, this disintegration has left Scottish Gaels today living in cultural and social 'detritus'.<sup>77</sup> The same conclusion has been expressed by the poet Iain Crichton Smith, who in his bitter, trenchant and incisive essay 'Real people in a real place', written in 1982, denounced the historical 'interior colonization' and growing materialism that he believed had left Gaels in a cultural milieu increasingly 'empty and without substance'.

<EXT>I recall with a sense of injustice my own fragmented life, the choices I had to make when I didn't realise I was making them, the losses I endured before I well knew I was enduring them, the contradictions I was involved in before I knew they existed ... my own life has been a snake pit of contradictions, because of an accident of geography and a hostile history.

<T>Invoking and reworking a question asked by bards at the time of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century land struggle – 'Shall Gaelic die?' – Crichton Smith answers with another question: 'Shall Gaelic die! What that means is: shall we die?' He placed education in the centre of this snake pit, and emphasised its role in creating among Gaels 'a deep and subtle feeling that English must be superior to Gaelic'. The many confusions engendered by this feeling meant that for a Gael 'he [*sic*] is in fact, and must be, the divided man in the very depths of his consciousness'.<sup>78</sup>

<NP>Such views resonate with perspectives on colonization now being made by writers and scholars of colonized peoples. From the perspective of colonial Kenya, the Gĩkũyũ novelist and scholar Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o has argued that economic and political control 'can never be complete without mental control' and that colonialism's 'most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonised, the control, through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world'. This control was achieved, he writes, through the colonial child's immersion in the imperial education system and its cultural norms which 'resulted in a dissociation of sensibility of that child from his [*sic*] natural and social environment, what we might call colonial alienation'.<sup>79</sup>

<NP>Exposing the role of education and other modes of colonial power in engendering alienation from the ground of one's own traditional modes of being, has been a central objective of indigenous researchers, according to the Maori scholar and indigenous researcher, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, in her path-breaking book *Decolonizing Methodologies*. These researchers try 'to understand the complex ways in which people were brought within the imperial system' and analyse 'how we were colonized ... what that has meant for our immediate past and what it means for our present and future'. The fundamental objective of such work is not academic but instead begins with 'a very powerful need to give testimony to and restore a spirit, to bring back into existence a world fragmented and dying'. For Tuhiwai Smith the purpose of indigenous scholarship is to restore the ontological space in which the ground of indigenous peoples' own different modes of being can be maintained. She writes that 'we perceive a need to decolonize our minds, to recover ourselves, to claim a space in which to develop a sense of authentic humanity', to 'retrieve what we were and remake ourselves'. In this agenda, 'coming to know the past has been part of the critical pedagogy of decolonization'. Revisiting 'site by site, our history under Western eyes' in order to transform 'our colonized views of our own history (as written by the West)' is necessary, argues

Tuhiwai Smith, because the impact of that history ‘is still being felt’.<sup>80</sup> Crichton Smith would surely agree.

<NP>From the perspectives articulated by indigenous scholars, the emerging historiography disclosing the Scottish Gàidhealtachd as a site of internal colonization over many centuries – a historiography of which this article forms a part – may also be understood as a contribution to the decolonization of the Gaels of Scotland. Such contributions are being made not only in order to retrieve what we were and recover ourselves now, but also, in so doing, to support the opening of creative spaces in which recovering Gaels can develop a sense of our own authentic humanity. These are spaces in which we can take up the work of restoring and reworking traditional modes of being and of agency; of re-imagining and re-making a future, by way of our own lights.

---

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to *Ionad Eachdraidh aig Oilthigh na Gàidhealtachd agus nan Eilean* (The Centre for History at the University of the Highlands and Islands), for organising ‘Land and People in Northern Scotland – the Strathnaver Conference’ which was held in *Am Blàran Odhar* (Bettyhill) in September 2014. The paper I presented there has become this article and attending allowed me to receive useful comments and constructive criticism, both at the conference itself and following. I am also grateful to *Comann-rannsachaidh air Eachdraidh nan Gàidheal ann an Alba* (The Discussion Group on the History of the Gaels in Scotland) at Glasgow University, for the opportunity to have an early draft of this paper discussed at one of its meetings. I would particularly like to thank Dr Aonghas MacCoinnich and Dr Martin MacGregor whose immensely useful (and challenging) commentaries on a later draft of the paper caused me to radically rework the piece. I would also like to thank the two reviewers on behalf of *Northern Scotland* as well as the editor of this special edition, Dr. Elizabeth

---

Ritchie. Their comments have also considerably strengthened content and structure. Dr Andrew Wiseman also offered some very useful suggestions to a late draft. Any remaining mistakes are my responsibility.

<sup>2</sup> Aside from instances in which the term ‘Highlands and Islands’ has been specifically used in works cited, the term ‘Gàidhealtachd’ is used in preference to ‘Highlands and Islands’ throughout this article. This reflects the work’s focus on the experiences of the Gaels of the Highlands and Islands area in the modern period. However, there seems to be no reason why a similar analysis could not be attempted for the area’s people of Nordic descent. Additionally, in the wider British context such analyses may have interpretative traction beyond the Highlands and Islands of Scotland; Barbara Arneil’s work, for instance, suggests forms of internal colonization have been widespread in the late modern period. Barbara Arneil, ‘Liberal colonialism, domestic colonies and citizenship’, *History of Political Thought* 33 (3) (2012), 491-523.

<sup>3</sup> Robert J. Hind, ‘The Internal Colonial Concept’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (3) (1984), 543-568, here 553.

<sup>4</sup> Eric Richards, *The Highland Clearances. People, Landlords and Rural Turmoil* (Edinburgh, 2000), 4, 6, 7.

<sup>5</sup> T. M. Devine, *Clearance and Improvement: Land, Power and People in Scotland 1700–1900* (Edinburgh, 2006), 1, 7.

<sup>6</sup> Eric Richards. *History of the Highland Clearances, Vol. 1: Agrarian Transformation and the Evictions, 1746–1886* (London, 1982); Robert Hay, *How an Island Lost its People: Improvement, Clearance and Resettlement on Lismore 1830–1914* (Lochs, 2013), 14; Sir John Sinclair, *General Report of the Agricultural State and Political Circumstances of Scotland drawn up for the consideration of the Board of Agriculture and Internal*



---

*Improvement*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1814) vii, viii; Andrew MacKillop, *More Fruitful than the Soil: Army, Empire and the Scottish Highlands, 1715–1815* (East Linton, 2000), 80-2; Eric Richards, *Patrick Sellar and the Highland Clearances: Homicide, Eviction and the Price of Progress* (Edinburgh, 1999), 285, 286; Peter Womack, *Improvement and Romance – Constructing the Myth of the Scottish Highlands* (Basingstoke, 1989), 3.

<sup>7</sup> Allan MacInnes, ‘Commercial landlordism and clearance in the Scottish Highlands: the case of Arichonan’, in J. Pan-Montojo, and F. Pedersen (eds), *Communities in European History: Representations, Jurisdictions, Conflicts* (Pisa, 2007), 47-64, here 47.

<sup>8</sup> Jürgen Osterhammel, *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Princeton, 2005), 4, 15; Arneil, ‘Liberal colonialism’, 491, 492.

<sup>9</sup> David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 2000); Julian Goodare, *The Government of Scotland 1560–1625* (Oxford, 2004); Martin MacGregor, ‘The Statutes of Iona – text and context’, *Innes Review* 57 (2) (2006), 111-81; Aonghas MacCoinnich, ‘Siol Torcail and their lordship in the sixteenth century’, in *Crossing the Minch – Exploring the Links between Skye and the Outer Hebrides* (Port of Ness, 2008), 7-32; Alison Cathcart, ‘The Statutes of Iona: the archipelagic context’, *Journal of British Studies* 49 (1) (2009), 4-27; Martin MacGregor, ‘Civilising Gaelic Scotland: The Scottish Isles and the Stewart empire’, in Éamonn Ó Ciardha and Micheál Ó Siochrú (eds), *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice* (Manchester, 2012) 34-54; Aonghas MacCoinnich, *Native and Stranger. Plantation and Civility in the North Atlantic World. The Case of the Northern Hebrides, 1570–1637* (Leiden, 2015). R. A. MacDonald has suggested that the process of ‘internal colonialism’ is also present in relation to the fourteenth-century Gàidhealtachd. R. A. McDonald, *The Kingdom of the Isles. Scotland’s Western Seaboard c.1000–c.1336* (East Linton, 1997), 139.

---

<sup>10</sup> James Hunter, *On the Other Side of Sorrow. Nature and People in the Scottish Highlands*, (Edinburgh, 1995), 28, 144; James Hunter, *Rights-based Land Reform in Scotland: Making the case in the light of international experience – a discussion paper for Community Land Scotland* (Unpublished, 2014), 13; Eric Richards, *The Leviathan of Wealth – the Sutherland Fortune in the Industrial Revolution* (London, 1973), 285; Eric Richards, ‘Scotland and the uses of the Atlantic empire’, in Bernard Bailyn and Philip.D. Morgan (eds), *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1991), 67-114, here 92-95, 107-111; Richards, *Highland Clearances*, 79. The third chapter of Richards’ book on Patrick Sellar and the Sutherland Estate is entitled ‘Colonising Sutherland and the Dazzling Plans of 1809’, a reference to the view of the soon-to-be estate commissioner William Young in 1809 that Sutherland was ‘the new colony’ (see also paragraph at n.40, this article). Richards, *Patrick Sellar*, 59. Other recent historiography on landholding in the modern Gàidhealtachd has tended to take the land risings of the late nineteenth century as a starting point. The emphasis of major work by Ewen Cameron, Andrew Newby and Annie Tindley looks forward to the consequences of the risings in the twentieth century, rather than back to the structural changes that helped to provoke them. Ewen Cameron, *Land for the People? The British Government and the Scottish Highlands, c. 1880–1925* (East Linton, 1996); Andrew G. Newby, *Ireland, Radicalism and the Scottish Highlands, c. 1870–1912* (Edinburgh, 2006); Annie Tindley, *The Sutherland Estate, 1850–1920: Aristocratic Decline, Estate Management and Land Reform* (Edinburgh, 2010).

<sup>11</sup> Osterhammel, *Colonialism*, 3, 4.

<sup>12</sup> David Cannadine, ‘The empire strikes back’, *Past and Present*, 147 (1) (1995), 180-94, here 183.

<sup>13</sup> J. G .A. Pocock, *The Discovery of Islands. Essays in British History* (Cambridge, 2005), 155.

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism. A Historical Introduction* (Oxford, 2001), 17.

<sup>15</sup> James Tully, 'The struggles of indigenous peoples of and for freedom', in *Public Philosophy in a New Key. Volume I: Democracy and Civic Freedom* (Cambridge, 2008), 36-59; Arneil, 'Liberal colonialism'; Cole Harris, 'How did colonialism dispossess? Comments from an edge of empire', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (1) (2004), 165-82. Arneil's analysis suggests that domestic colonies are a development of the nineteenth century. The present article suggests her analysis can be drawn back at least a century further, and affirms her important conclusion that 'liberal colonialism' is a phenomenon that must be understood as being central to the constitution of imperial states, as well as to their empires. Arneil, 'Liberal colonialism', 522, 523. In particular, and in light of this article's later discussion of Michael Hechter's thesis of internal colonialism in Britain's Celtic fringe, Tully's theory of 'internal colonization' is of interest as it does not treat the 'internal' aspect of the colonial process as an 'artificial analogy' of external colonization – a criticism levelled at many internal colonial analyses. However, Tully's theory is based on colonization in North America and covers the whole colonial process there from the moment of 'first contact' until the present day. Although deeply insightful, this makes the scope of his theory too large to fit easily with the more restricted period covered by this article. It may, however, have the potential to help disclose the existence of broadly colonial processes and attitudes towards Gaels in Scotland as far back as the eleventh century.

<sup>16</sup> Osterhammel, *Colonialism*, x, xi, 10-12, 32.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 15, 16.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 16, 17.

<sup>20</sup> Young, *Postcolonialism*, 17, 26, 27; Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, *Postcolonial Studies*, 54.

---

<sup>21</sup> Osterhammel's argument is a little unclear at this point as he describes this form of colonialism first as 'internal colonialism' before then describing it as 'informal colonialism' without explaining why he has changed the term. Osterhammel, *Colonialism*, 17.

<sup>22</sup> Hind, 'Internal Colonial Concept', 552, 553, 555. See also Hunter, *Internal Colonialism Review*, 104.

<sup>23</sup> Silke Stroh, *Uneasy Subjects: Postcolonialism and Scottish Gaelic Poetry* (Amsterdam, 2011), 14, 15, 22, 328, 333.

<sup>24</sup> Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics Volume 1: Regarding Method* (Cambridge, 2002), 47, 51.

<sup>25</sup> Several historians of the Gàidhealtachd have developed an 'internal colonial' analysis. Allan MacInnes (1988) argued that the cumulative result of tenurial changes was to entrench the Gàidhealtachd as a net exporter of manpower and raw materials such that it 'became an internal colony rather than a beneficiary of empire'. Eric Richards argued that the Gàidhealtachd was 'essentially semicolonial within the internal British world' and, moreover, that it became in the eighteenth century 'an internal colony that served as a demographic and military reservoir for service in the external colonies' of the British imperial system. Andrew MacKillop proposed that late eighteenth century military recruitment – manpower as a commodity – can be considered the 'market niche' of the Gàidhealtachd's underdeveloped economy and that the area can in this sense be considered an internal colony. MacInnes (in 1996) has since moved away from his initial view, claiming that the case for internal colonialism is only 'superficial' as 'indigenous landlords' were 'the principal instruments of economic and social change' – a point also raised by MacKillop. MacInnes is surely right to emphasise the principal role of indigenous leaders as instruments of internal colonialism, a process whose existence in the seventeenth century Martin MacGregor has noted. However, given that the co-option of local elites is widely recognised as a common feature of colonial

---

situations, it is not clear why Macinnes believes the occurrence of this phenomenon in the Gàidhealtachd negates his original position. Silke Stroh and Robert Young are among the scholars who have commented on native cooperation with imperialism. MacKillop expresses a further doubt about the Gàidhealtachd's internal colony status. He argues that Gaels' active role in serving the empire can be seen as an inversion of internal colonization. However, applying the native cooperation observation to, for instance, the deployment of Gurkha regiments in India and elsewhere during the British empire appears to alleviate such doubts. Allan Macinnes, 'Scottish Gaeldom: the first phase of clearance', in T. M. Devine and Rosalind Mitchison (eds), *People and Society in Scotland Volume 1, 1760–1830* (Edinburgh, 1988), 70-90, at 85; Allan Macinnes, *Clanship, Commerce and the House of Stuart, 1603–1788* (East Linton, 1996), 223, 224; Richards, 'Uses of the Atlantic Empire', 95, 107; MacKillop, *More Fruitful*, 240, 241. Stroh, *Uneasy Subjects*, 28, 29, 330; Young, *Postcolonialism*, 74. See also Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, *Postcolonial Studies*, 48, 73, 74.

<sup>26</sup> It would also support postcolonial scholars' use of the language of 'colonization' and 'decolonization' in their ideological and discursive analyses of power relations and cultural attitudes in the late modern Gàidhealtachd.

<sup>27</sup> Martin Martin's proposal, first published in 1695, to establish a 'fishing colony' on Skye and his extended, and in places perhaps imaginative, description of the exploitable resources of the Western Isles may be indicative of the influence on him of his connections with the London-based Royal Society which was pioneering new methods and enterprises of scientific enquiry. Eric Cregeen's seminal analysis of tenurial change on the Argyll Estates in the early eighteenth century suggests that following their 'conquest and annexation' of the territories of the Macleans of Duart in Morvern, Mull and Tiree, the Campbells entered these areas as 'colonizers' in a way similar to the MacKenzies on Lewis a century or so earlier. Martin

---

Martin, *A Description of the Western Islands of Scotland Circa 1695* (Edinburgh, 1999), 200-8, here 3, 202, 204. Eric Cregeen, 'The tacksmen and their successors: a study of tenurial reorganisation in Mull, Morvern and Tiree in the early eighteenth century', *Scottish Studies* 13 (2) (1969), 93-144 and reprinted in Margaret Bennett (ed.), *Recollections of an Argyllshire Drover and other West Highland Chronicles* (Ochertyre, 2013). For further information on the Campbell annexation and its support from the Scottish Crown, see also Macinnes, *Clanship*, 46, 134-7.

<sup>28</sup> Commissioners to the Annexed Estates, *Present State of Husbandry in Scotland: Extracted from the reports made to the Commissioners to the Annexed Estates and published by their authority*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1778), 17, 62, 64, 141, 150. See also A. H. Miller (ed.), *A Selection of Scottish Forfeited Estate Papers* (Edinburgh, 1909), 237, 262; MacKillop, *More Fruitful*, 77.

<sup>29</sup> MacKillop, *More Fruitful*, 82, 90-4, 100, 242, 243.

<sup>30</sup> Fredrik Albritton Jonsson, *Enlightenment's Frontier: The Scottish Highlands and the Origins of Environmentalism* (New Haven, CT, 2013), 3, 31-4.

<sup>31</sup> A useful account of the development of these colonies is given in M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement: A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action* (Cambridge, 1938), 201-8.

<sup>32</sup> John Knox, *A Discourse on the Expediency of Establishing Fishing Stations or Small Towns in the Highlands of Scotland and the Hebride Islands* (London, 1786), 12.

<sup>33</sup> G. Mackenzie, *A General View of the Agriculture of the Counties of Ross and Cromarty* (London, 1810), 262-5. The experiment at Ullapool was not the end of proposals for 'fishing colonies'. George Mackenzie himself published a letter supporting a different kind of fishing colony, to be led by Dutch fishermen, in Sutherland; further representations on the issue led a Parliamentary Committee, in their consideration of a harbour at Wick in Caithness, to

---

propose that ‘We might even establish there a colony of Dutch fishermen, skilled in the Herring fishery’. The 1845 Statistical Account claimed there had been several failed attempts to establish ‘fishing colonies’ on Harris and in the 1880s a Skye delegate to the Napier Commission discussed the existence of a ‘fishing colony’ in the area of Glendale. Mackenzie, *General View Ross and Cromarty*, 306; Parliamentary Papers [PP] 1806, *Report from Committee on the Funds of the Forfeited Estates in Scotland*, 16; *The New Statistical Account of Scotland Vol XIV Inverness-Ross and Cromarty* (Edinburgh, 1845), 157; *Evidence taken by Her Majesty’s Commissioners of Inquiry into the Condition of the Crofters and Cottars in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland*, Vol.1 (London, 1884), 436.

<sup>34</sup> David Young, *National Improvements Upon Agriculture in 27 Essays* (Edinburgh, 1785), 217, 231, 233, 242, 336, 343.

<sup>35</sup> Mackenzie, *General View Ross and Cromarty*, 300, 301.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 301.

<sup>37</sup> Sir John Sinclair, ‘Accounts of the improvements carried on in the County of Caithness for the years 1801, 1802 and 1803’, Appendix no. 1 in Capt. John Henderson, *General View of the Agriculture of the County of Caithness: with Observations on the Means of its Improvement* (London, 1815), 19, 74, 75.

<sup>38</sup> Henderson, *General View*, 208; Sinclair, ‘Accounts of the improvements’, 59.

<sup>39</sup> James Loch, *An Account of the Improvements on the Estates of the Marquess of Stafford in the Counties of Stafford and Salop and on the Estate of Sutherland* (London, 1820), 110.

<sup>40</sup> Richards, *Highland Clearances*, 217; Eric Richards, ‘The prospect of economic growth in Sutherland at the time of the clearances 1809 to 1813’, *Scottish Historical Review* 49 (2) (1970), 154-70, here 164.

<sup>41</sup> Sinclair, ‘Accounts of the Improvements’, 25, 30-2.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

---

<sup>43</sup> Sinclair, *General Report*, 120.

<sup>44</sup> Jonsson, *Enlightenment's Frontier*, 243.

<sup>45</sup> PP 1831, *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to consider of The Poor Laws*, 271-6; Sir Robert Wilton Horton, *Lectures on Statistics and Political Economy* (London, 1832), 5-8, 15-18; Thomas Chalmers, *On Political Economy. In Connexion with the Moral State and Moral Prospects of Society* (Glasgow, 1832), 556, 557 and passim; Robert Owen, *Development of the Principle and Plans on which to Establish Self-Supporting Home Colonies* (London, 1841); Duncan Bowie, *The Radical and Socialist Tradition in British Planning. From Puritan Colonies to Garden Cities* (London, 2017) 48, 49; 'Emigration and home colonization', in *The Journal of Agriculture and Transactions of the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1843), 41-7; Robert Somers, *Letters from the Highlands, or, The Famine of 1847* (London, 1848), 110-16, 150, 151; *The Morning News*, 8 May 1884, p.5; Annie Tindley and Eric Richards, 'Turmoil among the crofters: Evander McIver and the "Highland Question" 1873-1903', *Agricultural History Review* 60 (2) (2012), 206.

<sup>46</sup> Andrew Wiseman, 'Islands Penal Colonies', *Scottish Islands Explorer* 18 (2) (Mar./Apr., 2017).

<sup>47</sup> PP 1830, *Report of the Select Committee on the State of the Poor in Ireland*, 40; PP 1830, *Third Report of Evidence from the Select Committee on the State of the Poor in Ireland*, 500, 653.

<sup>48</sup> Although he does not use colony types in his description, in substance the assessment here follows Eric Richards' assessment of the estate reorganisation plans of the countess of Sutherland both before and after the arrival of William Young and Patrick Sellar. Richards, *Patrick Sellar*, 39, 55.

<sup>49</sup> Osterhammel, *Colonialism*, 26, 108, 109.



---

<sup>50</sup> Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, *Postcolonial Studies*, 54, 55.

<sup>51</sup> Colin Kidd, 'Race, empire and the limits of nineteenth century Scottish nationhood', *The Historical Journal* 46 (4) (2003), 873-92, here 877; Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600 – 2000* (Cambridge, 2006), 2f.

<sup>52</sup> Kidd, 'Race, empire and the limits', 878.

<sup>53</sup> Juliet Shields, *Sentimental Literature and Anglo Scottish Identity 1745–1820* (Cambridge, 2010), 39. Arguably, in a broader sense the racialisation of Gaels in Scotland can be traced back into the medieval period. See Martin MacGregor, 'Gaelic barbarity and Scottish identity in the later middle ages', in Dauvit Broun and Martin MacGregor (eds), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander'?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow, 2007), 7-48. For Kames and wasteland cultivation, see reference at n.30, this article.

<sup>54</sup> In earlier work Colin Kidd described Pinkerton as holding a 'racist ideology'. However, in subsequent work Kidd consistently appears to distance himself from the term 'racist' when describing the race-based prejudices held by Pinkerton and Robert Knox towards Gaels, choosing instead to label these as 'racialist'. In his article 'Race, Empire and the limits of Scottish Nationhood' Kidd only uses the word 'racist' to describe the attitudes of what he calls 'Scottish imperialists' when their race-based prejudice was being applied to situations that we might now call 'external colonial' relations. Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism. Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 2004 [1999]), 204; Kidd, 'Race, empire and the limits', 879, 881, 882; Colin Kidd, 'Ethnicity in the British Atlantic World 1688–1830', in Kathleen Wilson (ed.), *A New Imperial History. Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire 1660–1840* (Cambridge, 2004), 260-81, here n.13; Kidd, *Forging of the Races*, 110, 111.

---

<sup>55</sup> John Pinkerton, *An Inquiry into the History of Scotland Preceding the Reign of Malcolm III or the Year 1056 Including the Authentic History of that Period*, 2 vols (London, 1794), ii, 139.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 140. The difference between them is that Sinclair believed in colonization as a means of improving the ‘situation, habits and prejudices’ of the people being colonized (see paragraph at n.37); for Pinkerton colonization was simply a means to dispose of them.

<sup>57</sup> Pinkerton, *An Inquiry*, i, 341.

<sup>58</sup> David Theo Goldberg, *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning* (Oxford, 1993), 64; Kidd, ‘Race, empire and the limits’, 877, 878.

<sup>59</sup> Robert Knox, *The Races of Men. A Fragment*, (Philadelphia, PA, 1850), 22.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 21, 27.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 27, 44, 49.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 60, 253.

<sup>64</sup> Krisztina Fenyő, *Contempt, Sympathy and Romance. Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands and the Clearances during the Famine Years 1845-1855* (East Linton, 2000), 10, 32, 85, 86. For criticism of Fenyő’s work, see the review by Ewen Cameron in *The Journal of Scottish Historical Studies* 21 (1) (2001), 77-9.

<sup>65</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* (Princeton, NJ, 1981 [1871]), 174.

<sup>66</sup> Osterhammel, *Colonialism*, 109, 110.

<sup>67</sup> Loch, *Improvements*, 73.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 44, 45, 51, 53, 60.

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 133; Harris, ‘How did colonialism dispossess?’, 174. For the similar policies of Sutherland Estate and Sir John Sinclair, see paragraph at n.39; for Sir John Sinclair’s intention to transform the people, see paragraph at n.37.

<sup>70</sup> Osterhammel, *Colonialism*, 16, 109; See also Jürgen Osterhammel, *Europe, the “West” and the Civilizing Mission. The 2005 Annual Lecture of the German Historical Institute of London* (London, 2006).

<sup>71</sup> R. J. Adam (ed.), *Papers on Sutherland Estate Management*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1972), 175, 176.

<sup>72</sup> Richards, *Patrick Sellar*, 285, 286.

<sup>73</sup> Fenyö, *Contempt*, 86.

<sup>74</sup> T. M. Devine, *The Great Highland Famine: Hunger, Emigration and the Scottish Highlands in the Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh, 1988), 251.

<sup>75</sup> T. M. Devine, *To the Ends of the Earth: Scotland’s Global Diaspora* (London, 2011), 119. For discussion of ethnic cleansing in the Gàidhealtachd, see also Fenyö, *Contempt*, 90-2.

<sup>76</sup> The situation is more complicated than the limited analysis presented here. The three administrators examined in this article are non-Gaels. However, in the nineteenth century many of those who were controlling land tenure change and industrial development in the area were Gaels, a situation consistent with imperialism’s co-option of native elites (see n.25) Using the ideas of cognitive polyphasia (the ability to successfully hold two contradictory ideas at once) and cognitive dissonance (the emergence of an awareness of the contradiction) from social psychology, I have elsewhere investigated the late nineteenth-century Royal Commissions on land in the Gàidhealtachd as a crucible in which the attitudes and actions of some of the native elites responsible for land tenure change could be tested and questioned. The analysis there supports the view of the nineteenth century land reformer Alexander MacKenzie on one of the native elite widely accused of oppressing the people – Donald

---

MacDonald of Tormore, a farmer and factor [estate administrator] on Skye. Shortly after MacDonald's deprivations had been given a full public airing at a sitting of the Napier Commission, MacKenzie wrote: 'Tormore, the factor, and Tormore, the man, are evidently two widely different persons. Indeed this is the case with most of his class.' Aya Ikegame's study of colonial Mysore in India has emphasised the alienation and 'split identities' that can result when native elites are educated into the employment of the imperial system. In the context of colonial Kenya, the Gĩkũyũ novelist and scholar Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o has called this process 'colonization of the mind'. The analysis based on the Royal Commissions suggests that factors who were primarily 'practical farmers', such as 'Tormore', may have been more likely to experience dissonance than factors who were also professional lawyers, such as Alexander MacDonald of Treaslane, when both types were questioned on the difference between, on the one hand, their general sentiments towards other Gaels, and, on the other, their practices towards them as factor. Iain MacKinnon, "Eachdraidh nar cuimhne" – "History in our memories": an analysis of the idea that the Highlands and Islands of Scotland can be understood as a site of colonisation', unpublished PhD thesis (University of Ulster, 2011), 402-16, here 414; Aya Ikegame, *Princely India Re-imagined: A Historical Anthropology of Mysore from 1799 to the Present* (Oxford, 2013), 54, 55; Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o, *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (London, 1986).

<sup>77</sup> John MacInnes, *Dùthchas nan Gàidheal. Selected Essays of John MacInnes edited by Michael Newton* (Edinburgh, 2006), passim, here 266.

<sup>78</sup> Iain Crichton Smith, 'Real people in a real place', in *Towards the Human* (Edinburgh, 1986), 13-70, here 18, 37, 38, 42, 51, 68, 70.

<sup>79</sup> Wa Thiong'o, *Decolonizing the Mind*, 16, 17.

<sup>80</sup> Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples*

---

(Dunedin, 1999), 4, 23, 24, 28, 34. For Tuhiwai Smith's critique of Western ideas about 'authenticity' see, 73, 74.