



• DORNOCH •
HERITAGE • SOCIETY



'The Influence of Scots in Australia'

Talk by

Ian Fraser

22nd October 2009

Well I can't tell you how thrilled I am to be here this evening to talk about the Scots in Australia. I first delivered this paper in a part of a doctoral programme in 1984 and can I tell you the havoc that it caused you just won't believe. It was in Edinburgh University and it was a very, very large audience and there were two professors there that I didn't know at the time, one called Geoff Bolton from Murdoch University in Perth and the other one a guy called Professor Eric Richards and his books there, he wrote the definitive history of the Highland Clearances so I commend all these books on there to let you have a look at.

And I was petrified when I was told that these guys were there because they were the preeminent historians from Australia and on Scottish history, the links between Scotland and Australia. But can I tell you, when I read their books I've never heard so much rubbish in all my life. It was astounding and I hope to be able to clear that up for you.

My ancestors here, their photographs and their diaries are on the desk here if you want to have a look at them later on. The first guy who left was a fella called Colin Fraser and he sailed to Australia in 1863 and his diary is there and the copper plate writing is just astonishing. And his son, and you may wonder what this, what is he, I've got this, this is a piece of silver ore from the mines in a place called Port Pirie just north of Adelaide where his son, who was eventually knighted, became Sir Colin Fraser as my great grandfather owned this silver mine.

So that's going to be another one of the major planks I'm going to put here. He sent this to me by post in something like 1950 and at that time I was madly in love with Roy Rogers who had silver guns and I got this came from your uncle's, Uncle Colin's silver mine in Australia and I thought terrific. So I painted it black to make sure nobody stole it and I can't get the paint off it to this day which is that there's an Australian coin melted into the middle of it as well that he sent me so I was greatly thrilled to know that this famous man.

One of the other planks of the talk that I'm going to give to you, we hear so much about the clearances and how evil and how bad they were but I wonder if there was some historical research done on who was the most successful? Those who left or those who stayed? Well my father was the only one who stayed. Three brothers went to Australia taken out by Sir Colin Fraser. One went to America, one went to Spain, one went to England and my father stayed and you can see how poor I am when all the rest of them fly over regularly and so on and so forth.

So that's part of it and it's to again extend how the county of Sutherland, what it contributed to Australia. For example my grandmother on my father's side was the first cousin of Brigadier Sir Ivan Mackay who was in charge of the defence of Australia during the Second World War and Sir Colin Fraser who ended up filthy rich and so many other Frasers. One other little, I met a group of Australians not all that long ago and they said where are you from? I said Scotland.

They said what's your name? I said Fraser and of course there was a prime minister in Australia called Malcolm Fraser and they said oh god you're a Fraser. That guy Malcolm Fraser, the worst prime minister we've ever had. In fact he said over in Australia now we say if you're having a bad day you say I'm having a Fraser of a day.

So you're about to have a Fraser of a night whether you like it or not. What I intend to do first of all is to do a very, very, these little handouts I gave you is purely the precursor to the paper that I'm about to deliver tonight but I thought I would sort of couch it in terms that you might understand where the controversy was actually coming from and this paper that I read at the symposium at Edinburgh University was then published twice in refereed journals in Australia. Not in this country but the Aussies loved it so that will do.

So the central debate, and this is the, were the reasons for the qualitative impact of the Scots in early Australian history due to notions of the individually brilliant Scot and that's the great writers Richards and Prentice and Macmillan were saying. The other one was due to clannishness. In fact Geoff Bolton said, he called it they stuck together like bricks.

So the clan system was it. And then the Protestant work ethic. The great thing about the Scots were they didn't like handouts and they worked very hard and they were thrifty.

What they actually meant they were mean. So that was the backbone thesis of all that work on Australian Scottish history. The individually brilliant Scot, clannishness and the Protestant work ethic.

Well I just didn't agree with it and I did a lot of interesting stuff. Just another little aside, I was sitting in the university library at Stirling that holds all the archives for immigration to

Australia. And I'd been there for a week looking through and I said, God there's an amazing number of grants have emigrated to Australia.

So I wonder why, what was so wrong with Glyne Morrison, why all the grants were leaving? And then after a little bit more research into it, it found was when they were corrupt and saying to the guy who was recording, and who are you? He said, oh I'm a grant. Meaning they were grant aided. It was nothing to do with their name.

So he said, oh you're a grant. First name John, John Grant, that's fine. The grants must have been the biggest clan in Scotland because there was about 130,000 of them went but it was grant aided and that was an interesting piece of research that came out.

So here's the main, David S Macmillan, his wonderful book Scotland and Australia 1788 to 1860. Malcolm Prentice, The Scots in Australia. Professor Gerald Bolton, The Rise of Burns and Philp 1873 to 1893.

A. Henderson, Early Pioneer Families of Victoria and Riverina. And Eric Richards, A History of the Highland Clearances. And T.C. Smythe, Professor Christopher Smout, A History of the Scottish People 1560 to 1830.

And he's at St Andrews. So these were very much the works that I looked at in this context. The other primary sources, and I've got it again in the table here, is my family Bible.

Goes back to 1823 and I'll come back to that. The diaries of Colin Fraser and Sir Colin Fraser, his son, with photographs are on the desk here if anyone wants to look at that. His obituary and newspaper articles concerning the family Fraser and how rich they had become, and who's who, to give you some idea of the extras that I looked at.

So here's the key questions. What made this extraordinary scenario possible? Because the Scots were last to go to Australia. We much preferred going to Canada.

We didn't like America terribly much, but we had a long, long tradition of going to Canada. Also, believe it not, to South Africa and India. We were very late to emigrate to Australia.

The English, Welsh and Irish were there in much greater numbers long before the Scots went. And then how did it become to be allowed? What made the Scots so successful there? And why did the English allow that to happen? So that was the orthodoxy that we've looked at there. As a revisionist historian, this is what I was, and these are the backbones of the institution of poverty, the institution of rejection, and the institution of establishment.

And the institution of poverty, to cover Ireland and the Irish who went there. The institution of rejection is the English and Welsh who were sent there from the hulks as prisoners, etc, to Australia. And the institution of establishment, the excuse for why the Scots were so successful there.

And the key concepts that I'll be looking at tonight are this concept of Geoff Bolton, sticking together like bricks, Scotland as an institution, rational economic decisions, the role of the Kirk, the role of Macquarie and Langmuir, Scottish lawyers and accountants, absent male economies, and the role of women and freemasonry. So these will give us, I hope, another

insight to it as I look, and then at the end of it, I will look at the clearances. So what are the flaws in the orthodoxy? The wrong explanations of Scottish cohesiveness.

I reject completely that it was anything to do with clannishness, because the vast majority of Scots who went to Australia were from the borders and from the central belt. Rational economic decisions versus clannishness. It wasn't because we stuck together because we were all from the same clan.

That's just not true. It was because of rational economic decisions. And the other point was the Scottish literacy and numeracy and understanding of the English legal system and international accounting method.

And if you have a look at the handwriting of the guy who wrote the diary in 1863 as he sailed there, it is absolutely copperplate. His equivalent from a wee country place like Port Scara, the vast majority of Europe couldn't write, never mind read in these days. So the Scottish education, albeit based on the church, was way ahead of everything else.

The other one is the omission of women. All of these guys that I said to you that have written the great orthodoxies on Scots in Australia, completely ignore women, which is an astonishing thing, as I hope to be able to convince you of. The feudal clan system or the clannishness was long since dead. And Freemasonry, as I say, a misdelivered aristocratic benevolence.

And the conclusions, I would like further comparative research to be done. Scotland and Ireland, I would like to see a comparison made of that, and Scotland and England and Wales, how that came about, and further research. And this is really the background of it. In February 1982, I came up to see my parents who lived in Stafford Road, and I drove up for an appointment at Dounreay. And it was a beautiful day. And I drove up the east coast there and I thought, wow, I've got to come back here sometime. And here I am. But the point was, I got to Dounreay in the morning. And four hours later, when I left, we were a foot deep in snow and I was stuck in Dounreay for a week before we came out in a convoy. The weather was so bad.

Now, if you drive from Helmsdale to Melbury in a snowy day, how could anyone have possibly have lived there? How could anyone possibly have lived there and benefited from it? And I hope to develop that as well. But I tell you, if you don't believe me, take a tent and pitch it at Forsinard sometime in January and see how long you can stick it. Our folks did, mind you, they didn't live very long, as I'll go on.

So the journal articles, they printed, if anyone's interested, 'The Reason for the Quality of Scots', Journal of Australian Studies, number 19, 1986. And this one here is on the desk again, 'The Scots in Australia', The British and Australian Association, volume one, number two. OK, so if I can deliver this paper to you, and I'll be very happy to answer any questions to the best of my ability at the end of it.

An orthodoxy, somewhat surprisingly, considering the lack of ambition in that direction, has grown around one remarkable piece of history on Scotland and Australia. I refer, of course, to David S. Macmillan's opus, Scotland and Australia, 1788 to 1860. Touching on, but giving no special paramountcy to such ideas as the individually brilliant Scot, clannishness and the Protestant work ethic, Macmillan's contribution to the central debate has proved to date to

be not only wholly acceptable due to the excellence of both his research and his intuition, but also irresistible to successive historians.

Eminent writers such as Professors Eric Richards and Geoff Bolton have confirmed many of his conclusions under the three terms highlighted above. Moreover, in recent publications, *The Scots and Australian*, Malcolm D. Prentice has comfortably extended the orthodoxy through to 1900. However, it is under these headings together with three others, conspicuous by their absence, in most learned papers that this report wishes to take issue with the orthodoxy.

At the same time, it is hoped that some new insights may be revealed on the special relationship between the two countries. Whilst there is no doubt that Scotland produced a goodly number of famous Australian sons, disproportionate to her number of immigrants, two vital questions need to be asked. Firstly, how was this possible? And secondly, how did it come to be allowed? How did the authorities allow it to happen? After all, Australia harboured many more English and Irish folk and the Scots were fairly late in arriving on the scene.

The first hypothesis is that the Scots came to Australia differently and endured their first years there against an atypical back cloth from that of the majority of their fellow Britishers. I would argue that the Irish came to Australia via the institution of poverty. In other words, from a zero base, economically speaking.

They also came leaderless in the sense that their supervision emanated from an establishment that found them in the main loathsome. Many of them, for example, were transported criminals or camp followers of the like, and many of the rest were stamped as rebellious or radical. Further, a hostile elite did nothing to foster their integration into the daily life of the colony, which reflexively and effectively militated against their economic or otherwise advancement.

More likely, it encouraged the ensuing mythology that grew around the criminal outcast. Also, the improvements they experienced in their standard of living in terms of climate, employment and sustenance from the aforementioned zero base engendered in them an initial apathy that self-prescribed them from much of the waiting Australian bounty. The English and Welsh immigrants came via the institution of rejection.

Many, as with the Irish, were transportees and suffered similarly under an oppressive regime. The rest were either the religiously disowned or the unemployed flotsam that Malthusian Westminster was glad to be rid of. However, this alienation did not lessen on arrival in Australia.

In fact, in many cases, it was heightened. Such circumstances were not conducive to producing many instances of overnight success for such people. However, those Englishmen who did have a nearly impact in Australia tended to be of the elitist echelons back home and were often the second sons of the old landed interest attempting to establish their own dynasties on the Australian back.

Others were civil servants with the authority to forage where best they could in order to establish Australia as certainly British. The imported English legal system, of course, not only encouraged such manoeuvres, but also drew such prominent English names as Sturt and

Henty. However, in proportion to the English number, such instances of fame do not measure those of the Scot.

So how did the Scot come to Australia? Surprisingly, via the institution of establishment. He was selected to go because he was valued not only by establishment bodies, but also privately by such as existing entrepreneurial spirits in Australia. He was in demand by these different power centres for a number of disparate, but vitally important reasons.

He was, for example, more Protestant than the Irishman was Catholic. Very surprising. His countrymen back home were not feared to be seeking independence from the British monarchy and constitution.

In 1707, for example, he'd aligned himself with England in the cause of economic betterment rather than continuing to go it alone. Had Scotland not teamed up with England in 1707, we would have been the ultimate backwater in Europe. I don't think there's any question about that and I'll develop that as we go on.

In other words, he was a conformist and as such potentially a positive force in the maintenance of a colony. Moreover, his history of individualism grounded in his religion made him ever more acceptable to emerging laissez-faire and liberal impulses in industrialising England. It would seem then that he was the man for the hour.

Further, he'd already shown a preference for working within a constitution he recognised by generally choosing Canada as opposed to America in his early migration patterns. Australia, by the 1820s, the first decade of a marked Scottish exodus to the Antipodes, was similarly blessed. He was thus patronised and favoured by the establishment.

In addition, his excellent track record of surviving abroad in such places as India and Canada and of purposefully contributing to their development, together with his traditional willingness to adapt to his environment, removed him from any risk category and assured him of encouragement and of being used by the elite in the furtherance of their cause. Secondly, private interests similarly recognised his worth. He had the reputation of being hard working and thrifty.

He had his own entrepreneurial instincts. He was reared to fend for himself, rejecting to a greater degree than other immigrants did, the desire for charity. And this last element gives glimpse at least to two possible factors of why the Scot had such an impact in Australia.

Firstly, the Scot, in his distaste for handouts, gave rise to certain business innovations back home. Often, for example, the businesses seeking Scottish help in Australia were in fact home-based organisations that they knew and trusted their fellows. The migration flow thus ensured them a colonial market.

Also, it provided these companies with the opportunity to lend their free capital to a low-risk group. The Scottish-Australian Company of Aberdeen was one such firm. It gave an enormous number of loans to the Scots in Australia because they had nothing better to do with their money and it turned out to be very good.

All of their eggs were not merely in the export of goods market, the home-based enterprises that thus became merchants of all trades, namely as exporters, importers, loan companies and passenger ferries, as my great-great-grandfather did in 1863. So therefore they were charging them to go out, they were charging them loans, they were bringing stuff back from Australia. This was the first great economic betterment of the Scots from that point of view.

This in turn led to the need for strong representation of their interests abroad. They sent the best men available and this factor of good men being in Australia was further broadened by the fact that the Scot did not come leaderless. The church via such as James Dunmore Lang provided much of the early direction.

Also, the newly redundant taxmen, not TAX, T-A-C-K-S, tacksmen, were often given the brief to take the chief's children to the colonies and ensure their welfare. They were also given money to meet this end. Therefore, we have a picture emerging of how it was possible for the Scot to come to eminence in so short a space of time and against all numerical odds.

And secondly, we are thereby given insights into why this phenomenon was allowed to take place. In the light of the above, this paper questions the individually brilliant Scot theory on two grounds. Firstly, it suggests that the prominence gained by many immigrant Scots was thrust upon them rather than gained independently.

Old ties with the homeland, such as the chief's bounty and authority, guaranteed the custodians of the chief's children a measure of visible influence. Also, the old institutions of Kirk and school gave some the security to be aggressive to the point of prominence. Rather than representing themselves, they achieved fame as the agents of a greater force.

J. Dunmore Lang is surely an example of this phenomenon. Again, the new institutions of commercial enterprise provided many with a sound base for personal advancement. They being in the front line of their company's development, were briefed to exploit the situation and to react to opportunities as they availed themselves, whilst many of them, such as Morehead, did exercise individual brilliance.

It was not of the swashbuckling type, rather it was similar in nature to that of Dunmore Lang on the back of a grander concept and easily described by the word management and empire building. The Scots were good at that, not on behalf of their own individual selves, but on behalf of institutions. They had a bigger back cloth to work against.

And in fact, Morehead was the guy who decided that, especially in the Scottish areas of location in Australia, that our native sheep were no good because we're coming from the Arctic, taking them to a place as warm and as bereft of greenery as Australia. So what happened was, on the way to Australia, he stopped off in Spain and took a lot of Spanish sheep out to the colonies. And that was one of the brilliant factors that Morehead did.

So firstly, it suggests that the prominence gained by many immigrants' thoughts was first of all, sorry, this being the front line of their companies on the back of a grander concept. Secondly, and as an offshoot of the above, the institutional ties with the homeland provided the immigrant Scot with a stout framework for his personal success. Therefore, once again, it was not his individual flair that brought this to fruition.

More, it was his ability to make use of the advantages that were provided for him. For example, a leadership of such as a taxman gave the rank and file the opportunity to tap into expertise. This fostered in the individual the confidence to take risks.

Also, the ethics of his Kirk bred in him the old values of hard work, thrift, honesty, and individualism, which in human terms made him agreeable, if not to everyone, then certainly to himself and those who mattered. Furthermore, the ambitious new institutions valued his success. They saw him as a reliable employee and as mentioned above, as a reliable borrower who would use the loans not only to better himself, but also to expand the commercial potential of the companies themselves.

He was thus given every encouragement to make good. Naturally, such a vibrant economic activity delivered individuals into prominence. However, as suggested, the successes came via the benefits of being tied to Scotland spiritually and economically rather than through the sheer force of being a gifted individual in the sense of Carnegie and others on the American scene.

In other words, all of these happy coincidences together with the tacit approval of government go far in explaining the qualitative impact made by the Scots in Australia. The opportunity was his and he exploited it. Such was not the lot of most of the Irish, Welsh, and English immigrants.

Smart Scottish interests such as the lawyer-led commercial enterprises allowed this no smarter than his fellow Scot the chance to develop. Thus he came to have one foot still firmly planted in the old country through either the establishments that he'd carried with him, through either the establishments of those that had preceded him or those that still controlled him from behind. Moreover, the new institutions experiencing a true measure of economic liberty, probably for the first time, had money that needed worked and the immigrant Scot was the truest beneficiary of this fact.

The relationship between Scotland and the Scottish individual in Australia was very much a two-way street and this greatly contributed to the illusion of clannishness which we will examine below. Therefore, in conclusion, the individually brilliant Scot theory fails because it does not adequately explain the phenomenon of why individual Scots appear to make such a disproportionate impact on early Australian history. The theory implies charismatic properties in individuals whereas from the evidence as presented above, this paper suggests that the reality lay in the charismatic qualities of Scotland as a total concept.

Her institutions old and new, her culture and traditions, her entrepreneurial spirit, all bloomed together as a unit for the first time and as such pushed up new heads in a foreign and fertile soil, all representative of her roots and of the stem that linked Scotland and Australia. The glory of any part played in the formation of Australia does not lie therefore with the myriad of remembered and lauded Scottish names. It lies irrefutably with the nature of Scotland at that time.

All of this was allowed to happen because a grateful Westminster could not discern any difference between its own names and those of Scotsmen in the matter. Furthermore, it did so because it was cognisant of the benefits being moved by the Scottish force in Australia. For the first time, Scotland was truly on the make abroad.

The second theme of the orthodoxy that attempts to explain Scottish success in Australia is the theory of clownishness. This theory rosily assumes that the visible cohesiveness between Scots was due to ancient and deep-seated family ties, that is the feudal clan system. For so long, a strong image in the eyes of outsiders to Scottishness.

Australian historians such as Professor Bolton have observed from their research that the Scots stuck together like bricks. Of this, there can be no doubt. However, writers such as Prentice have seriously erred by over-interpreting this notion and by under-interpreting the work of Macmillan.

Although a small nation, both geographically and numerically, Scotland's children were and still are unusually diverse in their nature. The Highland Scot had a vastly different culture and language from his lowland brother. Even the Islander had a different set of values from the mainland Northerner.

Moreover, distinct clans followed special gods. Some went for King George, others craved for Bonnie Prince Charlie. The men of Angus had different priorities from the Sutherlander.

Catholicism still had a strong in the North West. The clans also found much to dispute between themselves. They fought bloody encounters through the centuries over land, sheep, and petty insults. In fact, my own clan had a murderous battle called the Battle of the Shirts in 1619 on the shores of Loch Lochy, where the weather was so good, let me surprise you, that they took their shirts off and it was known as the Battle of the Shirts. At the end of the battle, only five Frasers remained and eight of the Clan Ronald, and that was over. They didn't like the lassie that Lord Lovat sent down to Clan Ronald to marry his son. She wasn't a bonnie enough, so let's have a punch up and let's do something dramatic. Consider, for example, the names Campbell and MacDonald.

Others feared a return to feudalism and superstition. The borderers might unite to raid England, but would soon be restored to petty squabbling when back at their own hearths. East and West Coast commercial interests bolted each other's successes. Macmillan even reports of strife between Edinburgh and Leith. Everyone hated the Edinburgh lawmakers. Therefore, there is much in Scottish history to suggest that the idea of clannishness is not very viable.

Moreover, Prentice's major error lies in the fact that he appears to apply it across the Scottish board. Also, he fails to recognise its potentially negative nature in the instances and regions of settlement where it might possibly have applied. Thus, clannishness seen as a normalcy in Scottish social life is plainly a myth.

Moreover, the dominant religion at the time, Presbyterianism, encouraged individualism in deed and thought. Therefore, again, it seems strange to explain the behaviour of such a people by the antithesis of the prevailing Scottish psyche. Clannishness.

It's almost antithetical to the individual throne, which is an astonishing mistake, I believe. In it itself was an imposed system and one which few historians would claim suited the ordinary membership. The rank and file of the chief, they were having a miserable time.

And if you read any of Mendelsohn's accounts when he came to visit the north of Scotland, he was astonished at the poverty of the rank and file. But the huge houses that the chief lived in was an astonishing thing. So clannishness, a haem ad dux.

However, we are left with the fact that the Scots stuck together like bricks. This paper therefore suggests that the rational explanation of this, as with so many other social actions in Scottish life, for example, the union of parliaments, was the result of making rational economic decisions. We were nae daft.

The Scots came together in partnerships. What clannishness was in reality was the common economic aim of making good. The achievement of this end was more likely if, as Macmillan hints, you combined with those you knew, understood and trusted.

In the past, many other nations have displayed similar tendencies that have escaped the charge of clannishness because they did not harbour such a visible yet ancient system within their national identity. Therefore clannishness is too conveniently ascribed to the Scots in the Australian context. The Irish, Welsh and English acted similarly.

But what overshadowed their tendency was Scottish success. Clannishness was the easy explanation of this social interaction. However, the true one was that Scottish institutions, old and new, together with the coincidences of acumen, opportunity and encouragement, brought the Scots together in viable economic units and in a series of common interests and concerns such as the ownership of land.

We understood what owning land meant. In short, the Scots did not stick together like bricks due to the manifestation or resurgence of some ancient social form. More, it was due to a conglomerate of individual economic aims that required a rational degree of mutuality.

His links with the old country lay in the harsher world of economic reality. This was how he came to prosper and how he differed from such as the Irish. As part of the orthodoxy, there is a seemingly sounder case for the theory of the Protestant work ethic and the part it might have played in the Scottish impact on Australia.

The religious basis of the Scots' desire to work hard and be thrifty is possibly true. His religion was coherent on those matters and consistent with them in its promotion of individualism. God helps those who help themselves can be reasonably suggested as the dominant religious theme of the Scot in Australia.

Presbyterian was not a religion that greatly advanced the riches and entry into heaven debate. To be rich was fine, but to flaunt it in conspicuous wealth was sinful. Anyway, there was small chance of that in the Australia of the time.

Also, the church leadership, for example, Dunmore Lang, was to say the least anxious to maintain not only a Protestant domination of the spiritual horizon in Australia, but also of the commercial one. Churches, after all, have to be financed from somewhere. Also, Protestant cohesion was probably made more visible by the leadership's whipping up of anti-Catholic sentiment.

However, several questions must be posed here. Firstly, this paper would argue that Weber's theory is no more presentable in the Australian context than it is anywhere else. Not all Protestant Scots were industrious.

Not all Irish Catholics were apathetic or unsuccessful. What we once more have to confront is the fact that the Scots had old and new institutions working to make success easier for them. The Irish did not enjoy such advantages, or at least did not have them so ready in their cause.

In many ways, it is surprising that there were not more Scottish and even less Irish successes. However, this leads us on to examine some of the negative aspects of Presbyterianism within the context of the central debate. Puritanical jealousy at the advancement of others was a well-known quirk of the Scottish Protestant mind.

Burns and 'Holy Willie's Prayer' made this understood internationally. There was, and presumably still is, in certain religious environments, an invisible hand that prods neighbours into controlling any runaway success by their friends. Henderson, for example, notes cases of boardroom tussles, business disharmony, and dramatic changes in personnel among some of the early partnerships.

Macmillan also reveals instances of profitability being too much to bear in Scotland, and hence the movement of head offices to anonymous London. You would not believe the number of Scottish companies that moved their headquarters to London. It is absolutely astonishing.

Simply, they wanted to spend their money, and they couldn't spend it in Scotland because it was too conspicuous. And so, hence the movement of head office, where presumably, publicists no longer fix themselves on conspicuously crass buyer behaviour. This is, of course, very difficult to assess.

Peter F. Clarke has shown that church attendance, without proclamations of faith, or the lack of both, do not necessarily reflect the reality of an individual's commitment to God and his doctrines. If I say I'm a believer, is it going to do my business any good? And that is the cynical view of it. Therefore, there must still be a case for the theory that suggests that Scottish success was due to industry, financial acumen, and the availability of financial facilities, all swollen by that same vibrant economic environment, rather than it being caused by any religious dimension.

Again, here is a possible misinterpretation of the orthodoxy of one of its main themes. This paper contends, therefore, that whilst it may have correctly isolated certain constituents of the Scottish character, such as industry and thrift, it has erroneously assigned them to a religious driver rather than to an economic one. Again, so far this paper has examined three integral parts of the orthodoxy.

Now it wishes to introduce a vital fourth theme on which that same orthodoxy makes little or no comment. Women are rarely mentioned in the works of Macmillan and Prentice, and even less are they considered. By this omission, both these writers imply that clannishness and the Protestant work ethic were male preserves.

This is patently ridiculous. The Scottish wife, daughter, and granny shared in the Presbyterianism and contributed greatly to the work ethic. This was particularly so in the regions of Scotland that endured an absent male economy.

Dr Angus Calder, for example, has conjectured that when the Caledonian women and children were confronted by the Duke of Sutherland's clearance agencies, it was not because the men were hiding behind skirts, but because they were involved in truck and barter elsewhere. They were taking the cattle from Sutherland and Inverness-shire as far as Manchester. They were droving these beasts to Manchester, Carlisle, Greenock, on the way down.

And in fact, there's a public house in the Piccadilly area of Manchester called the Fat Scott, which must be just a trifle ironic. If you've walked from here to Manchester and back, you're going to be a guy, guy skinny, I suspect. So that's an aspect of it.

So it was not because, in other words, the male went about his economic business in distant parts, assuring the knowledge that his children were being reared in an atmosphere of family and sound religious principles. They were either soldiers, sailors, fishermen, or drovers. They weren't at home.

So somebody was running the show back there. So this fact has several important repercussions for the orthodoxy. Firstly, the cohesiveness of the Scot, if it existed for reasons other than the economic ones I've mentioned above, was a practical product of the women of Scotland.

They passed on their skills, their impressions of the culture, and so on, at that vital and impressionable stage of a child's upbringing, namely the formative years. Had they not shared their husband's religion and commitment to what he held dear, then the Scot would have been a very different animal indeed. Macmillan and Prentice at best assume this fact, but nowhere do they deem it worthy of note or explanation.

Secondly, with regard to the worth ethic, the women passed on not only their practical interpretation of the religious factor, but were also the living examples of true industry. The harvest, the livestock, the peat, the early education of the children, the management of meagre finances, the cooking, the dressmaking, cottage industry, and more, were all part of the Scottish wife's daily life experiences, especially here in the north of Scotland. And as a child, I remember watching an 84-year-old woman with her harvest of peat in her bag, in an alder tree, which she had been up with her to bring down for a little bit.

Thirty-four years ago, absolutely stunning. So, the harvest life of peat early. She knew all about hard physical work, as did her children, as they strove to make ends meet in a harsh physical and economic world.

These were the facts of an absent male economy, and the women played an important part in it. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that in Australia, another palpably absent male economy, especially in the Scottish regions of settlement, the immigrant Scottish female still had her vital role to play. As such, should she not by rights be accorded in true measure her place in any historical overview that tries to account for her place in time? Women greatly influenced the environment in which they lived.

Even more so, the absent male economy was solely dependent on the input of the female for its continuous and viability. However, is this not being found to be a true analysis of so many situations over and above those of the Scot in Australia? In this omission of Macmillan and Prentiss, is it not an endemic sin of historically, of history generally, as a long male-dominated profession? As Alwyn Hughden observes, beside the portrait of the true-born Englishman, I want to see his sister, his mother, his daughter, his wife, his aunt, and his great-grandmother. This paper would also like to see included the font of all knowledge, his granny.

Also, if an Englishman substitutes Scotsman, and that being done, we might be on the move to a fuller social history and a better understanding of the impact of the Scots in Australia. Thus, the orthodoxy is looking ever thinner. The cohesiveness was a fact.

Prentiss and others have perceived it but have wrongly attributed it to some sort of Scottishness. Based on the evidence, a more logical conclusion would appear to be that it emanated from, firstly, rational economic decisions and the system available to the Scots to advance these decisions, and secondly, from a universal and ever more fully recognised contribution made to it by women, particularly profound in an absent male economy. And because of the size of Australia, men would literally be away for a year before coming back to their families in Adelaide or Port Pirie or wherever it happened to be.

Another potential theme missed by the orthodoxy is one that should centre on the contribution made by Scottish lawyers and Scottish accountants to Scottish success. It sees no portent in the fact that Scottish trading companies had many such professionals on their boards. This is possibly due to the recognition by its authors that the Australian legal system was in essence English, and therefore reasonably presumed to be beyond the practice of such Scottish characters.

However, the point most markedly is that whilst there may have been some practical truth in this in terms of direct involvement in legislation, it did not prescribe them from understanding the subtleties of the English system or from manipulating it in the favour of Scottish interests. Further, this again questions the notion of clannishness, the marriage of lawyers and merchants, the involvement of Kirk ministers in accountancy, tacit establishment approval, and the generally brisk but mainly anonymous nature of most business tactics and dealings, especially in distant and new regions of settlement, is suggestive more of Freemasonry and of the above-mentioned feudal social system. Freemasonry was of course not exclusive to Scotland, but it has to be admitted that the movement did have a profound presence in Scotland of the times, especially amongst farmers, bankers, merchants, lawyers, ministers, and their respective clientele, all of whom came to be well-represented in Australia.

Membership of this fraternity was undoubtedly another possible avenue to success and influence. The orthodoxy makes no mention of such a possibility, and it was in fact another PhD student, a colleague called Annie Midwood, who was doing research in Lord Inverclyde's archives where she came across this vast reference to Freemasonry influence and commercial interest in Australia. So therefore the orthodoxy as it has developed admits of other possible flaws.

Thirdly, it seems bent on ignoring its own work. For example, it does not sense the case that it develops for there being a myriad of possibilities of why and how the Scot had had such an

impact in Australian history. It insists on making too simplistic and rosy interpretations of the evidence.

It often examines such diverse factors but then chooses not to include them in this explanation or interpretations. For example, it acknowledges that Scotland had a long history of immigration. It mentions the role played by Scottish military men in exploration and in social control.

Half the rivers and mountain ranges in Australia are named after Scots. It considers the Scottish landowning propensity, together with its implications for the Australian political situation. It notes Scottish mercantile ambition. It praises Scottish educational standards. It perceives Scottish experience in the colonial civil service. However, nowhere does it lay the case for all of the above being brought together to answer the central debate.

Rather, it prefers to stick with what appears obvious and to fit Scottish myths, the individually brilliant Scottish clannishness and the Protestant work ethic, and in so doing leaves itself open to accusations of over or misinterpretation of the evidence. In conclusion, this paper suggests that the current orthodoxy, whilst being excellent in terms of research, has failed to interpret properly its own data. It has also chosen not to consider at least three conspicuous areas of interest, namely the impact of women, Scottish business lawyers and accountants, and Freemasonry, all of which might have yielded a fuller and more robust explanation of why the Scots had such a qualitative impact on the early Australian history.

Moreover, it has refused to recognise the Scottish entity's role in the formation, development and consolidation of Australia as being much greater than the sum of its Australian parts. There is much work to be done on the relationship between the two countries. There is also a desperate need for a sensitive Scottish interpretation of the Scottish end of the data so that Australian social historians might be better equipped to deal with the Scots and their impact on Australia.

A final point worthy of making hangs on the observation that a strange emphasis has been placed on the way the Duke of Sutherland perpetrated the clearances, rather than a proper evaluation of the economic strategy that lay behind his image-shattering action. The feudal clan system was dead in the water. Sutherland ascent and other such areas were bleak beyond belief.

It is questionable if they were even suitable for sheep. The wind, cold, wet and snow were rarely conducive to the production of plump beasts ready for beckoning distant markets. In addition, diseases such as cholera regularly devastated the population, as did foreign wars diminish male numbers.

Housing was primitive in the extreme. Canada, Australia and other places of English concern would be no worse than what the disenfranchised would come to leave behind. In fact, in many cases, Scottish immigrants would soon do very well in every possible sense of that emotive phrase.

The world is full not only of exiles, but also successful Scottish ones at that. Therefore, research into what were the subsequent and consequent economic experiences of those who were cast out compared with those left behind would be very useful. The arrogance and

insensitivity of the Duke of Sutherland might then be laid to rest as nothing more than the traits that blight the hearts of the overprivileged and the inherently self-centred.

And that's it.

Thank you very much.