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Abstract

In 1997 Scottish citizens voted to re-establish a Scottish Parliament after a nearly 300-year hiatus, which had resulted from the 1707 Act of Union. As the new Parliament developed, so did the concept of a building-less National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) whose foundations relied on collaborations with artists and performance spaces in Scotland. As academics and journalists heralded a “Second Enlightenment” at the turn of the twenty-first century, the nation attempted to capitalize on the philosophical and industrial lineages of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Scotland. In this dissertation I scrutinize the ways in which Scotland is performed: the modes of performance undertaken by individuals and institutions to construct and circulate particular framings of Scotland and Scottishness. My project situates moments of “national” performance in the early nineteenth century—namely, productions of a “National Drama,” *Rob Roy Macgregor*, and the 1822 pageant for King George IV—beside political performances produced by “national” institutions in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries—specifically, the mobile NTS and the Scottish Parliament’s architectural design and Festival of Politics. Through archival and ethnographic research, I analyze the spatial materiality of these events and sites to consider how public spaces, architecture, images, texts, and institutional bodies complicate an exchange between mobility and rootedness in Scotland. As I map these complex performance practices, I ask: What are the frameworks in which articulations of Scotland become visible and material in these historical moments? How does a mobilization and circulation of Scottish bodies, texts and subnational imaginaries forward an agenda of an itinerant Scotland in larger political economies?
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Chapter One

Introduction: Practicing Scotland

January 25, 2009, the 250th anniversary of the birth of Scottish poet Robbie Burns, kicked off *Homecoming Scotland 2009*.¹ This year-long celebration taking place across Scotland includes over three hundred events that range from whisky tastings and Highland games (tossing a caber, tug of war, hammer throw) to a number of family and clan genealogy events to dance, music, and theatre performances. The performing and visual arts feature quite prominently in the programming: the National Library of Scotland houses a “Scots Music Abroad” exhibit, the Glasgow School of Art hosts “Mackintosh 100” to celebrate the work and influence of architect and designer Charles Rennie Mackintosh, poetry and literary festivals occur in St. Andrews and Glasgow, and the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) is staging *Be Near Me* based on the novel by Scottish writer Andrew O’Hagan in various cities this year. The year-long initiative requires the collaborative efforts of local and national institutions and organizations (academic, governmental, tourism, artistic) and the partnerships of politicians, artistic practitioners, and heritage site operators to promote and circulate the local resources of Scotland primarily to international audiences.

While the *Homecoming* agenda includes these exhibitions of and engagements with visual, performing, and literary works, a visit to the event’s homepage reveals additional components of the programming that distil Scotland’s complicated past into distinct categories. The webpage’s “What is Homecoming Scotland” identifies five headings: Robert Burns, Whiskey, Golf, Great Scottish Minds & Innovations, and
Ancestry. These categories, and indeed the theme of *homecoming*, attempt to reunite Scottish expatriates and descendants with the lands and practices (real and imagined) of their ancestors. These classifications also demonstrate a tension between past or traditional (Burns, Ancestry) and new or innovative (Great Scottish Minds) and suggest different kinds of experiences (reading, drinking, playing, learning) for those who participate. They speak to particular audiences targeted by those organizations, like VisitScotland, that are actively engaged in marketing this endeavor.

The promotion of *Homecoming 2009*, however, does not appear to highlight the complex geocultural awareness cultivated in Scottish politics over the recent decades nor the changes in the socio-cultural landscape of the country. Familiar signifiers of Scottish life stand in for more complicated, ongoing affiliations and alliances. Member of Scottish Parliament (MSP) Jim Mather (of the Scottish National Party) views the *Homecoming* agenda as “one of the biggest family reunions that the world has ever seen…we are inviting everyone who has either an ancestral or an affinity link with Scotland to come this year and celebrate who we are, what we have done and what we can do together in practical thematic terms.” Mather correlates this large-scale, nationally-coordinated celebration with the intimate, relatively small-scale undertaking of a family reunion. The event, as pitched by Mather, positions visitors and participants more as holiday-going, passive recipients of Scottish life than as active agents, charged with helping the Scottish government and citizens reconfigure their nation for the twenty-first century. Mathers goes on to indicate target audiences for *Homecoming*, revealing transnational components to this massive project. In addition to those living in the UK, he names the United States,
Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Germany, and Ireland as “low-hanging fruit,” part of ready-made tourist markets with visible connections to Scotland. Another marketing strategy used by VisitScotland to promote Homecoming 2009 has been to highlight the increasing strength of the US and Canadian dollars and the Euro against the British pound. As this scheme promises for more cultural value for a visitor’s expenditure, perhaps it also suggests a certain “cheapness” to Scotland and its people.

This move to entice capital into Scotland (promoted even more strongly because of the current international economic downturn) also, perhaps rather unwittingly, attempts to knit together Scotland by celebrating its diverse topographies, cultural practices, historical figures, and technological innovations within one seemingly comprehensive agenda that transforms the nation from a “location to a destination,” a concept outlined by performance theorist Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. This conversion requires the circulation of ready-made cultural signifiers extracted from their specific Scottish locations to be reintroduced in other venues. Scotland’s “brand,” argued sociologists David McCrone, Angela Morris, and Richard Kiely, has been over-produced by the heritage industries and has become unmoored from its political circumstances. Homecoming 2009 contributes to the over-production of the Scottish brand by situating circulating commodities (whisky, tartan) alongside embodied practices (Highland dancing, caber-tossing). This process evacuates the political and material consequences of these activities and runs the risk of making these physical practices seem static and, ultimately, purchasable.
Circulating these images and ideas across the World Wide Web, Homecoming Scotland’s website offers a knowable, truncated vision and version of Scotland through which outsiders can easily navigate. In addition to the main webpage, television advertisements, conveniently placed on the internet, give a flavor of these happenings to potential visitors. These ads feature well-known Scottish figures, including actors (Sean Connery and Brian Cox), singers (Eddi Reader and Amy Macdonald), and athletes (cyclist Chris Hoy and golfer Sam Torrance). These Scots, superimposed in front of dramatic, wind-swept or grey-skied iconic Scottish landscapes (glens, lochs, standing stones, and a golf course) embody desired characteristics of Scottishness: soulful and passionate, relevant and successful. In addition to these individual bodies, the images of natural backdrops and Scotland’s capital city perform Scotland as a slide show of evocative, almost “timeless” landscapes waiting for a visitor to step into and enjoy for themselves the aesthetic pleasure of these places. This visual schema does not differ very much from the circulating postcards and posters that transported images of the Highlands, places made more readily accessible through the introduction of railroad lines in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to wealthy Brits seeking “exotic” holiday destinations. As bagpipe music plays at the end of the ad, the printed text forwards Mather’s sentiment that “the whole world” is invited to join in these celebrations. But whose home do these ads actually depict?

In her close reading of this advertisement, and the premise of Homecoming Scotland 2009, theatre critic Joyce McMillan identified the layers of meaning filtered
through this marketing campaign. In her column for *The Scotsman*, McMillan questioned the image of Scotland produced by these sleek marketing tools:

in launching a venture of this kind, the Scottish Government wades
instantly into deep cultural, political and psychological waters, apparently
without a full sense of the consequences. On one hand, the modern SNP
[Scottish National Party] is fully committed to the idea of a multicultural,
multiracial Scotland, which is welcoming to new migrants, and recognised
for its good community relations; only this week, one expert expressed the
view that Scotland could become a global model for civic integration
between Muslim and non-Muslim communities. Yet at the same time,
the SNP Government sanctions and supports an event which frames
“Scottishness” as a kind of enduring blood-link with people of Scottish
ancestry who have not lived here for decades or centuries, and which
boasts a web site so loaded with clichéd tourist-industry images of what
Scotland has to offer…that it reads like one of those stereotypes of
Scotland that was already being angrily rejected…as long ago as the
1970’s. Of course, some of these clichés are useful as “unique selling
points” in a crowded global tourist market, just as shamrocks and
leprechauns are useful to the Irish.7

McMillan’s observations not only address tensions between elements of an ethnic and
civic nationalism, as I discuss below, but she articulates here some of the emergent
anxieties about how non-Scots view Scotland and, more worrisome, about how Scots
promote, produce, and perform themselves, aided by increased communication and transportation technologies. McMillan warns of the slippery slope from celebrations of the multi-textured and complex lands and peoples of Scotland to those replicated, emptied-out symbols of a Romanticized Scottish culture that draw from its Enlightenment history and seem to disappear in the mists of Loch Ness, devoid of a specific, located political context. I find it noteworthy that a theatre critic (one who is well-respected in various socio-political and cultural sectors in Scotland) has pointed out these incongruities made visible by this form of national self-promotion. As McMillan notes, by not acknowledging the deeply rooted, complex networks of relationships from which these images and ideas emerge, Scotland runs the risk of re-playing itself as culturally or politically inferior to its British neighbors or as not serious or inventive enough to address the current and future needs of its peoples.

McMillan’s historically-informed performance lens calls attention to these significant ambivalences and serves as a model for me in my project. My work takes into consideration a core tension between locatedness and circulation in the material and embodied productions of Scotland and Scottishness in the early nineteenth century and in the decades around the turn of the twenty-first century. Across a span of nearly two centuries, I consider the resonances between the socio-political stakes of theatre performance events and the theatricality deployed by political institutions in Scotland. I work to reframe nationhood as a processural network of ideas, objects, bodies, social relationships, institutions, architectures, and geographies that disrupts the idea of nation as a historically-formed unified and stabilized entity.
Methodological Movements

The theatrical performances that form the object of my analysis signal significant ambivalences in how political events shape social spaces and impact relationships between bodies, objects, and places. My research also exposes the use of theatre and cultural practices as an instrument of government in both the early nineteenth century and the cusp of the twenty-first century. Although the intention behind these actions has varied greatly (Walter Scott’s pro-Union vision realized in the 1822 pageant or the questioning of Labour policies that deployed Scottish troops to Iraq in 2003 in the National Theatre of Scotland’s production of *Black Watch*), influential political bodies (individual or collective) have called on theatre to evoke different modes of Scottish participation to develop, support, or enact certain policies and alliances. Also, applying the multi-disciplinary nature of theatre to national undertakings exposes the kinds of labor involved in nation (re)building and the proposals, rehearsals, and performances that shape the dramaturgies of government. In the case of Scotland, I locate two sets of practices being shaped and utilized. On the one hand, policies seek to create a social equilibrium of sorts at home in the specific cities, towns, and rural areas of Scotland by investing in local resources and emphasizing geographical distinction and ecological awareness (especially today). On the other hand, finding flexible, mobile ways of operating beyond geopolitical boundaries (seen, for example, in the Scottish Parliament’s welcoming of European and American political and technology leaders) demonstrates the nation’s adaptability in outfitting itself to function alongside international organizations and supranational governing bodies in Europe and beyond.
Each of the early-nineteenth- and early-twenty-first-century performance events that I examine (Rob Roy Macgregor productions and the 1822 pageant; performances of HOME and Black Watch, and the Festival of Politics), re-animates Scottish history to suggest certain relationships and achievements: an overcoming of internal strife, a willingness to collaborate to meet future demands, a reinvestment (social and monetary) in the peoples and places of Scotland, a learning from past mistakes to repair a damaged reputation, or an acknowledgement of the global impact of Scottish innovation and creativity. The mobilization of Scottish history adds to the spatial dynamics of these events. Every performance, I argue, produces spatial relationships between the various environments and individuals involved. The narratives of Scottish history unfold within the spaces generated by each of these performances. The temporalities of these histories (linear or cyclical, diachronic or synchronic) contribute another spatial dimension as, for example, spectators in the present witness the re-playing of historical moments. This retelling may support the ethos of progress and development, which creates a chronological timeline and privileges certain classes, or it may refute or complicate this trajectory by using fragmentary or non-chronological storytelling that introduces perhaps overlooked participants in the events. In both cases, these performance spaces act as propositions of the past and a potential future based on this version of Scottish history. Each performance, then, produces space, historical narratives, and proposals for viewing the present and imagining the future.

By reading across geographies, theatrical productions, architectures, texts, and cultural policies, my interdisciplinary research offers a way to rethink the performance of
citizenship, the political staging of “national” heritage, and the active production of a nation. It does so by expanding the understanding of performance as being beyond the binary of actor and spectator as well as extending past the physical parameters of a performance venue and into an ecological arrangement of heterogeneous materials. I see significant links between theatrical productions and enactments of nation, and I attempt to articulate them in each of my sites. This work may also be more broadly applicable to European studies as nations (particularly substates, or “stateless nations,” like Catalonia, Flanders, and the Basque Country) attempt to capitalize on their socio-cultural pasts in this new European age.

Specifically, my project synthesizes performance events that have occurred in two historical moments. Chapters Two and Four look at a post-Enlightenment decade (1817-1827) to explore the circulation of a “National Drama,” *Rob Roy Macgregor*, at three cities in Britain as well as particular events (including a performance of *Rob Roy*) that comprised the 1822 pageant coordinated by novelist Walter Scott for King George IV’s royal visit to Edinburgh. Chapters Three and Five examine events of a more recent decade (1998-2008), devised by two contemporary institutions in post-devolution Scotland. The National Theatre of Scotland, established in 2005 as a building-less artistic enterprise, has generated a new model for a national theatre that invests its resources not in a single building or acting troupe but in the extant networks of theatre practitioners and performance venues in Scotland. Meanwhile, Scotland’s new governing body, the Scottish Parliament, proposes ideas of nationhood through its architectural design and its Festival of Politics that transforms the house of governance into a cultural venue. My
choice of these two historical moments (the early nineteenth century and late twentieth/early twenty-first centuries) is not arbitrary. Not only do resonances exist across this span of time between the politics of performance and theatricality of politics as individuals and institutions collaborate to promote and produce Scotland, but the legacies of the Scottish Enlightenment continue to prove a critical and creative locus of discussion, debate, and artistic endeavor in Scotland of late. Two examples of this ongoing consideration of the Enlightenment can be seen in the 2006-2007 lecture series on the “Enlightenment and Popular Culture” at the University of Edinburgh and in the central theme of the 2009 Edinburgh International Festival programming. Festival organizers explained, “We’ve taken as a point of departure the Scottish Enlightenment, that incredible period in the 18th century which saw a huge surge of intellectual, artistic and scientific accomplishments. Ideas which continue to shape the world today.” Festival Director Jonathon Mills noted that the programming blends the theme of the Enlightenment with *Homecoming 2009* by incorporating productions that touch on aspects of home and diaspora in Scotland and elsewhere. In addition to celebrating, in the words of *Financial Times* journalist Andrew Bolger, the “technological developments, philosophical provocations and scientific discoveries,” of the Enlightenment, the program also include a new theatre production by Scottish playwright Rona Munro about the last woman to be executed in Scotland for witchcraft (in 1727). I am interested in how some contemporary Scottish institutions invoke the Enlightenment to characterize Scotland as rational, innovative, industrial, and scientific. At the same time, however, Scottish theatre- and cultural policy-makers attempt to deconstruct certain legacies and
paradigms of thought materialized and promoted by the Enlightenment, such as society’s dominance over nature. That the multiple individuals, philosophies, and practices that comprised the Enlightenment act as creative stimuli for such different projects suggests an ambivalence to how Scots view their ongoing affiliation with these eighteenth-century enterprises and their ancestors.

My research does not seek to construct a linear history of post-Enlightenment and post-devolution “national” life in Scotland but to understand the relationships between physical sites, political formations, cultural institutions, and theatrical embodiments that characterize each of these singular moments. I investigate how the exchanges between circulation or mobility and locality or rootedness shape these relationships and practices then and now. One contemporary example of this circulation exists in the form of the NTS’s touring production of *Black Watch*, which has visited three continents and has appeared on dozens of stages, carrying with it questions about the masculine characterization of this Scottish military regiment as well as the political contentions regarding its ongoing role in securing the British state. As I consider the movements of specific ideas, bodies, and imaginaries, I simultaneously emphasize the local, the distinct territorial makeup of this small nation, as it operates as a complementary mode of verbal and physical place-making. While it demonstrates the transnational quality of Scotland’s military history, *Black Watch* simultaneously provokes questions about the specific genealogy of its regiment located, primary, in the “heartland” of Perthshire, Fife, Dundee, and Angus, according to playwright Gregory Burke. This rooted identity is imbued with a working-class sensibility as these men consider the financial prospects of soldiering as
opposed to working in shipyards or coal mines. As the production weaves together the border-crossing and located aspects of the regiment, it presents the generative tension between rootedness and circulation that I see at work throughout the national iterations of Scotland that I read.

In addition to investigating this tension between mobility and rootedness, I am interested in both the temporal and spatial dimensions of the networks produced in attempts to think and perform Scotland and Scottishness. Given the substantial influence of literature and literary figures that comprise a great deal of Scottish identity, I include textual analyses (of materials such as dramatic texts, newspapers, and journal accounts) as one component of my study. I also look to the ways in which public spaces, architectures, and various political and theatrical bodies complicate the exchange between circulation and locality in Scotland. Where previous scholarship on landscape, theatre, history, and nationalism has often focused on problems of representation, using largely semiotic or discursive analysis, investigating the networks that I identify demands that I explore more radically materialist methodologies that emerge from cultural geography, anthropology, sociology, which I discuss in more detail below.

**At Home in the Nation**

As I seek to unearth the tensions of national affiliation and nation-building, especially as they resonate with theatrical production, I consider the scholarship on nationalism that identifies processes of nation-formation in the early days of modernity and reads the nation (understood as socio-cultural community) as yoked to the development of a state (read as geo-political territory and institutions). Several scholars
recognize this bound relationship between the nation and state; they argue that the nation developed either in response to burgeoning capitalism, through the production of discursive images, or as forms of collective identity-building (and branding). Eric Hobsbawm (1990) investigated the nation in relation to the development of economic liberalism in the nineteenth century, arguing that the nation was fashioned within an extended period of mercantilism and trade. Anthony Giddens (1995) suggested that the rise of the nation-state accompanied the expansion of capitalism. In examining the components of the nation-state, he identified it as “a set of institutional forms of governance maintaining an administrative monopoly over a territory with demarcated boundaries, its rule being sanctioned by law and direct control of the means of internal and external violence.”

For events such as the Rob Roy Macgregor productions and the 1822 pageant, the designers, writers, and theatre managers exerted a degree of monopolization and control over the dramaturgy and choreography of the performances. They did so, I suggest, in such a way as to withhold violence so as not to mar the spectacular image generated from their creative management. How each of these performances governed bodies and movements resonates with this idea of nation-formation; however, Scotland, as one of several nations within a larger political state (i.e. the United Kingdom) does not conform to the nation-state specifications identified in these arguments.

Another strand of theories of the nation looks at different modes of discursive formation in relation to a political configuration of a nation-state. Timothy Brennan (1990) acknowledged the nation as both “the modern nation-state and...something more
ancient and nebulous--the 'natio'--a local community, domicile, family, condition of belonging." Homecoming 2009 seems to situate itself at the crux of these two definitions as it straddles the local and national resonances of a Scottish home. Brennan went on to identify the nation with a Foucauldian “discursive formation...a gestative political structure.” This performative enactment signals a continual reshaping of power relationships within the social and political frameworks of nationhood, and this view informs my analysis. Benedict Anderson’s (1991 [1983]) formulation conceived of the nation through the collective practices of a socio-political entity, which are limited, sovereign, and imagined. A form of nationalism, he suggested, accompanies this concentration of affiliation through cultural practices that developed through the circulation of print media (primarily novels and newspapers). Over the last two centuries, political ideologies, social alliances, and cultural practices have moved across Scotland via textual and pictorial accounts. Scotland’s distinct geographies and its vexed position within the UK, however, make it difficult to situate a study of Scottish nationhood strictly within these paradigms of thought that still suggest a clear correspondence between nationhood and statehood.

A third perspective on nationhood examines the production of material and embodied acts that enact a recognizable collective identity comprised of repeated performances. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger’s (1984) edited collection, The Invention of Tradition, extended this notion of the nation as practice, understood through particular social conventions that, as Hobsbawm addressed, “seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with
Building on this argument, Hugh Trevor-Roper (2008) believed that the Scottish nation exemplifies the centrality and prevalence of these constructed myths. He supported his claims by citing James Macpherson’s nineteenth-century literary construct of Ossian and the manufacturing of tartan that has draped the Scottish past in heroic patterns. My research resonates with the notion that certain goods, institutions, events, artists, embodied acts, and texts aid in the production of the Scottish nation, but my approach differs from Trevor-Roper’s methodology. Whereas he delineates Scotland by identifying (and, arguably, stabilizing) the political myth, the literary myth, and the sartorial myth and his analysis rests on specific individuals as the agents of these constructions, I locate connections between philosophies, texts, objects, and individuals, each playing a role in generating Scotland through multi-dimensional events.

In this dissertation, each of my sites point to different versions of Scotland (as a nation) and Scottishness (as a practice) developed through complex choreographic and dramaturgical arrangements (physical movements and embodied relationships, as well as rehearsals or propositions of the nation by individuals or institutions). Since Scotland, both in the early nineteenth century and in the years abutting the twenty-first century has existed as a substate, part of a larger geopolitical entity but with its own distinct institutions, international alliances, and cultural practices, the standard nation-state optic cannot adequately account for Scotland’s particular socio-political and geographical dimensions. Scottish political philosopher Tom Nairn made the case for Scotland’s unique position in Western Europe when he suggested that while its scientists and philosophers proliferated “ground-breaking” theories about governance, economics,
geology, and moral philosophy, ideas that shaped the development of nation-states (such as the United States and France), Scotland itself was not in a position to fully adopt these principles and practices to produce itself as an autonomous nation-state.\textsuperscript{16} Although Scotland did not become a self-governing entity during the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries, it did participate in processes that resembled the kind of monumentalizing that was occurring during the consolidation of regions into nation-states. Scotland’s military regiments, for example, fortified the British Empire, while increased transportation routes connected Scotland to its British Isles neighbors and urbanization led to the construction of built environments (monuments, libraries, universities, and courts), which emanated authority and reason. As Scotland has more overtly questioned its place within the UK and Europe over the last decade, it has begun to configure ideas and practices of national affiliation based on flexibility, organic arrangements, and responsive and inclusive policy-making. Despite all of its efforts to deconstruct certain seemingly stabilized ideas and architectural constructs, however, Scotland’s artistic and political institutions still run the risk of re-valorizing those very processes that have contributed to its \textit{substate} reality.

Drawing from the work of Tom Nairn, geographer Tristan Clayton pointed to the need for a nuanced understanding of the network of relationships, identities, and affiliations experienced by many Scots. Clayton’s (2002) article, “Politics and nationalism in Scotland: a Clydeside case study of identity construction” employed a case study of Paisley South (a town outside of Glasgow) to elucidate the complex dynamics of class, nationality, and culture that impact the construction of a (Scottish) national identity. Clayton, focusing on the time between the 1997 devolution referendum and
1999 Scottish Parliamentary election, argued that neither a strictly ethnic nationalism nor a civic nationalism can fully account for social affiliations and material concerns acknowledged by Paisley South residents. Clayton’s research modeled a nuanced approach to dealing with the apparent contradictions of identity construction in Scotland (and elsewhere, I would argue) through his place-based framework. He called for the “deconstruct[ion of] static and outmoded ideas of ‘the nation’ in order to reconstruct a dynamic neo-nationalism, where the changing relationship between people and space is recognized, and rigid notions of identity and belonging (which ethnic and civic nationalisms are guilty of) are challenged.” Clayton’s research points to the complex constitution of Scotland as a “stateless nation,” beholden to the configuration of the UK and existing as a devolved entity (experiencing a measured political autonomy) within this geopolitical arrangement. Clayton’s analysis exposed the shifting nature of how different relationships between Scots and their surroundings (environmental, cultural, political) affect their collective production of a Scottish nation.

My analysis of Scotland’s multiple (and multi-layered) performances as a nation draws from the work of these scholars as I seek to underscore particular discursive (or gestative) and material relationships that appear more complicated when adopting a performance lens that combines these aspects of nationhood with questions about spatiality, theatricality, and networks. Approaching the production of “Scotland” through particular theatrical apparatuses and modes of performance helps me to identify and to understand the embodied practices and performative nature of geographies (in relation to those living within them)—a perspective that remains largely absent from the scholarship
in studies of nationhood and nationalism, which has tended to approach land and landscape as a representational phenomenon. I apply a lens of performance analysis to parse the modes of production, reception, and deployment of theatrical symbols and the nature of performance venues to see how theatre events mobilize elements of Scottish history, environments, and cultural affiliations and practices. I not only consider the narratives and images staged by the events but how these performances, in turn, are circulated beyond their immediate environments through textual and pictorial accounts, policy documents, and recording technologies. Theatre emphasizes practices and materials, actors and processes that collaborate to enact a performance. Scotland, I argue, is reshaped, rearticulated, and reproduced through similar kinds of geocultural transactions, and by tracing some of the actors (or agents) involved in these exchanges, I locate specific performance events, which I consider important nodes or assemblages that articulate a version or proposal of the Scottish nation.

Here I contribute to a field of theatre and performance studies scholarship that assesses the political efficacy of theatre in relation to geopolitical entities of different historic moments. Loren Kruger investigated issues of cultural legitimation and mass political representation in *The National Stage* (1992), analyzing the formation of National Theatres in France, England, and the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Jen Harvie’s *Staging the UK* (2005) stepped outside of the “national theatre” paradigm to consider other kinds of theatrical performances (site-specific events, festivals, cultural-policy-making) to explore how the production of national identities acts in dialogue with theatrical productions. Daniel O’Quinn’s *Staging Governance*: 
Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1770-1800 (2005) argued that within theatrical performances (that occur in explicit theatre venues as well as courtrooms, for example) a “new form of citizen emerged” in late eighteenth-century London who was forced to contend with the changing shape of the British Empire, an analysis of interest to me as I interrogate early nineteenth-century events that point to tense political relations both within and beyond Britain. Steve Wilmer’s edited collection of essays, National Theatres in a Changing Europe (2008), visited the complex terrain of Europe at the dawn of the twenty-first century to ask how national theatres have historically functioned, and continue today to function, as political tools for governing bodies, to reflect cultural achievements in the nation, and to serve as an exportable brand of internationally-recognized “national” culture. Crucially, although a few authors cite the NTS in their essays (namely Bruce McConachie, Michael Coveney, and Janelle Reinelt), none of these essays contain a sustained investigation into Scotland as a provocative case study of national performance or potential model for other (“stateless”) nations in Europe. Many of these studies also examine the symbolic or representative function of theatre within the nation-state political matrix without considering, in depth, the kinds of labor involved or issues of class related to defining the nation as partially constructed by the social elite.

Recent theatre and performance scholarship has also begun to grapple with theories and methodologies deployed to investigate relationships between theatre/performance and spatial and material practices. In their introduction to Land/Scape/Theater, Una Chaudhuri and Elinor Fuchs name landscape as a particularly salient “new spatial paradigm” for theater. In arguing why they focus on landscape, as
opposed to space or place, Chaudhuri and Fuchs forwarded that “Landscape is more grounded and available to visual experience than space, but more environmental and constitutive of the imaginative order than place…Landscape has particular value as a mediating term between space and place.”\textsuperscript{20} In my work, I try to examine the complicated terrain of space, place, landscape, and locality in terms of theatrical enterprises and political activities in Scotland. The work of other theatre and performance scholars use various case studies (dramatic texts, playwrights, performers, venues, and performance events) to tease out the material implications between theatre and its geographic and ecological connections. Bonnie Marranca’s \textit{Ecologies of Theater} (1996) identified two primary networks of relationships: those that exist between an ecosystem comprised of texts, images, or sounds and the cultural system in which it exists, and an ecosystem of the materiality of the production, reception, and funding of a theatrical work. Ric Knowles’s \textit{Reading the Material Theatre} (2004) picked up on a similar network of relationships between the production and reception of a theatrical event, coupled with the spatial dynamics of a given performance venue as he labored to configure and apply a method of analysis to theatre that attends to a “politcized understanding of how meaning is produced.”\textsuperscript{21}

I find the work of the following performance scholars instructive to my undertaking of Scottish nation-production and embodied acts of Scottishness. Baz Kershaw’s \textit{Theatre Ecology: Environments and Performance Events} (2007) interrogated the “fundamentally paradoxical” and durable traces of ephemeral performances through a lens of ecology. Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks’ \textit{Theatre/Archaeology} (2001)
considered both disciplines as modes of cultural production that articulate processes of loss, regeneration, and change in material ways. I find their use of the concept of *stratigraphy*, a layering evident in both site-specific performances and archaeological digs, compelling in reading Scottish historical events and diverse landscapes. Within this field of materialist performance studies I also situate Jon McKenzie’s *Perform or Else* (2001). McKenzie distinguished between different paradigms of performance (technological, organizational, cultural) that have reshaped subjecthood in a globalized world of late-capitalism or neo-liberalism, developed, in part, by increased transportation and communication technologies. I build from this compelling corpus of theatre and performance scholarship that parses the material and embodied elements of performance, a seemingly ephemeral object of analysis, to highlight the multiple networks and theatrical nodes that *perform* and *produce* Scotland.

As I move away from an emphasis on theatrical representation to take apart and piece together the material nature of the spatial and temporal networks in which performance and theatre participate, I turn to critical cultural geography and to Actor Network Theory for methodological inspiration. In *for space* (2005), cultural geographer Doreen Massey built upon the intellectual tradition of Henri Lefebvre and others, to argue that the conditions of a given space (local, national, global) continually work in tandem with the social relations that occur within it to shape its social and spatial dynamics. An ongoing process, Massey identified this process as “simultaneous stories-so-far,” a concept that encompasses temporal and spatial, narrative, ideational, and material dimensions. I find this combination of the mutually constitutive and inherently plural
elements of space and social relations, as well as the foregrounding of recurring change, pertinent to my exploration of the productions of the Scottish nation.

I also draw from Actor Network Theory (ANT), most clearly laid out in Bruno Latour’s *Re-assembling the Social* (2005) and the case studies in John Law and John Hassard’s edited collection, *Actor Network Theory and After* (2005). Actor Network Theory argues against a determined and homogeneous notion of “the social” (we might also say, “the national”) by calling for a dissolution of the nature-society divide and articulating the inherently continuous movement of elements that shape the formation of an idea or physical object. Latour forwarded, “Thus, social, for ANT, is the name of a type of momentary association which is characterized by the way it gathers together into new shapes [Latour’s emphasis].”22 For Latour, then, the “social” is never a given or pre-determined condition or grouping; it is, instead, a particular arrangement of materials that occurs during a specific period of time and is comprised of various objects and interactions. And this arrangement occurs, in part, through the engagement of the scholar who selects particular elements to consider in her analysis. The stakes of ANT resonate with the need to rethink nationhood and national identity as ongoing practices that defy stabilization, blur apparent boundaries between the local and the global, and are constituted through the continual formation and reformation of networks. From this perspective I ask how cultural practices in Scotland in the early nineteenth century and the most recent decade articulate nationhood through consolidating multiple individuals (performers, spectators, reviewers, historians), specific locations (theatres, halls, streets, cities, buildings), various materials (playbills, sets, reviews, subsequent performances), and particular material ideologies (policies, proclamations, missions) into a shifting network.
The scope of my project, with its stakes in spatial (particularly geographical and ecological) perspectives necessitates an interdisciplinary approach as I tease out the tensions between locality and mobility at these four Scottish sites (Rob Roy Macgregor productions, the 1822 pageant, NTS performances, and the Scottish Parliament) in these two historical moments. So I connect the work of performance scholars with the theories and methodological approaches from cultural geography, sociology, and anthropology. I also try to break down components of a seemingly unified entity by examining, for example, multiple embodied articulations of a particular theatrical production (Rob Roy) or different accounts of the same event (NTS HOMEs). Also, I labor to highlight the relationships between local accounts and circulating ideas, fixed sites and mobile bodies in a movement back-and-forth through time in order to disrupt any single, linear narrative. In doing so, my research consists of two main elements, namely archival research and ethnographic study. For the archival research, I perform close readings of theatre production materials (programs, playbills, reviews, notices) and the circulation of first-hand accounts via newspapers and journals. I also interpret nineteenth-century century playbills, playtexts, and reviews to examine the marketing and reception of Rob Roy Macgregor in three cities (London, Glasgow, and Edinburgh). By combing through eyewitness accounts of the 1822 pageant along with images (paintings and political cartoons) produced during the event, I make visible the theatrical spaces produced by the pageant as well as the multiple actors taking part in the proceedings, such as the Highlanders “on parade.” My ethnographic work consists of observing NTS productions and the Scottish Parliament’s Festival of Politics. I have conducted formal interviews and
informal discussions with Scottish theatre practitioners, scholars, and cultural policy-makers that also feed into my analysis. Lastly, I perform spatial ethnographies of two performance venues of *Black Watch* and the Scottish Parliament site to consider how material arrangements of these buildings intersect with the kinds of performances (cultural, theatrical, social) that take place within and around them.

To track the historic and recent developments in Scotland where small- and large-scale performance events “gather into new shapes” of Scotland, I take a cue from the work of theatre scholar Joseph Roach’s *Cities of the Dead* (1996), as I read across material practices (textual and embodied) of theatrical events enacted in different historical moments. Like Roach, I employ archival and ethnographic research to flesh out the kinds of transactions (literary, sensorial, economic, geographic) that occur within different dramaturgies of performance and interactions between performers and spectators, actors and citizens. While keeping an eye on the movements generated through these interactions, I also look for evidence of a reinvestment in Scotland’s local resources (its natural resources—coastlines, cities, hills—and social constitution—theatre practitioners, policy-makers, citizens). In order to situate my interpretation of the productions of the Scottish nation, I include a brief historical sketch to provide the reader with an abbreviated temporal framework for my chapters, in which I attend to deeper investigations of specific issues and institutions, geographies and dramaturgies. I begin with this brief movement through Scottish history with a significant, transformative moment, one to which the process of devolution directly speaks: the Treaty of Union. “Scotland,” suggested David McCrone, “is not simply what you want it to mean. It is a
complex theatre of memory in which different ways of ‘being Scottish’ are interpellated and handed down, constructed and mobilised by social and political forces which seek to naturalise them.” In what follows, I point to some of these social and political forces that have shaped the (theatrical) productions of Scotland, such as its global ambitions, its legacies of industrialization and de-industrialization, and its political and artistic endeavors with respect to class.

**Forwarding Scotland’s Past**

On May 1, 1707 the Treaty of Union took effect, proclaiming “That the Two Kingdoms of England and Scotland shall…forever after be United into One Kingdom by the name of GREAT BRITAIN.” This performative act required Scotland’s compliance with dissolving its own parliament in Edinburgh in order to become one of the new members of the British Parliament in London. According to Scottish historian Tom Devine, this process of dissolution and union was not a unanimous decision. Prior to its disbandment, the 147-member Scottish Parliament primarily contained loose alliances held between those “representing the nobility, the barons (or county members) and the burgesses of the towns,” based on mutual interests. According to Devine, England, worried that Scotland might prove a tactical staging ground for its adversaries, saw the promise of national security as the primary benefits of the union. For Scotland, though, the benefits of a union with England appeared more vexed, and the proposal met with popular resistance, as Scots worried about what an “‘incorporating’ union” would mean for their future.” Devine suggested that one perceived advantage for Scotland in accepting the treaty was its increased ability to trade with, for example, the American
Colonies. Prior to the Treaty, Scotland paid steep tariffs on its exports to the “new world.”27 Fear of civil warfare if the Scottish Parliament opposed the Treaty also may have acted as a motivating factor in the parliament’s support of it. Devine concluded, “In this situation the [Scottish] parliamentary opposition was fatally weakened by internal divisions and inept leadership and was in no position to exploit national disaffection.”28 The structure of the Scottish government, with many parliamentarians coming from higher social ranks meant that they may have seen the personal benefits of the union without the need to consult those who they ostensibly represented. Changing this particular political configuration would be seen as one of the main tenets of the reassembled Scottish Parliament in 1999.

While the Treaty of Union certainly affected various aspects of life in Scotland, the governance and development of three particular Scottish institutions (education, law, and religion—perceived by many scholars as necessary elements of nation-statehood) remained in the hands of Scots, a crucial stipulation in the makeup of the Treaty. As the British Empire took shape in the eighteenth century, Scotland made important contributions during the period, which came to be known as the Scottish Enlightenment. The ferocity of this intellectual output had a corollary in the industrial production that seized hold of Scotland. Joseph Black’s advancements in chemistry, Thomas Telford’s civil engineering projects, and James Watts’s steam engine led the way for the expansion of communication and transportation technologies that would better enable the British Empire to secure its colonial holdings while also urbanizing large sections of its domestic landscape not engaged in agricultural pursuits.29 These developments, coupled with
Scotland’s increased trade (thanks, in part, to the Treaty), led to Glasgow’s decades-long title of the “Second City of Empire” in the nineteenth century. Scotland’s focus on helping to chart and to secure (with the help of the Black Watch) the vast territories of the British Empire meant that much of its military, political, and socio-cultural energy was being spent outside of its borders.

As the twentieth century witnessed a gradual dismantling of this same Empire after its colonies across Africa and Asia, in particular, fought for their freedom, Scotland entered into a different kind of socio-political arrangement with Britain. In the 1970s, as many of its cities, like Glasgow, suffered unemployment and urban decline from processes of de-industrialization, Scots questioned the political status quo and expressed a desire to re-configure and re-characterize the role of the Scottish nation within the UK. Campaigners for Scottish devolution (a proposal to increase Scotland’s political autonomy, which I discuss in more detail below) began supporting a 1979 public referendum that asked Scots whether or not they wanted to begin a process of decentralizing political control from London. Dozens of workers’ strikes (in mines and factories) and a rise in unemployment at the end of the 1970s caused, according to Devine, many in Scotland to put economic stability before constitutional reform. Those economic worries coupled with a more unified campaign to vote “No” to the Scotland Act (and devolution), contributed to the failure of the referendum and ushered in nearly twenty years of Conservative rule in both Britain and Scotland (where the party received a minority of the vote). The tenure of British Prime Ministers Margaret Thatcher and John Major aligned with neoliberal policies supported by their contemporaries in the
United States. During the 1980s and early 1990s, increased privatization and deregulation of British companies, decreased political leveraging by labor unions, and a drop in funding for cultural and artistic institutions and projects resulted in high unemployment and industrial strife across the British Isles. Through the introduction of neoliberal policies, Britain’s industrial economies and communities transformed into more service- and knowledge-oriented ones, creating further social and economic disparity. Moreover, the introduction of a Community Charge (or Poll Tax) in 1989 in Scotland (before being introduced in England and Wales the following year) also set off a number of debates about social equality. Designed as a flat-rate payment for each resident of Scotland to contribute toward the funding of local government, protestors argued that the tax increased economic disparity between the rich and poor of Scotland. “More than any other single policy,” observed Devine, “the poll tax drove home the message to many Scots that they were being ruled by an alien government.”

While the failed devolution referendum in 1979 signaled a kind of stalemate in Scottish politics, artists across Scotland began challenging the socio-economically alienating policies being enacted by Westminster. Scottish literary scholar Cairns Craig, writing in 1989, asserted, “the 1980s proved to be one of the most productive and creative decades in Scotland this century—as though the energy that had failed to be harnessed by the politicians flowed into other channels.” In the 1980s and 1990s artistic output in literature and theatre displayed the deep concerns of creative thinkers and artistic practitioners who questioned what it meant to be Scottish and the kind of Scotland they envisioned for the future. The works of novelists Alasdair Gray, James Kelvin, and
Irvine Welsh; playwrights Liz Lochhead, Sue Glover, and John Byrne; and touring productions from theatre companies such as 7:84 Scotland and Wildcat provocatively expressed collective sentiments of social anxiety and political disaffection through compelling frameworks that scrutinized class and gender politics as well as the relevance of historical struggles in Scotland’s contemporary socio-political terrain. This artistic resurgence helped to bolster a renewed desire to step out from beneath the shadow of nearly two decades of (oppositional) political rule based in London.

As Tony Blair and his “New” Labour party sought to shift political energy in 1997 they, in a strategic political maneuver designed to keep the union intact, encouraged a revisit to the devolution referendum in Scotland. “Unable to implement a new conception of the state,” argued Nairn, “Blairism had defaulted to the model of a business company…For Blair and his Cabinet, Devolution is emphatically an event, not a process.” In this equation, devolution is a convenient deal to ensure the cooperation of Scots in forwarding the agenda of the Labour party. The idea of devolution as a one-off event works against an understanding of devolution (held by many MSPs) as an ongoing practice of decentralization. Labour’s business model, as identified by Nairn, did not stay confined to political arenas, but it spilled into cultural and artistic domains as well. By adopting economic imperatives to increase the productivity and earnings of artists and artisans, the government paved the way for the “creative industries” to take hold. Labour celebrated the boost to Britain’s GDP as the creative industries aligned nicely with the service economy that took the place of the “hard industries” of the previous century. As the term “creative industries” circulated, it carried with it the mechanized reproduction of
forms, objects, and ways of thinking that characterized Britain’s industrialization heyday. Linking creative practice to the efficient replication of commodities in this way runs the risk of stunting the very creativity the government seeks to promote, however. The Scottish Parliament’s Festival of Politics is, perhaps, an example of where this gap between artistic and economic output emerges and some of the resultant problems.

With Labour’s support for a new referendum on devolution in Scotland, Scottish politicians, including Donald Dewar (a Scottish Labour MP who became the Secretary of State for Scotland after Labour’s 1997 victory in the UK), worked to organize the vote. The referendum asked Scots two questions: Should there be a Scottish Parliament? Should the Scottish Parliament have tax-varying powers? With a 60.2% turnout of Scottish constituents, 74.3% voted for the Scottish Parliament and 63.5% voted for it to have tax-varying powers. Devolution meant that issues not reserved to Westminster (such as agriculture, natural and built heritage, Gaelic, sports and the arts, education, transport, tourism and economic development) would journey north to rest in the hands of MSPs in Scotland. The Westminster Parliament would, however, continue to decide upon reserved matters (including foreign affairs, defense and national security, employment legislation, common markets for UK goods and services, social security, and immigration and nationality). While some Scots (like Nairn, I imagine) voted for devolution based on the premise that it acts as a stepping stone toward an independent future for Scotland, others supported it to ensure the ongoing stable configuration of the British state (i.e. a political bone thrown to Scotland). The first session of the “new” Scottish Parliament met
in 1999 at its temporary home in the Assembly Hall at the top of the Royal Mile as plans to build a permanent residence (at Holyrood) began to take shape.

When examining even this brief survey of key moments and activities in Scotland’s past, I take note of the complex networks of political systems (local governance, statehood, Empire, devolution), embodied acts (strikes, commerce, theatre-making, taxing, voting), circulating texts (political treaties, legal documents, religious doctrine), socio-economic ideologies (welfare, (de)industrialization, socialism, capitalism, neo-liberalism), and sites (churches, farmland, cities, colonies, parliaments) that comprise this picture. In what follows, I tease out what I consider to be particularly dense, illustrative relationships that act as nodes within different social, political, and theatrical systems. I then read these important sites of convergence between objects, bodies, and geographies as they collectively propose, forecast, or replay Scotland and Scottishness.

**Mapping Scottish Scholarship**

Recent scholarship on Scottish nationalism has adopted a comparative approach, relating Scotland to other “stateless nations” (i.e. substates) or situating it within a broader supranational context like Europe. Another strand of scholarship that I find particularly salient revolves around the relationship between Scottish politics and landscapes. Kenneth White’s “The Mapping of Scotland” (2001) called for a geo-poetical understanding of the development of Scottish politics and cultural practices that proposes a more fully integrated relationship between facets of the “social” and “natural” worlds. And Neal Ascherson’s *Stone Voices* (2003) turned to the geological composition of the
Scottish nation to uncover the foundations of contemporary socio-political and cultural thought. Much of the scholarship that addresses my particular sites does so, however, by focusing on the literariness of Edinburgh and/or Walter Scott’s prominent position as author. These include Paul Henderson Scott’s *Walter Scott and Scotland* (1981) and Caroline McCracken-Flesher’s *Possible Scotlands* (2005). Recent articles about the National Theatre of Scotland from Robert Leach (2007) and Trish Reid (2006) detail the development, innovation, and reception of the mobile organization. None of this scholarship, though, takes into account the political ramifications of the NTS or the tension between locality and mobility that I read as especially significant in Scottish theatrical practices and cultural policies.

Undoubtedly, Edinburgh’s status as the UNESCO’s first “City of Literature” continues to influence and shape Scottish identity and tourism schemes. James Robertson, the former writer-in-residence at the Scottish Parliament, drew attention to Scotland’s literary past in his *Voyage of Intent* (2005). Robertson, clearly inspired by architect Enric Miralles, generated textual images that merge with Miralles’s early Parliament sketches. In current writing on the Parliament, texts focus on either the debate concerning devolution (Paterson 1998; Bogdanor 2001; Bromley 2006) or on parliamentary business, such as *The New Scottish Politics*, edited by Hassan and Warhurst (2000). Apart from a few entries on material symbols of political authority, Caroline McCracken-Flesher’s edited anthology, *Culture, Nation, and the New Scottish Parliament* (2007) predominantly emphasized the literary connections to the new governmental site. Charles Snodgrass’ contribution to the volume, whose title drew my
attention, “Staging Scottishness: The Dramatization of Scotland in Scott’s Rob Roy and
the New Scottish Parliament,” concentrated on the production’s positioning of George IV
as a father to this fatherless land. Snodgrass did not actively address the physical location
nor the political potentiality of the Scottish Parliament in his essay, which I consider
crucial to understanding its present role in Scottish society. Due to its recent advent, none
of the aforementioned texts mention the Festival of Politics or considers the embodied
acts that constitute parliamentary procedure. I hope to add to this complex field of
scholarship on Scottish politics, artistic practices, landscape, and literature by finding
moments of convergence between these fields and performance articulations that express,
cohere, and question the dynamic nature of Scotland.

Chapter Outlines

My next two chapters scrutinize the politics of theatre production and reception,
as particular performance events root themselves into particular city- and landscapes and
disseminate ideas concerning the (re)formation of national politics in Scotland. My
second chapter, “Rendering the Past: Staging Rob Roy and Circulating Landscapes,”
considers the circulation of Rob Roy Macgregor, a dramatic adaptation of Walter Scott’s
1817 novel. This theatrical production, identified as a “National Drama” both in the early
nineteenth century and by theatre scholars of the late twentieth century, created an
idealized, albeit conflicted, world wherein social and spatial boundaries overlapped as
characters crossed the imagined landscapes of England and Scotland. Walter Scott, an
adamant Unionist (wishing for Scotland to remain part of the UK) managed to
characterize an active threat like the Jacobite Rob Roy, a cattle thief amongst other
roles, as a Romanticized and noble Highland hero. Over the next 150 years, playwrights and performers invented and circulated their own staged versions of Scott’s imagined tale and cast of characters, creating a conflicted network of Scottishness. The geographical movements emphasized in the dramatic text coupled with the degree of touring that these productions experienced indicate an inability to construct a unified Scotland in this time. Here I ask how these productions simultaneously became a source of national pride and produced a seemingly outdated, innocuous Scottish threat.

Chapter Three, “An Unsettling National Theatre: Mobilizing Scottish Stories and Sites,” moves ahead nearly 200 years to investigate how an itinerant National Theatre of Scotland (NTS), developed from within the extant Scottish theatre community. With funding provided directly from the Scottish government, the NTS rethinks the role of theatre within a national landscape and its own contribution to creating a vision or version of Scotland within different performance events. Like the circulation of *Rob Roy Macgregor*, this model of an experimental national theatre exists as networks between people and multiple theatrical sites, especially evidenced in its inaugural co-temporaneous, site-specific productions of *HOME* (2006). Just months later, the NTS co-produced *Black Watch*, a compelling examination of its eponymous military regiment as it faced battle in the contemporary desertscape of Iraq. While the ten HOME projects existed over the course of one weekend in various Scottish sites, *Black Watch* became a national and international success and has toured throughout Britain and across the globe. Instead of a central theatre building—arguably, a legitimating space—the NTS utilizes
links between performers, producers, and spectators as the artistic foundations of its
diverse program.

The next two chapters more closely scrutinize the theatricality of political
ventures, institutions, and events. Again, I situate historical and contemporary events
beside each other to tease out the ways in which political structures have deployed theatre
for differing ends. Chapter Four, “Spectacular Pageantry: Framing Scotland, Forging
Scottishness,” returns to the nineteenth century and to Walter Scott’s complex stage-
management of King George IV’s royal visit to Edinburgh. Walter Scott, the “venerable
Scots citizen,” used this opportunity to make visible his Romanticized Scotland as this
social and political pageant traversed the cityscape of Edinburgh, positioning Scots as a
homogeneous and loyal constituency. Like Scott’s depiction of Rob Roy Macgregor, here
a threat of past conflict transformed into an auxiliary of trustworthy and dedicated men in
the form of the decorated Highlanders that accompanied George IV during his stay. The
march of the Scottish Highlanders presented further evidence of their loyalty to the
tartan-clad George IV and produced circulating signifiers of Scottishness that crossed the
Scotland-England border upon the King’s return home. In the political framework of the
pageant, the idea of a performative metonym works on many levels: geographically,
Edinburgh stood in for Scotland; socially, the Highlanders represented the Scots people
and their ‘resolved’ past; and politically, George himself existed as a nostalgic surrogate
Stuart (to follow Mary Queen of Scots and James VI/I) and as the future of the Union
Kingdom.
My final chapter, “Stages of Governance: The Scottish Parliament and its Festival of Politics,” deploys Jon McKenzie’s analysis of performance paradigms as I investigate the kinds of performances generated by the architectural design of the Scottish Parliament and its Festival of Politics programming. I assess how the Scottish Parliament promotes different forms of accessibility and heritage through its sustainable designs that connote the geographical and geological heritage of Scotland as well as its own physical location in Edinburgh. I also focus on the performances programmed in the Festival of Politics, which have included political debates and discussions, along with theatrical productions such as Lung Ha’s Theatre Company’s legislative theatre regarding disability rights and *The Journey of Jeannie Deans*, an adaptation of Walter Scott’s *The Heart of Midlothian*. Here I question the relationship between the sustainable and evocative design of the Parliament buildings and a practice of participatory citizenship by attending to its spatial dimensions and performances. I also ask how this governing body deploys culture (through the Festival of Politics) as a strategy to produce a sense of political autonomy that ultimately remains partial or incomplete due to Scotland’s current political status.
Chapter Two

Rendering the Past: Staging Rob Roy and Circulating Landscapes

Beginning in 1818, the Rob Roy steamship paddled its way from Greenock, a town a few miles west of Glasgow, across the Irish Sea to Belfast. Designed by David Napier, the Rob Roy was the first sea-going steamship to take to the water in early nineteenth-century Britain. The ship transported travelers and tourists between these two urban sites, and as it repeated this route between Scotland and Northern Ireland the Rob Roy shaped part of the United Kingdom in its wake. This recurring east-to-west-to-east travel moved bodies, as well as goods, information, and gossip, along the currents of the sea. It carved a practical pathway between the British Isles, and the ship’s mere existence made material the ingenuity and industrial prowess of these Isles. The destination points at each end of this route led Britain’s manufacturing of ships and railways. Movement between these two cities also strengthened the connections between the British Isles and the outposts of its Empire where the circulation of more bodies, goods, and information traversed even larger bodies of water.

The Rob Roy enacted a “heterotopic space” as articulated by Michel Foucault when he argued that a boat is a “floating piece of space, a place without a place, that exists by itself, that is closed in on itself and at the same time is given over to the infinity of the sea.” Here the boat is both contained and container: it moves across uncertain waters to its determined destination, providing a safe passage for those temporarily housed upon it. A boat maneuvers through time and space, operating as a hub that materially connects other times and spaces: the ship and a waiting dock, a traveler and the
passing landscape, or the re-telling of a story onboard and its new circulation beyond this discursive moment. The Rob Roy was likely named after Walter Scott’s novel; this naming signaled the prominent social status he held, and the boat offered a way to experience particular landscapes fictionalized in his texts.39 This particular ship carried with it the experiences of those living in and around Glasgow and Belfast, the chatter of its passengers and orders of its crew, and the materials stored in its hull, all culminating in the history of this particular Scottish vessel. As a technology of movement, the ship not only provided a practical fording of the sea, but it offered its passengers an encounter with the landscape en route, which may have been seen as a series of fixed sites to be passed by. These visual moments added up to a picturesque view of the hills, coastlines, and villages that delineated the passage, a similar function to the accumulation of fictional scenes and backdrops presented in Scott’s works, and in the theatrical productions based on his texts.

One text that sought to organize the topographies along this route for the traveler was The Steam Boat Companion; and Stranger’s Guide to the Western Islands and Highlands of Scotland. First published in 1820, this slim 200-page text, which could fit comfortably inside a jacket pocket, compiled many of the current routes—by water and by land—through western Scotland and included itineraries of journeys from Scotland to Northern Ireland and to England. The text introduced itself to its reader: “The ancient history of the Highlands of Scotland, when viewed in conjunction with the magnificent scenery of that country, and the peculiar manners and habits of the natives, has, in all ages, afforded subject of interesting inquiry to every philosophic mind.”40 The book
intertwined the topographic distinction of this area with a particular social history of its inhabitants. This combination not only offered readers a visual experience of these seemingly timeless geocultural elements but treated it as an experiment of sorts, a “subject of interesting inquiry” to the reader/viewer. That the text identified these travelers as “strangers,” unfamiliar with either the physical environment or the cultural behavior of the Scots who dwelled here, is a particularly salient point. These spectators were positioned at a distance from these places, seeking detailed information to get closer to, and become more familiar with, the distinct character of this corner of Britain.

**Theatrical Peregrinations**

The steam ship sought to connect bodies with places and to deliver goods from one part of the British Isles to another. The *Steam Boat Companion*, with its fold-out maps, calculated distances, and identified landscapes of possible interest, charted an agenda for the stranger to organize her visual experience. I locate a similar process of visual mapping in theatrical productions of *Rob Roy Macgregor* that, as they circulated throughout Britain in the early nineteenth century, offered viewers, starting in London, a guided tour through a part of Britain likely unfamiliar to them, “400 miles off.” During these visual journeys, specific architectural and scenographic elements and the dramaturgical ordering of the staged event steered their gaze. When the production moved from London to Glasgow, however, a different perspective of events became visible to the audience, one which embodied the material conditions of this burgeoning industrial modern city. In another stop on the production’s route, Edinburgh, the performance became exemplary of this Enlightened capital’s progress and development.
By tracking the movements of *Rob Roy* through these different cities and performance venues, which acted as temporary ports for the multiplicity of practices and materials that comprised the performances, I point to an important complication that the *Steam Boat Companion* attempted to elide: the inability to account for multiple perspectives and experiences. The audience imagined for the guidebook could locate each of the referenced natural features if they occupied a certain position on the boat’s deck. This presumption simplified the differences between individual travelers and the variants of the actual journey (weather conditions, changing currents, other vessels, times of day). The guide book represented *one way* to physically and imaginatively travel through the landscape, but it could not account for all features; some landmarks would have to be left out in order to make room for others. The journeys of *Rob Roy* reveal to us that despite attempts to garner a single “national” perspective by creating a set of works identified as “national drama,” a look beyond this surface discursive unity exposes important contrasts in perspective. In considering the simplifying processes that often undergird work in the social sciences, John Law and Annemarie Mol declared that “the various modes of ordering, logics, styles, practices, and the realities they perform do not exist in isolation from one another.” The kinds of discourses, relationships, and materials that collaborate to produce an idea, event, or practice move through processes that isolate both specific and general contexts and details. The steam ship, circulation of Scott’s novels, guidebook, and emerging transportation and communication technologies, therefore, conditioned and produced this early-nineteenth-century moment in Scotland and the
fictions that forwarded ideas of unity and progress, supporting national claims through
the appearance of harmony and consensus.

Whereas the materials that comprised Rob Roy (the steam ship), were all
assembled in or near Glasgow, the construction of Rob Roy (the theatre event) occurred at
multiple sites across Britain. This assembling occurred by way of a network buzzing with
creative, intellectual, and industrial activity: the eighteenth-century historical figure of
Rob Roy Macgregor who lived along the shores of Loch Katrine in the Scottish
Highlands, the nineteenth-century writer Walter Scott and his residences near Melrose in
the Scottish Borders and in Edinburgh (the city in which his publisher, James Ballantyne,
was also located), and the theatre venue in London that premiered the most frequently
performed staged version of Scott’s novel. This circuit expanded further to include the
labor of and interactions between the bodies of dozens of human actors (those
performing on stage and those at work behind the scenes) as well as non-human agents
(the printing industry, a network of theatres that aimed to profit from transporting
successful productions, political discourses regarding British imperial practices and its
domestic policies) that emerged at different sites across Britain. But before I begin to
survey the physical movements of these Rob Royals, I want to briefly consider the earlier
text that caught the attention and interest of so many in Britain.

Prior to the staged productions, Rob Roy passed between the hands of Britons via
Scott’s novel that sold in bookshops across cities such as Edinburgh and London, as well
as through the serialized accounts printed in newspapers and journals like the Edinburgh
Evening Courant and Blackwood’s Magazine. Scott's novel weaves together imagined
landscapes of northern England, Glasgow, and the Scottish Highlands with the (mis)adventures of its protagonist, not the eponymous Rob Roy (who makes his official appearance nearly halfway through the novel) but Englishman Francis Osbaldistone. The young Osbaldistone passes up his father's offer to join in the family's commercial business in order to seek his as-yet unknown desires, seemingly of a poetic nature. The novel creates a primary narrative of Osbaldistone's travels and encounters with his extended family and Diana Vernon, his romantic interest, as his disloyal cousin Rashleigh attempts to overthrow the Osbaldistone family business through deceit and treachery. Francis must right his cousin's wrongs and seek redress for the affront to his family. The novel's second storyline concerns the ambiguous dealings of Rob Roy in the mid-eighteenth-century Jacobite uprisings. Hunted by Captain Thornton and his English troops, Francis and Rob Roy each find themselves on the same side of righting the injustices done to them. Meanwhile, Bailie Nicol Jarvie, a Glaswegian magistrate and distant cousin of Rob Roy, acts as a mediator between Francis and Rob Roy, leading the Englishman into the Highlands for a meeting with Macgregor, the “Highland rogue.” At the novel’s conclusion, when the men’s names are cleared, Jarvie offers Rob Roy’s sons an apprenticeship with him in Glasgow. Rob Roy refuses the offer, and Jarvie and Francis make their way back to Glasgow before the Englishman returns home to London.

By returning to the point of inciting action, London, both Francis and the novel complete a circuit across the imagined terrains of threat and adventure (that encompass points north of London), and return to a more familiar metropolitan environment. Literary critic Ian Duncan reads the structure of the novel and its multiple locations (northern
England, Glasgow, the Scottish Highlands) as simultaneous occurrences of different socio-economic systems at work: “these are [respectively] the settings of a rustic feudalism (the crucible of Jacobite intrigue), commercial protomodernity, and prefeudal, ‘savage,’ clan society. The novel’s settings represent not just geographically distinct spaces but anthropologically distinct stages, very much according to Enlightenment conjectural history.” This analysis identifies a thread in Scott’s work in regards to his interests in social history and antiquarianism. It also points out how these different locales act as representative indicators of larger socio-economic and political processes. Here they are not mutually exclusive operations attributed to various developed or developing countries; they are all contained within one territory, leading to various frictions made visible to Osbaldistone as he moves through them by land and by water. This spatial and temporal tour of “Britain” hints at a process of fashioning social relations at particular sites, illustrating how these distinct social structures drive the larger economy while resisting absorption into a single unified system. They actually remain distinct and complex but hierarchically organized. While on the Rob Roy steam ship, the “stranger” carried her guidebook along with her in order to make sense of the unfamiliar environment, Osbaldistone, the Londoner, moved across these unknown regions with embodied guides (Jarvie and Rob Roy), who offered him ways to maneuver through the alien lands amidst the socio-political turmoil. As Francis became a traveler through these lands, the narrative of his peregrinations knits together a version of Britain that was transported further as the story circulated via its novel and serial publications.
In thinking about how the Rob Roy of Scott’s creation traveled as a text, I offer Benedict Anderson’s well-cited theorization of the nation as “imagined community.” Anderson argued that the form and transportation of novels and newspapers “provided the technical means for ‘re-presenting’ the kind of imagined community that is the nation.” The movement of print media, Anderson suggested, developed a sense of simultaneity among its readers who, unable to directly encounter their compatriots, could imagine this larger community in which they actively took part. While there is certainly an argument to be made about how the abundance of printed materials that traveled through and out of Scotland shaped and continues to shape a Scottish sensibility, I want to focus on particular ideas of Scotland embodied by and transmitted through the theatrical performances of Rob Roy, where the representative settings of Duncan’s critique became physicalized through stagings. For it is in these performances where an assemblage of bodies and materials came together to enact an event for a collective audience (as opposed to a single author constructing a text to be consumed, most often, for one individual at a time) that I can begin to parse the complexity of practices that produced a “Scotland” in relation to Britain at this time.

I want to suggest that by sifting through the stage materials, bodies, buildings, acts of advertizing, and physical movements across Britain, these theatrical performances can collectively indicate that in a time of concerted effort to unify areas along national lines, Scotland existed as a multifaceted network of social relationships, material exchanges, and geographic sites. This arrangement produced multiple local, regional, and national valences and did not cohere into a homogeneous socio-cultural, geographical or
political unity, a single “imagined community.” *Rob Roy* was presented and re-presented on stage and then dispersed again through the words and images of critics, journalists, and other spectators whose responses reflected the incongruities made evident by the dramaturgy of the productions. The different performances proposed various qualities of Scotland and Scots: an interwoven cultural and geographical identity, diverse, distant, and ultimately knowable and traversable. In addition to challenging the notion of a homogeneous Scotland, I read these *Rob Roy*s as embodying and generating a processural understanding of history as distinctly not a defined commodity able to be transported and used in the same way at any site. Instead, the productions exposed history as a process forged in the spaces between an ostensibly sedimented past and an inherently undetermined future and as a collectively experienced and constituted series of overlapping events. This movement between the familiarity of the past and the uncertainty of the future left different impressions on spectators at each of these sites, depending on the modes of translation emphasized by the different productions and their venues.

To examine the modes and effects of translation, I utilize two definitions identified by Steven Brown and Rose Capdevila as they parse the work of Bruno Latour, Michel Callon, and Michel Serres: “‘Translation is the semiotic ordering and organizing of significations, interests, and concerns.’ [and] ‘Translation is displacement of the object directly, no representation, no theory’.Æ45 Within translation, Brown and Capdevila distinguish between a function that is discursive and representative and a maneuver that produces a non-discursive performance. Both are processes: arranging and dislocating.
The activity of ordering makes legible and/or visible a particular hierarchical arrangement of materials, discourses, bodies, etc. Meanwhile, the dislocation suggests a movement that is not able to be transported or reconstructed at another site. It is in the movement between these two processes that I position my analysis of how *Rob Roy* moved from city to city and venue to venue, carrying with it, like the steam ship, different stories, bodies, ideas, and practices. In doing so, I hope to adopt some of the fluidity in my analysis that appears as a critical component to these performance events.

In order to process how these productions actively *arranged* and *dislocated* Scotland, I narrow the scope of my analysis to follow the movements of *Rob Roy* to three sites: London, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. While this sequencing of venues does mark three points along a chronology of *Rob Roy* performances that occur over several decades, I wish to highlight the specificity of these urban locations as important nodes of communication, education, policy-making, and industrial production in the British Isles. Also by setting my analysis of *Rob Roy*, with its depictions of the rural northwest of Scotland, within three cities, I aim to tease out some of the displacements that derived from characterizing and staging Scotland within these metropolitan milieux.

The productions of *Rob Roy* that encompass my analysis each utilized some of the same production materials as they staged this story: Isaac Pocock’s play text and the Grieve family’s set designs (backdrops). The characters and settings generated by these objects were temporarily housed in these theatres, and as I move from London to Glasgow to Edinburgh, I follow these materials. I concentrate my readings of these performances on the *differences* between the productions, however, as I ask what
translated, discursively and materially, ordering and displacing bodies and events from site to site. In this chapter I do not seek to create a totalizing picture of the movements of and within these performances. Instead, I scrutinize different aspects of these productions and these competing notions of translation to help identify how materials came together at a given site (in a Theatre Royal for example), to expose different kinds of socio-political networks and material relationships, depending on the site of reception. I am interested in finding out how texts and bodies came together, as sociologist Anni Dugdale argued, to “constitute subjects of a particular kind.” And the subjects under my scrutiny are multi-dimensional translations and productions of Scotland. Dugdale forwarded, “the subjectivities of the participants are already being produced in these material arrangements, even before any verbal performances have occurred.”

This process of alignment challenges the concept of fixed identity and subjectivity (in relation to a system, individual, or institution). In terms of the circulation of Rob Roy, I argue that each of the three urban topographies (London, Glasgow, Edinburgh) imbued the production with specific ideologies and historical narratives based on their individual socio-cultural and political dimensions. Since each site impacted the production and reception of Rob Roy, the attempt to codify and contain Scotland within the production was never fully successful. A stabilized, unified version of Scotland (or Scottish subjects) did not emerge. With each subsequent staging, then, the Scottish nation was being processed, rehearsed, and re-articulated.
A Nation’s Theatrical Repertoire

What sets performances of Rob Roy apart from dozens of other traveling productions that were also re-enacted again and again in theatres across Britain in the nineteenth century? In some ways, the melo-dramatic, romantic, or operatic conventions adopted by Rob Roy and perceived by its audiences aligned quite easily with a slew of other productions making their way across Theatre Royal stages. What makes these Rob Roy’s especially significant for me, however, are the ways in which venues and managers advertized and categorized these performances under the heading of a “national drama” of Scotland. This new “national drama” stood in contrast (or perhaps stood aligned with) the English “national drama,” primarily composed of the work of Shakespeare, that saw hundreds of stagings in many of the same venues as Rob Roy. The labeling of Rob Roy by theatre venues in their playbills and in newspaper advertisements and reviews as a “national drama,” or, at times, “national opera,” presumed and presented a coherence and arrangement to Rob Roy, linking it to other dramatic works adapted from Walter Scott texts. Subsequent twentieth-century analyses have continued to refer to these dramatic works under the label of “national drama.” Texts by Barbara Bell (1991) and H. Philip Bolton (1992) exhaustively chart the staging of theatrical events, many of which were considered “national dramas.” Organized in a similar fashion, these tomes meticulously archive several playbills and play texts related to productions derived or adapted from Scott’s writing. Such linguistic identifiers continue a line of thinking where the attempt to unify individuals, practices, or ideologies (such as in nationalism) has come to stand in for a multiplicity of practices, events, and relationships. This discursive move forecloses
on other interpretations or encounters with, in this case, specific productions of *Rob Roy*. It is just this kind of unifying practice that I wish to dis-assemble in order to expose the important contradictions within these productions.

*Rob Roy Macgregor* was performed at a variety of locations for several decades, usually proving financially beneficial to its venues. While its notoriety brought financial success to urban theatre managers, the production presented a view of the Highlands as culturally and monetarily impoverished. As the play’s narrative celebrated a feral, adventurous Scottish spirit (embodied by Rob Roy himself), it simultaneously enacted a quarantine of the Highlands and Highlanders and their role in Britain at that time. Among its dozens of productions, *Rob Roy* also occupied a prominent place during the 1822 pageant for George IV, as I discuss in Chapter Four. By examining this drama in different urban environments I hope to offer a nuanced reading of how it operated in terms of nation-building and branding during that event. Since many in Scotland were dissatisfied with how the ruling British state governed its territory, I am concerned with how theatre managers and venues, critics, and playwrights labeled a narrative or work of dramatic literature as “national.” I argue that the “national” attached to *Rob Roy Macgregor* actually carried with it several connotations and practices. It served the British monarchy by suggesting support for a stabilized domestic front and unified Empire-building; it erased (at least temporarily) material differences between different regions of Scotland; and it celebrated the resolution of a contentious past between England and Scotland.

Following the failed Jacobite uprising of 1745, the English government clamped down on actions in Scotland perceived to support the former Stuart monarchy and not the
new Hanoverian reign. Theatre historian Barbara Bell argued that staged works resisted such prohibitions:

Although the majority of the National Dramas were set in Scotland’s past it would be wrong to equate them simply with a tradition of Historical Drama. Government had made public access to and acknowledgement of Scotland’s history a live political issue. The adjective ‘Scotch’ disappeared from the bills to be replaced by ‘National’ and managers were able to announce that ‘a new National Drama’ was in preparation, secure in the knowledge that they were advertising a popular and recognised type of work.50

"National" acted more like a surrogate label, displacing the local connotations of "Scotch,” than as a rallying symbol of cultural or political autonomy in Scotland. It worked as an ethno-historical marker instead of exerting a territorial distinction. The ambiguity of “national” implied a celebration of a Britain alliance, suggested by the network of Theatre Royals across the Isles; “Scotch,” meanwhile, signaled the perception of Scotland as something other than “North Britain,” an area contained neatly within Great Britain and not particularly different from England. The Hanoverian monarchy, concerned with the rising displeasure over its reign in this period of transition between King George III and George IV, understood the potential danger in allowing audiences to gather in Scottish cities to collectively witness the performance of a rebellious moment in Scotland’s contentious past. While the monarchy may have viewed with trepidation performances in Scotland that presented an image of Scotland triumphing over unjust rule
from the south, managers of Theatre Royals (who were often English, even in Scotland) viewed the story of Rob Roy as a malleable historical event. *Rob Roy*, the theatrical production, began its life on a London stage before it entered a circuit of performances in England, Scotland, and Ireland. A look at this first staging at the Theatre Royal Covent Garden discloses how managers could mold this play into an instrument used to support the King.

**London’s Royal Site/Sight**

“Commencing our voyage at a little below London Bridge, we go on to observe, that in the immediate vicinity of the Thames, at this point, there is nothing that seems to require description, as the traveller is supposed to be sufficiently acquainted with the appearance of this part of London.”

*Rob Roy Macgregor* premiered in March 1818 at the Theatre Royal Covent Garden, a patent house, which, along with Drury Lane, offered “legitimate” theatre for metropolitan audiences. London served as the hub of British politics and trade as the Thames provided a necessary link between this capital city, European ports, and colonial outposts. As trade routes became more efficient and additional colonial markets opened, London’s wealth, size, and socio-economic status in Britain increased. From London Bridge, with a view eastwards passed the Tower of London and bustling docklands, a visitor would have headed west to reach the Theatre Royal Covent Garden. Following the snaking Thames, with the Houses of Parliament (sites of socio-political discourse) further westward, she may have passed through the City, the beating heart of London’s financial district. Arriving at Covent Garden and moving through the large, lively fruit and flower market toward the theatre, she may have noticed a few playbills pasted to the sides of buildings, advertizing the day’s shows.
Beyond informing potential spectators of a night’s events, playbills served several other functions. According to theatre scholar Jane Moody, they “doubled as programme, miniature review, forum for paper wars between different establishments...and dramatic manifesto.” As they attempted to pique the curiosity of spectators in order to best theatrical competitors, the playbills rendered, in the case of Covent Garden, the large scale of the production into succinct, easily consumable ideas that branded the performances as they revealed additional bits of information day after day. On a March 5, 1818 playbill advertising performances of *Fazio* and *Libertine, or Don Juan*, the Covent Garden plugged its upcoming show: “A New Musical Drama Called ROB ROY MACGREGOR; OR, AULD LANG SYNE. (Founded on the popular Novel of ROB ROY.) has been long in preparation, and will be produced early in the next week.” This advertisement identified the play as a musical drama and attached it to Robbie Burns’s poem, “Auld Lang Syne.” Its referencing Scott’s "popular" text might have appealed to potential spectators who had read the novel or had at least heard of Scott. This maneuver perhaps also attempted to validate the production by linking it to an established success, and, in doing so, it created a lineage for the performance first staged in London through Scottish writers: Walter Scott and Robbie Burns.

The play title’s connection of *Rob Roy* with Robbie Burns’s famous poem, also pitched the “Highland rogue” alongside the Lowland farmer or “Ploughman Poet,” in a move that yoked these iconic figures and the distinct landscapes with which each man was affiliated. This connection and the performance of Burns’s poem within the production created a curious temporal shift. Although Burns was born twenty-five years
after Macgregor's death (meaning, no one of Rob Roy's time could have known the poem), this production combined these two eighteenth-century moments, generating a condensed temporality in the presentation of the Scottish past. It simultaneously replayed and displaced moments of the eighteenth century for its London audiences. As the production tried to repair socio-political problems resulting from the Jacobite rebellion, the play’s title here alluded to a desire to join together distant locales and diverse terrains, emphasizing the appearance of a cohesive Scotland, through a theatrical staging. The mountainous Highlands and agricultural Lowlands brought together here forged a national character of Scotland based on literary productivity. The Londoners who sat in the Theatre Royal Covent Garden, hundreds of miles south of either Scottish locale, utilized the performance as a way to imaginatively traverse the spatial and social distances involved in acquainting themselves with their Scottish neighbors and, arguably, compatriots. On March 12th, the day of Rob Roy’s debut, the playbill restated previously advertized details about the production and included information regarding its scene painter, Grieve. These details, then, literally set the scene for what spectators would experience if they decided to visit the Covent Garden theatre that evening. The familiar name of the painter would disarm any concerns that spectators might have about encountering these unfamiliar places.

As I consider the network of objects and individuals created by the performance of Rob Roy, I situate this playbill beside the theatre’s architecture to scrutinize how these non-human actors produced the subjects of the theatre event, Scottish history, and the characters onstage. The Theatre Royal Covent Garden’s Neo-classical features denoted
an ordering of the exterior and demarcated a space of decorum for those entering the
venue. First built in 1732, this theatre suffered a devastating fire in 1808, leading to its
complete reconstruction the following year. Designed by Robert Smirke and under the
management of John Philip Kemble, the new, significantly larger structure, rearranged its
spatial configuration to accommodate more expensive boxes at the expense of space for
the lower- and middle-class audiences. In The Annals of Covent Garden Theatre, Henry
Saxe Wyndham provided extensive details regarding the new theatre building. He
acknowledged how critics condemned the front portico, "a correct model of Grecian
(Doric) architecture," for its inutility and its use of columns and bas-reliefs featuring,
among others, Shakespeare and Milton. The forty square feet that comprised the
building's stately entrance” had been made by purchasing the sites of the burnt houses
fronting into Bow Street. Subsuming the smaller, domestic sites that sat beside it, the
theatre incorporated its immediate surroundings in its bid to become a grander institution
than its rival, Drury Lane. This Royal theatrical space, with all of the appropriate

![Figure 2.1: Exterior of Theatre Royal Covent Garden.](image)
trimmings and symbols of opulence woven into it, also displayed "stone staircases and red porphyry pillars, and white-veined marble walls." These architectural designs completed the image of a theatre worthy of royal patronage and spectatorship. What messages did this architectural structure send to those who crossed its threshold? In addition to proclaiming itself a gathering place for London’s more elite residents, the theatre’s architecture communicated the need to distance itself physically from neighboring buildings and to provide a spacious environment in which well-to-do visitors could distance themselves from their more unruly co-spectators in the galleries. Visually produced, in part, by the Shakespeare and Milton figures, the Covent Garden theatre also linked its staged events, like the 1818 Rob Roy, with an extensive and weighty literary past dominated by these Englishmen.

As the spectators made their way inside, so did Wyndham:

The galleries opened by five doors into a spacious lobby, which was claimed as a great improvement as regards ventilation upon the former theatre. The house was lighted by 40 glass chandeliers arranged in front of each circle, the nightly supply being of 270 wax candles. The ceiling was painted to represent a dome. The proscenium was a large arch having red curtains and gold fringe festooned from the top, with the motto painted in gold letters, 'Veluti in Speculum' ['As in a mirror'].

In line with the theatre’s Neo-classical features, Wyndham’s text further arranged the venue, ordering the space with its literal counting of objects such as the glass chandeliers and wax candles that made the production visible to those seated in the house. Here I see
a hierarchical ordering from the monarch and his aristocratic coterie, down to the
commoners squeezed together on benches below the stage. This political ordering created
little opportunity to dissemble or to question the authority of the images and narratives
presented. The motto engraved above the proscenium arch reinforced the notion that a
stage had the ability to render a realistic image of something beyond its physical
parameters. In this case, the language suggested that the performance of Scotland and its
Highlanders was an accurate rendition. Instead of considering what was reflected by the
stage, though, I am interested in asking how the production refracted particular ideas of
political autonomy or social collectivity, through the medium of the audience. And this
refraction points to a dislocating, which I discuss below.

The material conditions in which *Rob Roy* opened at the Covent Garden included
this particular area of London, the theatre’s exterior and interior designs and features, as
well as documents such as the theatre’s playbills and the production’s play text. To begin
to uncover how the play appeared to confirm or to resist ideas of political control and
social order physicalized in the opulence of the house and the assumption that life on
stage mirrors the lives of actors (political, cultural, social) elsewhere, I look to the play’s
discursive designer, Isaac Pocock (1782-1835). Before he took up a role in theatre,
Pocock trained as an artist, an interesting profession given that he produced a distinct
rendering of Scotland in *Rob Roy*. One could read Pocock’s earlier theatrical works, the
melodramas, *The Miller and His Men* and *Robinson Crusoe; or, the Bold Buccaneers*, as
two views on nation-building. The former offered a portrait of a rural and Romantic
“nation” rooted in the domestication of an English landscape; the latter depicted the
colonization of a foreign territory and spatial extension of the British Empire. Pocock’s version of *Rob Roy Macgregor* created a sort of endo-imperialist adventure that celebrated—as it quarantined—the *native* character of the Highlands and its inhabitants through the eyes of an Englishman. Pocock’s experiences as a visual artist and as a writer of melodramatic adaptations likely primed him for this new theatrical undertaking.

Assembling a dramatic text of Scott’s extremely popular novel for this Theatre Royal was one process, however, enacting it on stage revealed a much more complex one.

Having highlighted instances of the material conditions of the production (the performance venue, advertizing, and playwright), I transition into the world of the play as revealed on this Theatre Royal stage. The performance, like the aforementioned boat of the same name, hinged on several kinds of imagined and physical movement. Performers passed in front of painted landscapes and cityscapes as the dramaturgical arrangement of scenes and events took the characters and spectators on a tour through various parts of England and Scotland. The opening scene introduced playgoers to the interior of a village inn in an unspecified location, ostensibly in northern England not far from its border with Scotland. On-stage, characters moved about. The stage directions revealed: “*Travellers preparing to set forward on their journey.*” The audience immediately encountered an unstable environment, a site that functioned simultaneously as a temporary resting-place and as a hub for activity. The inn’s host proclaimed, “Odd! there are twa mair travellers just alighting.—*Wha’d a thought o’ mair company at the Thistle an’ Bagpipes sae late i’ the day? But what wi’ Whigs, an’ Tories, Jacobites, an’ Rob Roy, we in the North here drive a bonny trade o’t.*” These travelers, Francis Osbaldistone and Owen (a family
friend and loyal clerk), entered the scene and announced the financial struggles of the Osbaldistone company to those at the inn and to those seated in the theatre. This inn took on a Scottish character, symbolized by its name, “Thistle an’ Bagpipes.” These two icons of Scotland (its national flower and its national instrument) intertwined aspects of its landscape and culture and existed materially in this transient shelter for travelers from across Britain. The host’s reference to political parties and alliances marked the unease within Britain during the time of Rob Roy; the innkeeper’s geographically-central location enabled him to comment on these social and political networks. While the interior of an inn was likely not an unfamiliar setting to these London spectators, the ambiguous locale of this inn might have begun the positioning of these viewers as strangers to this contentious place. Beginning Rob Roy within a place of business, leisure, and transit whose name was imbued with an identifiably Scottish character, and where visitors consumed political and social discourse along with a pint, promptly made visible a complex network of subjectivities and practices across Britain for these London “theatric tourists.”

This intersection of competing social and political interests extended from the dialogue and mise-en-scène to include the entire theatrical spatial experience on stage. While the Steam Boat Companion designated a direction for the traveler’s eye to follow, coming to rest on natural landmarks and topographical oddities, here, the organization of these scenes also determined a route of visual contact. The viewer followed the action from the interior of the inn to subsequent scenes: Osbaldistone Hall in northern England, several sites in Glasgow, and multiple outdoor environments in the Scottish Highlands.
The play concluded, unlike Scott’s novel, in the Highlands, with a rousing song that appeared to ask for the audience’s participation in its resolution. This route took the London viewer further and further away from her immediate, familiar surroundings and deeper into unknown territory. Each of these movements on stage contained certain depictions of these areas with visual cues that signaled how to read and to comprehend each locale, not unlike the textual trajectories mapped out by the *Steam Boat Companion*. What did it mean that the production’s dramaturgical ordering resembled a process made visible through the guidebook? Spatial theorist Henri Lefebvre claimed that a network of relationships exists between the environments created on stage and the movements of performers and spectators. He wrote of theatrical space

with its interplay between fictitious and real counterparts and its interaction between gazes and mirages in which actor, audience, ‘characters’, text, and author all come together but never become one. By means of such theatrical interplay bodies are able to pass from a ‘real’, immediately experienced space (the pit, the stage) to a perceived space—a third space which is no longer either scenic or public.  

Lefebvre noted a relationship between the concrete, material spaces that constitute part of the larger theatre structure and those spaces generated by the unfolding of the performance. This interplay makes it impossible for a production to cohere into a unified, stabilized object. The performance is, instead, a constant process of movements, intersections, alterations, and re-adjustments through multiple spaces, overlapping distinct times (the duration of the production and the historical moment being enacted, for
example). In the case of the opening scene of *Rob Roy*, the depiction of a village inn that offered refuge to travelers of all political orientations acted in dialogue with the “immediately experienced” site of the Theatre Royal Covent Garden, sanctioned by the current monarch. This theatre both *contained*—temporarily at least, the bodies of the spectators, production crew, performers, and all the stage materials that comprised the theatrical event—and *was contained by* its status of being a Theatre Royal, the network of other royal venues in Britain, and its specific geographical position in London. The necessary movement to which the opening scene alluded acted as a metonym for political instability in the country: the Jacobite discontent of the “past” and the jostling for power between the parliament and Prince Regent in the “present.”

Considering this overlapping of ideas, movements and affiliations, how might a spectator align herself with this performance in London? One example comes from the March 13, 1818 edition of *The Times*:

> The novel of *Rob Roy*, from the extraordinary popularity it has acquired, from the half-romantic, half-historical, nature of its subject…formed too obvious a mark to be missed by those ingenious persons who cater for our national drama, and form the taste of the rising generation…it seems to have been destined for the stage, and made its first appearance last night, at this theatre, as an opera...The alterations that have been made in the story, for the purpose of accommodating it to its new shape, are few, and most of those consist in making incidents co-temporary, which really happened at different periods.64
This review not only identified the nature of Scott’s “subject,” but it pointed to the active role of the stage in “form[ing] the taste” of its spectators. The critic did not view the stage as a passive site but one full of persuasive potential in transmitting ideas to spectators. These spectators, upon leaving the theatre, would then carry this knowledge (regarding for example, the place of the Highlands or actions of Highland clans) beyond the theatre walls, possibly affecting social interactions and subsequent theatrical performances. The “national drama” used to instruct its audiences linked *Rob Roy* to previous performances on this Theatre Royal stage; it also attempted to unite the different locales of the plot to represent the cohesiveness of a Britain-under-construction. According to this viewer’s perspective, in the production’s translation of the novel, its “new shape” arranged its materials by relying heavily on how Scott had told the story. The act of making “co-temporary” those events that had occurred at different historical moments was a political move, though. This dramaturgical ordering produced a condensed temporality of Scotland where the distinction between people and places, interactions and altercations was elided. What took the place of dissent and political unease was a palatable picture of an ultimately legible history. The production substituted spatiality for historicity, suggesting a new mode of controlling not just the national (Scottish) and state (British) narratives but possibly suggesting a way to envision the British Empire and its colonies at large.

This making of history did not remain completely behind the proscenium arch, however, as the same review revealed regarding the play’s closing moments:
Rashleigh falls by the hand of Rob Roy; and a pardon is procured for the bold outlaw, by a process utterly unintelligible. We could not indeed distinctly make out, whether a real pardon was obtained, or a critical pardon merely solicited from the audience…It was received throughout with scarcely [sic] a dissentient voice…[italics in original].

In its brief mention of the audience, this review discursively produced engaged spectators in affective agreement with the production. At the play’s conclusion, Rob Roy spoke the final line of dialogue: “We shall rejoice in your [Diana and Francis’s] happiness, though we may not share it. If in such moments, you ever think upon MacGregor, think kindly of him; and when you cast a look towards poor old Scotland, do not forget Rob Roy.”

Here the character of Rob Roy became permanently coupled with Scotland within the space of the Covent Garden stage. This created a “perceived space” in which the spectator’s new “perception” of Scotland relied on the materiality of this staged production (and the embodiment of these characters) and its two-dimensional topographies or backdrops, which I discuss in more detail later in this chapter.

The production’s closing song substantiates my argument that Macgregor became Scotland embodied and that this group of spectators took on another role in the performance. Here are sections from the three stanzas:

Pardon now the bold Outlaw,

Rob Roy MacGregor, O!

Grant him mercy gentles a’…

Set the Highland Laddie free …
Long the State has doom’d his fa’, …
Still he spurn’d the hatefu’ law…
Scots can for their country die,
Ne’er from Britons’ foes they flee—
A’ that’s past forget—forgie [sic].

Punctuated by solos sung by the English protagonists, Francis and Diana, the song ostensibly asked theatregoers to forgive and to forget the Scotsman’s misdeeds and to acknowledge the state (i.e. Britain)’s part in his hardship: “Long the State has doom’d his fa’.” By setting him “free” in this final moment, the audience played the role of benevolent, merciful monarch (a portrayal attempted by George IV), with the power to condemn or to liberate a man or a nation at will. Because Francis’s fate was resolved with his family business intact and his love interest in hand, Rob Roy’s misdeeds were more easily forgiven. The restoration of balance for the Englishman Osbaldistone ensured a reinstatement of the Scotsman’s (limited) rights—his freedom. Here the overlapping of past and present times and real and fictional spaces led the reviewer to find this moment “utterly unintelligible.” If the rest of the dramatic structure of the piece appeared clear and legible, then this moment seemed to fall into a messy slippage between a viewer’s passive observation of the staged events and one being called upon to reach a verdict on a man’s wrongdoings. The “critical” response elicited here alluded to a theatrical or fictional one that would stand in for an actual legal response (from perhaps the monarch himself) to the problems presented. The collection of human and non-human actors that framed and engendered the performance (the playbills, theatre venue, embodied
characters, and narrative arrangement of the performance) reinstated an authority that
prescribed theatrical and social taste and left no room for dissent. In attempting to smooth
over the violence of the Jacobite relation to Hanoverian rule, the conditions of this
performance rendered invisible the physical stakes and consequences of the events that
left a Rob Roy pleading for his freedom. The perceived lack of a “dissentient voice” from
the house alluded to this narrowing of perspectives.

In terms of translation, the circuit of materials and activities that collaboratively
produced this Rob Roy ordered the theatre space, staging, and sequence of events, likely
spilling over into the audience’s response. What appears to have been displaced or
disarticulated, though, is the geopolity of Scotland itself. Instead of an active, multi-
layered complex of institutions (law, religion), industries (transportation, printing), and
individuals (writers like Scott, clansmen like Macgregor), “Scotland” emerged as a
passive, reactive presence. Like its bold outlaw, Scotland was formatted as a tasteful
picture of a resolved threat for the audience’s visual consumption. Although its
conclusion presented a celebratory moment where wrongs were righted and villains made
to suffer, in its playing down of the politics of events and its glib request to recognize the
state’s part in Rob Roy’s suffering, the production evoked Scotland as a stand-in for
various socio-political injustices, which could be repaired or overturned with the ease of a
song. The series of performances in London made legible a need to learn from the past
and to support the present political institutions; the unintelligibility recognized by the
critic in the final moments of the play displayed an inability to envision a multi-
dimensional Scotland. As it journeyed through Britain, this particular production gave its
London audiences and, in particular, those who might identify with the strangers of the *Steam Boat Companion*, a certain trajectory of encounter through a characterization of Scotland that distanced viewers from a conflicted, complex presentation of the past as it offered them an easily digestible version of history. The popular and critical success of the Covent Garden’s production, though, led to many more performances for those “sufficiently acquainted” with this capital city both in London and across other British cities.

**Disseminating Northward, Crossing the Border** (a mobile interlude)

Nearly fifty productions of *Rob Roy Macgregor* took place in London in the fourteen years following its premiere at Covent Garden “both north and south of the Thames, both east and west of the City.”\(^68\) The area covered by these performances confirmed its immense popularity. One such production, *Rob Roy: A Romantic Drama*, written by George Soane, opened at Drury Lane just days following the Covent Garden debut. This new version, which rearranged some of the character relationships and events in Scott’s novel, did not elicit the positive responses anticipated by this other Theatre Royal. The disappointment of some spectators was evident in one review: “To distort characters thus, is in some measure to pervert the truth of history.”\(^69\) This observation implied that Pocock’s play had already attained a status as the official version of *Rob Roy* as it more closely followed Scott’s work of fiction. Other productions now faced comparison with Pocock’s version, and critics evaluated performers against those actors embodying the characters during the Covent Garden’s first staging. William Charles
Macready’s Rob Roy, John Liston’s Bailie Nicol Jarvie, and Miss Stephens’s Diana Vernon were points for the most frequent comparisons.

The productions that sprang up in London counted for only a fraction of Rob Roy’s movement in Britain. In 1818 productions quickly moved throughout England and Scotland, creeping northwards to parallel Francis’s journey. Portsmouth (May), Bath (April), Birmingham (March), Sheffield (April), and Newcastle (April) each housed their own productions of Rob Roy, identifying the performances as "melo dramatic spectacle," "musical drama" or "musical play." The label of “national drama” was not yet consistently in use as a marketing strategy, although reviews often referred to it as such. Each of these productions began within weeks of Covent Garden's opening and received mixed reviews and inconsistent box office receipts. The Rob Roy’s that took place in Birmingham and Newcastle did so in each city's own Theatre Royal. These performances benefited from the system of “legitimate” theatre venues, following the trail of other successful productions launched in London and transferred to other royal stages.

As the productions neared the border between England and Scotland, they implicitly created a dialogue with the border-crossing nature of the character of Rob Roy, viewed as a gentleman rogue, a Robin Hood of sorts, who traveled between the Highlands and Glasgow as a cattle drover. The movement across boundaries also spoke to the desire for a harmonious unification between England and Scotland, depicted in the dramatic text through the developing friendship between Francis and Rob Roy, as well as the quelling of a Jacobite threat to the Hanoverian reign. The playbill for the Newcastle production included an opening song that alluded to this northward movement. Sung by
the inn host and travelers, the song set the stage for mobilizing camaraderie and physical activity:

Soon the sun will gae to rest
Let's awa' together;
Company is aye the best
Crossing o'er the heather…
Bold Rob Roy, the Souterns says,
Is now upon the Border; Should he meet wi' us the day,
'T wad breed a sair disorder.
But take each man his stirrup cup,
His heart will feel the bolder,
Then set your lip,
The whisky sip,
And shoulder keep to shoulder.70

For a city like Newcastle that nearly straddled the border between England and Scotland, this song emphasized the importance of proximity. This potential threat in the shape of Rob Roy, who might lead to disruption and disorder, also became an active rallying-point for English unity. If these unidentified travelers, with their resolve strengthened by whiskey, could physically come together to face the unknown challenges that lie beyond the next field or glen, then perhaps they could help to stabilize socio-political relations between England and Scotland or at least mitigate the possible damage of an uncontained threat in Scotland.
Performing (in) Glasgow

“The site of Glasgow occupies both sides of the river [Clyde]; and, though at the distance of 45 miles from its influx into the sea, yet the tide, which flows a considerable way above the town, gives it a command of trade, and a means of ready conveyance for commercial purposes, to every quarter of the globe.”71

Glasgow is an important site to interrogate along the circuit of Rob Roy performances because of its locality in terms of Scottish geography, its growing industrial significance for the British Empire, and its local “resident,” Bailie Nicol Jarvie who played a compelling role in terms of both the dramaturgy of the performance and in thinking through the spatial and social configuration of Glasgow at this time. The network that shaped the theatrical production here included the materiality of the city’s spatial reordering, which incorporated the construction of theatre venues as part of its modernizing scheme. Glasgow’s proximity to the Scottish Highlands resulted in its receiving many of the peoples displaced during the Highland Clearances in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when (predominantly English) landowners transformed the Scottish hillsides from a place for crofters to make a living to a lucrative economic project primarily focused on raising cheviot sheep. Many of these migrants began working in the city’s growing shipbuilding and heavy engineering industries in the city, largely owned by English proprietors as well.72 Due to this mixing of Highlanders and Glaswegians, the city maintained a closer relationship with the cultural practices, including the music and language, of the Highlands than did its more stately neighbor, Edinburgh.

In order to survey the production of Rob Roy in another Theatre Royal, I need to consider this burgeoning city. Unlike Covent Garden’s material agenda in promoting the
wealth and stature of the state (and its monarch), this new royal venue in Glasgow symbolized and served a new industrial capital flowing into this Scottish city through the river Clyde. In some ways, Glasgow, like the rest of Scotland, benefited from the 1707 Act of Union, which freed up trade between Scotland and the American colonies, increasing the industrial city’s wealth. As the developing transportation industries of shipbuilding and steam locomotives opened up routes within Britain and the British Empire at large, Glasgow, with its river and port, found itself squarely on the map of imperial and industrial importance. Along with this nascent status and wealth came the desire on the part of city officials and entrepreneurs to organize the city into a place representative of the innovation and intelligence playing out behind the scenes of this growing industrial dexterity. As Glasgow’s population and imperial role increased, so did its geography. The city stretched beyond its boundaries, adding more streets to its growing urban grid. Developers planned new major thoroughfares, including Miller Street, Buchanan Street, and Queen Street. The city grew wealthier. This influx of capital moved through the hands of some of its citizens, making way for new buildings and institutions to be funded through public subscription, including the second Theatre Royal, built at the top of Queen Street.

Undergoing a process of translation whereby public and private spaces and buildings were organized around ideas of productivity and a modern sensibility, city planners structured its municipal layout to reflect an ability to promote Glasgow’s interests. As these changes took place outside of private residences, similar processes occurred within domestic settings. Economic and social historian Stana Nenadic argued
that following the rise of a Glaswegian middle class (derived from the high levels of trade and manufacturing) came a rethinking of the functionality of rooms and objects within their homes. Nenadic proposed that this categorization was “the tangible manifestation of the emergence of rationality and order within the middle-rank home. Interior spaces were ordered and categorised just as exterior spaces within the townscape were ordered and categorized.”74 And, one could argue, this interior systematicity also indicated the larger scale re-ordering of certain regions of Britain through practices of surveying and cartography,75 processes undertaken to catalogue and domesticate large land areas in order to access them more efficiently. Although other cities were undergoing a similar process, what was most interesting about Glasgow was how it maintained deep cultural and artistic connections to its Highland neighbors, while simultaneously pushing, full steam ahead as it were, into a modernity driven by its ability to produce and improve itself and contribute to the larger functioning of Britain. I recognize a similar tension between a mobile mercantile sensibility and a rooted relationship to Highlanders through the complexity of the character of Jarvie.

Before transitioning into the Rob Roy productions to tease out how they produce a categorization of spatial relationships in Glasgow, I turn to the theatrical landscape into which this production situated itself in this modernizing urban arena. This Scottish city, like London, offered various modes of entertainment in the form of operas, burlesques, pantomimes, and circus acts, alongside the stagings in patent theatres, the “satellites of the great London houses.”76 And like other Scottish cities, Glasgow’s theatre’s “chequered history” included several attempts by religious figures to obstruct the
building and programming of its playhouses. These conflicts perhaps indicated one reason why theatre productions did not appear to play as active a role in the lives of many Glasgow residents as they did, for example, in London. Although public subscription enabled the building of the Theatre Royals at Dunlop Street and then Queen Street, Superintendent of Public Works James Cleland, in his 1816 *Annals of Glasgow*, believed that what he saw as Glaswegians’ gradual disinterest in “theatricals” arose from two main trajectories: “oppos[ing] the theatre on moral and religious grounds, and… hav[ing] their time so completely taken up with mercantile or other pursuits… that they do not wish to spend evenings at the theatre.” This observation brought together two distinct sides of Glaswegian culture in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century, which invoked a tension between a desire to ensure a community’s moral stability and a need to develop the city’s economic infrastructure to secure its financial future.

Some Glaswegians, though, read the theatre’s role in society as potentially raising the quality of urban Scottish life. In a letter to the editor of the *Glasgow Theatrical Observer*, a Glaswegian using the initials W. T. stated:

That a good Theatre is of the utmost advantage to a town, as a rational and instructive place of amusement, is what few unbogged persons will dispute. Every effort then that is made, for the purpose of improving and encouraging our boards, ought to be viewed as a public utility to the city.... Judicious criticisms on the representations, operate not only as a strong incentive to exertions and improvement on the part of the performers, but they are also calculated to inspire the public with a taste for the Drama.
This opinion supported the idea that the theatre could act as a useful venture and not simply as an antithetical practice to the city’s definition of itself as an industrial leader. With the ability to fashion a particular “taste” in its audiences, theatre could adopt a similar ethos to the performances of industrial manufacturing and commercial business that brought in capital to, and circulated it through, the city. W.T. proposed here that the labor needed to improve (a theatrical performance or urban planning) would ultimately stimulate interest and inspire Glaswegians to work more diligently toward their own self-improvement. So, what particular instructions might a tasteful production of *Rob Roy Macgregor* have transmitted to audiences here?

A version advertised as coming from the Pocock genealogy arrived in Glasgow at the Theatre Royal Queen Street on June 10, 1818. This production associated itself with the Covent Garden production by way of its playbill, which strengthened the Theatre Royal circuit’s viability north of the English-Scottish border. The playbill announced that this “new” production was still a popular event in London: “performing at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, with the greatest applause.” But, undoubtedly, given the specificity of this new location, an industrial engine for the Empire and its connections to the Highlands, the production could not be simply replicated with the same responses as the one in London. For not only did Glasgow occupy an intermediary position along Francis’s travels within the world of the play, but the Scottish city occupied a pivotal geographical location between pro-Jacobites (many of whom resided in the Highlands) and pro-Hanoverians (who predominantly resided in the Scottish Lowlands and England).
In the Glasgow of the performance, characters moved from the house of Bailie Nicol Jarvie to the Old Bridge and College Gardens, traversing the city’s topography. The most provocative location in Glasgow, however, came in the form of a particularly confining space: the Glasgow Tolbooth (prison or jail). At the end of act one, Francis entered the tolbooth to find his compatriot Owen locked inside. Owen exclaimed, “[H]ave they caught you too? [T]hen our last hope fails, and the account is closed….but you that were your father’s sum-total…that might have been the first man in the first house in the first city, to be shut up in a nasty Scotch jail.”

Owen, reading changing events as financial indicators, marked Francis as the last hope for the family business and interpreted his perceived imprisonment as the final deficit in a company full of losses. Here Francis was instantly categorized and ordered in a specific socio-economic relationship based on a presumed relationship with his immediate surroundings, the tolbooth. This place of incarceration symbolized the kinds of spatial and social orderings that occurred throughout Glasgow. Particular activities (such as the transactions of a merchant, for example) took place in a specific area (such as the Saltmarket) due to the rigid spatial relationships being inscribed into the cityscape. A deviation from one’s expected environment (such as Francis’s appearance in the tolbooth) resulted in an inaccurate assessment.

The tolbooth in the performance not only presented a particular, rooted location (one which presumably kept prisoners in place) but this specific apparatus of confinement was also a meeting point between Glasgow and the Highlands with the entrance of Rob Roy and the news he carried with him. This moment of confinement actualized the larger,
more significant conflicts in the play, namely the state’s confrontation with Rob Roy, casually referenced in the aforementioned closing song. It also gestured toward the larger issue of Scotland’s ostensibly defined relationship with its southern neighbor for it was in this tolbooth that spectators first saw Rob Roy without the disguise he had donned earlier in the play when he first met Francis. Although he was not actually confined within a jail cell, in the prison Macgregor displayed his feelings of confinement in this urban atmosphere when he asked Francis and Jarvie to join him in the Highlands to resolve the current financial problems. “The air of Glasgow Tolbooth,” he confessed, “is not over wholesome for a Highlander’s constitution.” Glasgow, for Macgregor, existed as a transit point, not a permanent residence. This invitation marked a new path for Francis and yet another trajectory for movement within the play’s dramaturgy, beyond the city’s grid and into the “wild” territory to the north. Francis could not return home to London until he ventured into more alien landscapes. Fortunately for him, Jarvie agreed to act as his guide.

In keeping with Scott’s characterizations, Pocock introduced Jarvie, a Glaswegian merchant and magistrate, occupied a role as a cultural translator and embodied the aforementioned middle-rank status. In the production, he first identified himself as a merchant and then as a magistrate. Wearing two hats, his roles symbolized his capability to deal with the financial woes of the Osbaldistone company through the application of his sound, moral judgment. As a distant cousin to Rob Roy, Jarvie, at times, also behaved in accordance with familial duty by demonstrating his respect for his relative, despite clear differences of opinion regarding the activities of the Highlanders and the present
and future state of Scotland. The relationship displayed by these two cousins (Jarvie and Rob Roy) stood in stark contrast to Rashleigh’s disloyal treatment of his cousin, Francis, and his family. Jarvie was loyal to the Crown, however; he enjoyed the benefits of the British Empire, particularly in terms of the increased trading for Glasgow, perceived in the play as connected to the Hanoverian monarchy.

Jarvie first appeared to audiences within the setting of his Glaswegian home. After learning of the Osbaldistone problems, he declared:

Nicol Jarvie has a way o’ his ain to manage this matter… At ony rate, I’se prove mysel’ a friend; and if the house regains its credit, I shall recover my loss,—and if no, why I hae done as I would be done by, like my worthy feyther the Deacon, gude man!—blessings on his memory, say I, that taught me gude-will towards my fellow-creatures.¹⁸³

Rhetoric concerning business transactions punctuated much of Jarvie’s dialogue in the play. And his desire to balance friendship with his books became actualized when he guided Francis into the Highlands and offered the opportunity for Rob Roy’s children to receive his business and social guidance to ensure a successful future for the boys. Jarvie’s reference to his “worthy feyther the Deacon” connected him to his past while it simultaneously bolstered his credit among the Highlanders to expedite action in the present. His repeated allusion to his father throughout the play revealed that he, like Glasgow, could acknowledge his own history as he actively took steps toward securing a fiscally-sound future, in this case, by assisting with the recovery of the Osbaldistone business.
As Jarvie embodied Glasgow’s ability to take advantage of its local resources and relationships while acting as a hub for circulating goods, the actor who came to be most closely associated with the character, Charles Mackay, began his creative and lucrative transactions as Jarvie first in Perth and then in Dundee, Edinburgh, and Glasgow. Mackay was so popular with audiences that productions that included him on their cast list boasted that their performance contained “the real Mackay” in the role of the Bailie. Mackay stood as Jarvie, and Jarvie embodied and responded to his environment in social and political environment in significant ways. H. Philip Bolton suggested that in Jarvie, “the newly theatre-going member of the expanding urban middle class…could see himself and his friends, rather thinly disguised as his own recent ancestor, depicted sympathetically and humorously upon the stage.”

The Bailie operated as a link between the present (as a member of Glasgow’s growing middle class) and the past (the invocation of his father). His characterization on stage encouraged audience members to identify with him because although he might prove a bit hot-headed at times, he ultimately displayed a rational mind and a compassionate heart, proving to be a loyal friend. Like the Steam Boat Companion and the architecture of the Covent Garden theatre, he operated as a guide for viewers. His alignment with a particular modern sensibility influenced his running commentary on events and individuals. Perhaps theatre’s ability to “improve and encourage” individual citizens and their social interactions, as observed in the quotation from W.T., resonated with these more socially mobile individuals who saw the parallels between Glasgow’s prospects and their own. Viewing Jarvie as one of their own, these middle-class
spectators may have considered their own future business transactions as they watched the rise, fall, and rise of Jarvie’s fortunes, intricately tied to those of the Englishman Osbaldistone.

The *Glasgow Theatrical Observer* read Jarvie’s performance in 1824 as not only appealing to spectators but as a blurring of performance media:

> Of Mr. Mackay’s Bailie Jarvie what can we say? It is not acting; it is reality. It is the very Bailie Jarvie who lived in the Saltmarket some hundred years ago, with his all eccentricities, and his warmth of heart. No other person ought ever to attempt this character; no one but Mr. Mackay can ever represent an ancient magistrate of this important burgh.86

This review identified a fusion between the character and actor and, by extension, the staged performance and historical events, another “perceived space” created by the network of materials (conditions of Glasgow, embodiment of Jarvie, collection of reviews). This re-viewer inferred that a slippage between character and actor usually existed, but here the two men were so closely aligned as to appear as one. In the eyes of Scottish spectators, Mackay did not simply *represent* a particular Glaswegian character, but he *materialized* certain characteristics viewed as intrinsic to the ideal Glaswegian. And perhaps this Glaswegian marked the potential for the ideal Scot; without needing to eschew his past, Jarvie moved in an industrialized and Enlightened environment that reimagined and gradually produced how Scotland functioned within the larger geopolitical territory of Britain. Interestingly, Jarvie’s character received more press time in the reviews from Scottish playhouses than he did in the London productions. This
imbalance hinted at an unbridgeable distance between the image of Scotland as non-threatening, loyal, and rural as constructed through the Covent Garden productions and the “Scot” attended to by Glasgow audiences.

While Mackay clearly spoke to, and was embraced by, the spectators in Glasgow, his performance did not translate well to London audiences. The following account was printed in the *European Magazine* on 6 July 1821:

“*Rob Roy*” was repeated here to night, to introduce a Mr. Mackay, whose performance of *Bailie Nicol Jarvie* at Edinburgh, is said to have elicited a letter of warm applause from the invisible author of the Scottish Novels; and which letter, *if still in being*, we very anxiously hope Mr. Mackay brought in his portmanteau to London, as a very requisite introduction: for except in the circumstance of speaking pure Scotch, -- which is certainly not very marvellous in a Scotsman, we really saw nothing beyond the mediocre efforts of a low comedian; and the real *Bailie*, we think, could never have been so vulgar as Mr. Mackay made him.  

Despite Glaswegians interpreting Mackay’s enactment of Jarvie as a complete and accurate rendition of Glasgow, Londoners, or at least this one, did not have the same experience. The construction of Scotland manifested through the location, venue, and performance materials at Covent Garden did not generate a space for multiple takes on these characters. The ordering structure of the stage space and the privileging of London (as the home of the protagonist) could not afford competing images of Scotland or its peoples. Deviation from this rigid arrangement resulted in perceptions of vulgarity in
Mackay’s performance. While English characters, like Francis Osbaldistone, could enter into a fictional Scotland to achieve their personal and professional goals, the Scottish actor experienced much more resistance when attempting to persuade his English viewers that his efforts deserved respect and applause.

Glasgow functioned as geographical median in the theatrical production, existing without the trappings of a capital city like London or Edinburgh. In Jarvie, the productions of Rob Roy generated a model of and for Glasgow that offered a celebratory middle-rank and middle-ground position between merchant and magistrate who vacillated between familial and financial duties. In this way, the production embraced the developing mercantile and manufacturing reality of the citiescape while encouraging recognition of its own past, perhaps only in word, though. When Jarvie translated—ordered, arranged—Glasgow’s relationship to the Highlands, he fleshed out the aspirations of the city. Scottish spectators embraced the man as their own. But what became disarticulated in this process? The emphasis placed on Jarvie’s performance as middle-class Glasgow likely obscured the actual labor taking place throughout the city (the dangerous machinery at the dockyards, the pollution-spewing vents of the factories, and the rampant diseases brought on by a population boom and inadequate sanitation in the city). Jarvie could afford to be comedic and clever since his social position as a merchant and magistrate indicated a degree of education, privilege, and stability. His inability to take into account those less socially mobile in the city would have placed an organized aesthetic on the city that might not have been visible on a laborer’s daily travel to and from her place of employment, unless she passed by the Theatre Royal Queen
Street. While this dichotomy became observable in these city streets, another complex duality was in process within another Scottish city.

**Edinburgh’s Capital Production**

“The northern metropolis of Britain being an important point of attraction to strangers, is commonly the first object of a visit to Scotland. From it, the assistance of a guide to other parts of the kingdom becomes most essential; and here, most properly, it ought to commence. The capital itself abounds in interesting features…”

My third and final destination for surveying productions of *Rob Roy* is the Scottish capital, positioned in the excerpt from the *Steam Boat Companion* as a British metropolis and as the entry point to explore Scotland. This urban environment opened up different social, political, and cultural inflections within *Rob Roy*, particularly interesting given that Edinburgh’s Theatre Royal used the production to help identify itself as Scotland’s national theatre and that the capital city was conspicuously absent from its texts (the novel and the play text). One of the dominant industries flourishing in this “Athens of the North” was printing: Edinburgh’s numerous publishing houses produced a variety of journals, magazines, pamphlets, and novels, which led to higher levels of literacy in the city. The industries, practices, and discourses on law, education and printing shaped in Edinburgh were woven into its urban fabric. While these characteristics resonated with activities in London, Edinburgh also shared certain qualities with its Midlothian neighbor, Glasgow. Its development of distinct Scottish policies, programs, and institutions linked this white-collar capital with its more blue-collar neighbor to the west. Through its connections to London and Glasgow, Edinburgh produced its own hybrid identity that became staged, in part, through the expansion of its urban topography.
While in Glasgow, Jarvie/Mackay performed as the city’s metonym for its residents, Edinburgh’s relationship with *Rob Roy* was quite different since this Scottish city was not a fictional site visited in the theatrical production’s narrative. The absence of a staged Edinburgh meant that spectators here were more akin to strangers, like the steam boat travelers, on this journey through the visual depiction of their own country. The images (backdrops) and character interactions on stage guided the spectators through an encounter with places that were geographically distanced from them. The production made visible to these citizens a way of life that their city had determinedly left behind in its spatial arrangements. *Rob Roy* offered a version of the Highlands that appeared as a place out of time, distinct from the socio-economic and political developments underway elsewhere in Scotland and especially in Edinburgh. After viewing such a production, with its commentary on a rural part of Scotland, spectators left the theatre and re-emerged into the capital cityscape. With its nascent eighteenth-century New Town, viewed as a solution to what some urban planners, architects, and political philosophers saw as an outdated mode of life, Edinburgh became a home for residents with more privilege who sought to put space between themselves and their neighbors. The newly named, performative *Old Town* became an object of historical inquiry and antiquarian interest, a place to be viewed from afar (not unlike the coastlines seen by steam ship passengers).

Entrance—by sea—into the Scottish capital meant a visitor traveled from the Firth of Forth estuary that connected the city to the North Sea and into the urban center. In 1752, some prominent Edinburgh residents (likely including Adam Smith, Adam Fergusson, John and Robert Adam, and David Hume) expressed their concern with the
unsanitary conditions and overcrowding in Edinburgh in their publication, *Proposals for Undertaking Certain Works in the City of Edinburgh*. The municipal developments that emerged from this text and several discussions with city planners effectively created a suburb to the overpopulated streets of the city’s medieval layout. The New Town that emerged over several decades designated an urban environment in acute distinction to the city’s medieval center. Its wide avenues, park squares and central gated garden offered residents—many of whom were, initially, aristocrats and gentry and, subsequently, lawyers, military men and merchants—an environment separated from the commerce taking place in the Old Town. Here gestures and body movements denoted a certain way of inhabiting this city and reflecting the Enlightenment principles which had led to the creation of this new section of Edinburgh. The wide streets offered residents an open-air performance venue to see and to be seen. According to Scottish architecture historian Charles McKean, as the New Town residents strolled down these promenades, they enacted a "poised presentation of self...on an urban stage in which all doubled as actors and audience." The bodies enacting this “poised presentation” were keenly aware of the process of constructing a social identity that would signify particular attributes to viewers: social standing, wealth, style, self-control, and discipline. The distance created between one another generated a precise ordering of civic and embodied practices and allowed for the optimal perspective to judge the movements of others.

This burgeoning area’s topography added another layer to the “poised presentation” of its inhabitants through its design. The new roomy grid arranged by
designers and architects infused a particularly *British* character to this northern metropolis:

the street names became Hanoverian—Queen Charlotte, Princes, George, Frederick and Hanover—leaving a residual Scottishness only in St. Andrew Square...The celebration of the Union was relegated to the naming of the two artisanal streets--Rose and Thistle--in the 1780s. Their narrowness, lower scale and poorer quality of masonry was evidence that class distinction was now being horizontally rather than vertically organized.\(^9^1\)

The performative act of street naming made legible to all of Edinburgh’s residents the intended longevity of the Hanoverian’s influence by displacing those “Scotch” signifiers and entering into what might have appeared to be a more unified, national character that connected Scotland to Britain, not unlike the re-placing of “Scotch” with “national” on the theatre playbills. As the streets indicated, Britishness dominated the aesthetic of the New Town, while those spaces expressly affiliated with symbols of Scotland were relegated to the corners of this area that most closely resembled those of the Old Town. As part of this spatial management, narrow alleys and walkways hidden behind the prominent facades of the grand three-storey buildings hid the commerce of the "artisinal streets," keeping these spaces out of view, unable to mar the coherence of the upper-class public pathways. The bodies that traversed these routes performed the ideals of the New Town as clean, organized and well-manicured with their own aesthetic choices and prescribed behaviors.
By saturating these new places of residence with a British identity, the plans for the New Town aimed to create an alternative to the Old Town's disorder and claustrophobia, giving those who had attained an elite social status a polite, spacious environment in which to conduct themselves. This area performed itself as a self-enclosed community for select citizens at arm’s length from commercial and entertainment pursuits. Initially, access into the New Town was limited, but the building of the North Bridge on the eastern end of Princes Street opened up a pathway between Old and New Towns. After observing this overpass into the New Town, a Polish visitor recalled, “A deep valley to the left, over which two bridges are thrown, divides the Old Town from the New, the Scottish from the Anglicised.”

The city was comprised of these two distinct areas that collaborated to help Edinburgh become a popular tourist destination and generator of educated citizens who took part in imperial duties overseas. Interestingly, the first building to lay its foundations after the completion of the North Bridge, essentially at the point that connected the Old and New Towns, was the Theatre Royal Edinburgh.

A theatre had stood in Edinburgh in the Canongate (eastern end of the High Street) since the early eighteenth century; however, staging plays was illegal in Scotland until 1767 due to strict Calvinist principles. That year an English actor and theatre owner, David Ross, decided to build a new playhouse closer to the New Town under construction. This new theatrical venue imported many of its productions from London, including countless performances of Shakespeare’s plays. From 1809 until 1815, two other English actors, Henry and Sarah Siddons, managed Edinburgh’s Theatre Royal.
Following the death of Henry Siddons, Sarah and her brother William Murray undertook the theatre’s management. Murray remained at the helm for the next thirty-six years; this Englishman controlled the output of this Scottish venue, complete with its own “statue of Shakespeare supported by the muses of Tragedy and Comedy.”

*Rob Roy Macgregor* entered the Scottish capital after appearing in theatres in dozens of other cities. It allegedly arrived by way of Daniel Terry, stage manager of the Covent Garden, who had sent a copy of Pocock’s text to Murray in Edinburgh. Its Edinburgh run enabled Murray to turn a profit for the theatre. According to Donald Mackenzie, writing in the 1960s, *Rob Roy* ran for forty-one consecutive nights and after two months Murray had netted £3000. The first mention of the Pocock production in the *Edinburgh Evening Courant* appeared on February 11, 1819:

Shakespeare’s Tempest was on Saturday evening last again honoured by the presence of a most brilliant and fashionable audience…It will be repeated to-morrow evening, when it must be withdrawn, on account of the preparations for the representation of Rob Roy, the scenery and machinery for which have arrived from London, painted by Mr Grieve of the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden… the Navigators… will be repeated, for the 18th time, on Saturday evening next, when it must be withdrawn on account of the preparation for the production of the celebrated Opera, called, Rob Roy Macgregor, or Auld Langsyne. The only information released about the “celebrated Opera” in this venue at this point was that it would utilize the “scenery and machinery” from London. The mention of the
transport of Grieve’s work served a similar function as including Walter Scott on the
Covent Garden playbill: it connected this particular production to an established success
that helped spectators imagine the state of Scottish relations to Britain. This inclusion
also put emphasis on the production’s scenographic elements, put on display for the
Scottish audience’s visual consumption. Created in London, these images would have
taveled hundreds of miles to reach Edinburgh in order to stand in for Highlands to these
Edinburgh spectators.

Although hundreds of designs for scene paintings by the Grieve family (John
Henderson Grieve and his sons, Thomas and William) exist today, the vast majority of
them are unlabeled, making it impossible to know for certain which images belonged to
which late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century theatre productions. After looking at
hundreds of images from the Grieve’s collection of set designs and scene paintings,
however, it becomes clear that a large selection of their images depicted picturesque rural
villages or rural landscapes that emphasized a sublime aesthetic. These former images
portray individuals cultivating the land to promote productive farmland. These
illustrations call attention to a territorial mastery and spatio-material reorganization via
agricultural practices. The latter images stand in stark contrast, though. Here rugged cliffs
dwarf individuals painted into the scenes, and when transferred to a backdrop, the
hillsides and cliffs would have towered above actors on stage. In Figure 2.2, the jagged
cliffs stacked up on one another appearing to reach inwards, creating a wild, unsteady
frame to the scene. The pathways in the foreground and around the hills helps carries the viewer’s attention around the image and draws focus upwards toward a vanishing point below the rickety bridge. This unstable, man-made structure tentatively connects these two sides (perhaps only slightly less securely than the North Bridge connecting areas of Edinburgh), offering travelers a way to cross above the valley below, albeit by an unpredictable passage. In the foreground sits a thatched cottage, nestled in the corner beside the outcroppings of rocks, almost blurring into its surroundings. Here the ground appears volatile; the cliffs nearly tremble. The absence of humans reiterates the dominance of an unpredictable nature with which the cottage inhabitant must negotiate on a daily basis. The feral space depicted here utilizes certain features (an isolated building, rugged cliffs, erratic pathways) to evoke particular emotions: fear, caution,
hesitation, uncertainty. Perhaps this example of a scenic backdrop is not too far removed from those backdrops used to depict the Scottish Highlands in *Rob Roy* that intended to invoke similar anxieties among the other characters as well as among those seated in the theatre. These images embrace a temporality akin to the perspective created in the reformation of Edinburgh’s Old Town: a clustered, disorganized past not yet made efficient or fully legible through human intervention.

In the Pocock script, the first few scenes occurred in interior spaces (an inn, library, jail) but in the end of Act II, as the protagonist Osbaldistone and his traveling companion, Andrew Fairservice (a Scottish gardener working in England), journeyed through locales in northern England and into Scotland (Glasgow and eventually the Highlands) scenes took place “outdoors.” With “military music” signaling a shift between scenes, the spectators began to get a visual sense of the distanced landscapes of Scotland from their seats within the playhouse. The scenes in the Highlands outnumbered those taking place elsewhere in northern England or Glasgow. Scenes occurred in “The Clachan of Aberfoil,” “The Pass of Lochard” and “Wild Scenery in the neighbourhood of Aberfoil.” Each of these sites presented slightly different but connected perspectives of the Highlands to viewers: its crags, pathways and foliage. Within these fictional and visualized spaces significant realizations occurred in the play. In Aberfoil, Diana Vernon recognized an important transaction that occurred between Rob Roy (as related to Scotland) and the Osbaldistone business. Believing that their paths must remain separate, Diana, in melodramatic fashion, bid farewell to Francis, “there is a gulph between us—a gulph of absolute perdition. Where we go, you must not follow.” Diana feared that her
actions in support of the Jacobites would lead to problems for Francis. She continued, “Take from my hand these eventful papers;--poor Scotland has lost her freedom, but your father’s credit will at least be restored.” This exchange of freedom for financial recovery marked a future path for the Englishman, while “Scotland” must follow the will of others. Scotland has become unified in this transaction into a single object, lacking autonomy and confined within a British commercial future.

The production’s final scene, “Rob Roy’s Cave and a View of Loch Lomand” (Figure 2.3), brought to a close the production’s travel through the Highlands. This painted backdrop, the only one which I have located that has been labeled as part of the Pocock production, offered a split focus for the spectators: toward the confining, dark

Figure 2.3: Scenic Backdrop, "Rob Roy’s Cave and View of Loch Lomand." Courtesy of Theatre Museum Archives, Victoria and Albert Museum.
interior space of the cave or out into the expansive, bright horizon of the loch with its surrounding rolling hills. This single backdrop coalesces the two predominant genres in the Grieve’s collection: the rural and the sublime. Here, one direction took the spectator/stranger further into the unfamiliar, dangerous territory of the Highlands that resembled a maze of darkened entrances; the other led her to the steam boat that would travel back to the industrialized, modern urbanity of Glasgow by way of more welcoming natural surroundings, which she could observe along the side of the loch. Like the cliffs in Figure 2.3, here the stones and intertwining vegetation of this cave structure frame the image, the performers moving in front of it, and the viewer looking upon it. In this scene, Francis offered Rob Roy a solution to securing his children’s future: “Rely on it, the proscription of your name and family is considered by the English as a most cruel and arbitrary law. …Might they [Macgregor’s children] not, with some assistance, find an honourable resource in foreign service? If such be your wish, depend on its being gratified.” While in the play, Rob Roy connected himself to Scotland through his words—“when you cast a look towards poor old Scotland, do not forget Rob Roy”—here Francis stood in for England in his assertion that England categorized Rob Roy’s punishment as “cruel and arbitrary.” His gesture of aid required the Highlander to leave home in order to achieve honor; life in the Highlands and being considered respectable stood at odds. Francis believed, as did perhaps quite a few of the Edinburgh theatre spectators, that a successful future for Scots depended on progress and industry that contrasted the depiction of life in the Highlands as promoted by Grieve’s backdrops. This foreign service might very well have been a civil post in a British colony, a place being
exploited by the Empire for its natural resources or geographic locale, a site possibly visited by a steam boat not unlike the Rob Roy.

In viewing the convergence of materials (urban topography, reviews, box office figures, theatre managers, and the production’s scenography) that conditioned and created *Rob Roy Macgregor* in Edinburgh, I am interested in how backdrops acted as guideposts, building a pictorial pathway through the story unfolding in front of viewers. This route contrasted the differences between the rural parts of Scotland envisioned by these paintings and the civic practices that delineated a new spatial and social arrangement in the Enlightened Scottish capital. The production also resonated with the confluences of the city’s New and Old Towns, which emphasized an interplay between British and Scottish topographic resonances. By being left out of the staged event, Edinburgh could applaud its material difference from the Highlands in order to emphasize how its brand of “national” proved compatible with that of Britain writ large.

“‘The triumphant success of Rob Roy, or Auld Lang Syne,’” read the next morning’s play-bill, “‘renders all comment unnecessary—it will be repeated every evening till further notice.’” After three and a half years, and dozens of stagings of *Rob Roy*, first advertized as a “celebrated Opera” in 1819, the production had discursively transformed into a “national Opera,” as noted by the *Edinburgh Dramatic Review* in 1822:

As often as this national Opera has been performed, it never fails to prove attractive whenever it is presented to the public. As represented here, it has many advantages that it cannot boast in London and elsewhere. The
locality is one great auxiliary, the Scottish dialect is another. This was, on
the English stage, entirely laid aside, as it there has the peculiar advantage
of being least understood when best spoken.\footnote{104} This reviewer implicitly praised the Scottishness of this production by suggesting that
Edinburgh’s physical proximity to the places depicted in the staging factored into its
success. The review might lead one to believe that all Scots, regardless of their political
leanings (Jacobite, Unionist) or geographical location (Glasgow, Edinburgh) in Scotland,
should have been interested in this national performance as it spoke to and for them in the
wider circuit of British and, indeed, international performances, (productions also
occurred in New York City, for example). The reviewer identified particularly Scottish
aspects of the performance (land and language) that, unlike the industry of Glasgow and
printing production of Edinburgh, did not line up with the Britain under construction.
What a London reviewer labeled as vulgar in Mackay’s Jarvie, this Scottish review
classified as something to be embraced and praised. The Scottishness displaced by the
London productions, became an ordering principle in the reception of \textit{Rob Roy} by Scots.

“Why should we not be proud of our National genius, humour, music, kindness
and fidelity?—\textit{why not be national?}\footnote{105}” This question, posed by \textit{The Scotsman} reviewer,
elided the stark contrasts existing within Scotland: the inability for a New Town resident
in Edinburgh to identify with a clan system in the Highlands, for example. This list of
traits (humour, musicality, kindness, fidelity) might apply to a specific rendering of
Scotland, like the characterization of Jarvie, but they appear more as an aspiration than as
a present practice. The review presented the matter as a simple choice: a Scot could
simply “be” national if she decided. This use of “national” proposed different affiliations than the one Bell identified as replacing “Scotch” in the playbills. While that “national” suggested a collaboration with Britain (or at least a set of practices that did not oppose Scotland’s relationship with Britain), this usage hinted at the inability for Brits (especially in London) to embrace distinct aspects of a Scottish geo-culture.

Unlike in London and Glasgow, spectators who viewed performances of *Rob Roy* in Edinburgh did not encounter an environment that sought to present their immediate surroundings in any way. And they did not observe characters who reflected back to them their specific socio-economic status. Instead, this production revealed quite the opposite: exactly what Edinburgh sought to order and to discipline through its New Town and the cultural practices it attempted to “preserve: in the formation of Highland Societies.” In this production, the Highlands symbolized a “poor Scotland,” an object of historical inquiry, a marker of all that had been overcome, passed by in order to achieve modernity driven by industrialization. The staged Highlands were then stabilized, contained, and commodified.

**Moving Toward a Conclusion**

By scrutinizing the materials related to *Rob Roy Macgregor* productions in London, Glasgow, and Edinburgh in the early nineteenth century, I find networks produced by practices (printing, painting, touring, staging), objects (backdrops, playbills, playtexts, buildings), individuals (Scott, Macready, Mackay, Grieve, reviewers), and institutions (Theatre Royals, Highland Societies) that comprised, configured, and constructed these performance events. While the novel’s author, Scott, wrote a
historically-infused adventure for readers to journey through particular corners of Scotland in order to see the trajectory of certain potentially dangerous actions and their eventual quelling, these performances dispersed various materials for collective audiences, making visible heterogeneous activities and associations. In London I recognize a tasteful ordering of shaping of historical events to present a distant and digestible history to viewers. The production in Glasgow suggests something else; here Jarvie was the city’s forward-thinking mobile character with Mackay’s performance bolstering its believability. When the production moved to the Scottish capital, however, the identification with its Scottishness seemed more muddied given Edinburgh’s desire to celebrate the aesthetic and practices of a British New Town but to acknowledge discrete, untranslatable idiosyncratic local resources. These cities, then, did not simply make up a continuous route, a touring circuit, inhabited by the same production at different times, but they point to the inability of Britain to perform as a single unified entity at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

As the years passed and theatrical events produced further attempts to depict and to question a “national” character of Scotland, various tours continued through the cities and countryside, islands and Highlands of Scotland. What emerged, nearly 200 years following the debut of *Rob Roy* was an institution sanctioned and financed by a (partially) re-activated Scottish government that attempted to embrace the heterogeneous environments and practices that a production like *Rob Roy* (perhaps) inadvertently brought to the foreground. How would this institution take shape? Would the displacement of Scotland evident in London and the objectification of the Highlands
materialized in Edinburgh, continue as a dominant theatrical convention? Would productions and performers speak to Scotland in the way that Mackay, in the shape of Jarvie, did to Glaswegians? And how would theatrical experiments transmit outside of Scotland to its English or Irish neighbors, associates on the European Continent or farther afield to the United States, for example?
Chapter Three

An Unsettling National Theatre: Mobilizing Scottish Stories and Sites

“…theatre and performance in all their manifestations always involve the interrelational interdependence of ‘organisms-in-environments’. Or, to reformulate that last phrase from a more radical ecological perspective as proposed by ‘deep ecologist’ Arne Naess, they constitute a ‘relational total-field’ in which everything is interdependent and cannot always easily be assigned to clear distinctions, say as between ‘organism’ and ‘environment’.”

(Baz Kershaw)

“Landscape is a nexus of inhabitation, place and value. It is a term as complex and ideologically charged as culture. It should not be forgotten that the roots of the term still lie in the notion of an aesthetic cultivation of the view or aspect; a reflexive awareness of the historical roots of the concept itself is important. Landscape painting and architecture improve upon nature according to particular aesthetic or cultural values. This submission of place to reason and imagination imbricates time and history.”

(Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks)

Ferries, planes, a rigid inflatable boat. Cars, buses, trains, vans. On foot. These are the modes of transport that I have utilized as I have traveled through, around, across, and over Scotland during the past nine years. The villages, beaches, towns, islands, bridges, woods, farms, cities, suburbs, airports, hills, lochs, coasts, and walls that constitute and re-constitute the rural and urban topographies of Scotland exist in tension with one another and with their inhabitants, creating different kinds of eco-systems. These varying, but crucially interconnected places and points of social and physical contact, enact particular temporalities: a deep geological history that promises ongoing stability through rock formations; a cyclical time evident in the renewal of seasons and the movements within an environment such as tides or the departure and return of birds or ferries; a fleeting sense of time evident in the erosion of Scotland’s eastern beaches by the North Sea and the disappearing industrial cityscapes, transformed to more easily accommodate a new service economy. Like many nations in the twenty-first century, Scotland must
adapt to changing political landscapes, environmental crises, and socio-economic ebbs and flows.

Following the wakes made by the Rob Roy steamship and the wagon tracks and hoof marks left behind after touring theatrical productions of *Rob Roy* crisscrossed the UK in the nineteenth century, artists have designed new routes to creatively articulate Scottish history, social relationships, cultural practices, and the nation’s distinct geographies. In the past decade, Scotland has actively begun a new phase in renegotiating its political sovereignty within the UK as its government has labored to reorganize its cultural institutions. One of the most provocative developments to have emerged from these debates has been the launch of the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) in 2005.

**What?**

It is Scotland's first ever National Theatre working with the best Scottish actors, directors and theatre companies, we will produce unmissable nights out.

**Where?**

Everywhere. With no building of its own, the National Theatre of Scotland will tour to big theatres, small theatres and places where theatre has never been, across the whole of Scotland and beyond.

**Why?**

Because Scotland has the talent and the audience to have a world-class National Theatre. Welcoming interested viewers (artists, spectators, critics, tourists, and politicians) to their website, the NTS has created a cyber home full of information about their dozens of shows. The website’s layout presents a bright pink background, a design far different, perhaps from anticipated color schemes: the purple and white of the thistle, the red and yellow of the Rampant Lion flag, the blue and white of the Saltire Flag, or even a tartan plaid. But then again, the NTS has aimed to defy, or at least to re-configure, expectations.
On the eye-catching background of this mobile homepage sit outlined drawings of a map of Scotland, an airplane, and a tractor trailer. These images symbolize not only that this theatre is intended for the whole of Scotland but that mobility has been woven into its very fabric. This theatrical venture does not include a “built form” of theatre in the shape of a particular venue or complex, such as the ostentatious Theatre Royals that dotted Britain’s urban landscape in the beginning of the nineteenth century. And while some performances will take place in Scotland’s cities, the NTS will stage dozens more in the rural and suburban areas, attempting to spread its resources and create audiences across the nation.

Organizers of this new cultural institution have resisted established models of national theatres such as venues across European capital cities. Theatre scholar Marvin Carlson, drawing from the work of Loren Kruger, argued that the “intellectual roots of nationalism” and the notion of a National Theatre in Europe (in, for example, France, Austria, Germany, and Sweden) aligned with the development of Romantic theory as articulated by French and German philosophers. In these instances, a National Theatre functioned as a pedagogical tool to identify and to display a certain history and character of an ethnos. In doing so, it emphasized similarities and excluded differences in order to strengthen the perceived connections between a group of people. The theatre and its staged performances intimated a certain natural quality to the composition, behavior, and abilities of this ethnic group, making deviations from these representations appear unnatural and unwelcomed. They also suggested that natural environments were given, stable, and divorced from socio-cultural life.
While we might reasonably situate the productions of *Rob Roy Macgregor* within this view of nature and culture (particularly with its characterizations of the distanced Highlands and unfamiliar clansmen), the National Theatre of Scotland that has gathered steam in the beginning of the twenty-first century can no longer propose nature as distinct from industrially-infused environments. By existing without a designated theatre venue and taking a central building (a theatrical home) out of its equation, the NTS suggests that its home *is* and *can be* anywhere in Scotland or be the entirety of Scotland. For the NTS, home is performed through its practices and iterations, an inverse of the nineteenth-century imaginary where home, like nature, was seen as a given. This desire to carve out a collective identity from the territory of Scotland resonates with the deployment of a national theatre in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to help coalesce different regions into one nation (in the case of Germany, for example), but in the case of Scotland, it is not simply a process of concentrating resources and relationships. The NTS hints at, especially in its first productions, *HOME* and *Black Watch*, a necessary construction of theatrical nationhood by simultaneously emphasizing a series of movements (physical, social, economic, cultural) that are shaped by the interplay of natural and social relationships. The technologies (transportation, military, industrial, commercial) that contribute to and mediate one’s relationship with one’s surroundings have become harnessed in the NTS’s programming, which attempts to formulate new questions (or perhaps revisit lingering ones) between the traditions and conventions of Scottish theatre and the diverse topographies, communities, and histories that comprise this small country. In this chapter I chart the ways in which the NTS has rethought the
artistic architecture of Scotland by evolving to a flexibly designed national theatre. Designed for the twenty-first century, the institution moves away from defining a singular national space or theatrical corps, represented by a fixed building or permanent Scottish acting troupe. Instead it collects, designs, locates, partners, and activates multiple spaces, stories, and relationships contained within Scotland and existing between Scotland and other nations in the UK, the British Commonwealth, Europe, and elsewhere. These complex multi-textured arrangements propose a nuanced awareness of theatre’s ability to draw from and make visible the politics of labor (physical, artistic, intellectual, military) and to create a sustainable artistic ecosystem to promote Scottish interests at home and abroad.

My analysis of the NTS also extends my concern with the material heterogeneity of theatrical productions that I explored in the London, Glasgow, and Edinburgh productions of *Rob Roy Macgregor* in the early nineteenth century. To do so, I include ideas by theorists of theatre and performance that resonate with Actor Network Theory, such as the concept of “stratigraphy,” as embraced by Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks in their *Theatre/Archaeology* (2001) and “performance ecologies,” as scrutinized by Baz Kershaw in his *Theatre Ecology* (2007). These two texts argue that the ideological and material components of theatre and performance extend far beyond the explicit or visible boundaries of any theatrical production (particularly those, like *Rob Roy*, that employ a proscenium arch) and into various socio-cultural and physical environments that constitute the performance environment. Pearson and Shanks parse the dramaturgical layers of devised theatrical productions through the lens of stratigraphy, a reading of
layers of soil and rock unearthed during an archaeological dig that can disclose particularly salient information about the site under consideration:

We might regard the dramatic structure of devised performance as constituting a kind of stratigraphy of layers: of text, physical action, music and/or soundtrack, scenography and/or architecture (and their subordinate moments). Dramatic material can be conceived and manipulated in each of these strata which may carry different themes or orders of material in parallel.111

The relationships between elements of performance (the audience placement, sensorial features, and kinds of materials that coalesce into the event) structure the narrative of the production for performers and spectators. Creating resonances within a production adds possibly unintended textures, depths, and nuanced moments of dialogic interconnection. I extend Pearson and Shanks argument, developed around the practices of site-specific, devised theatre, to include other kinds of theatrical performances that seek to investigate physical and socio-economic elements of a simultaneously local and national environment. A process of stratigraphy highlights the material evidence of a particular community that has been embedded into the earth. By adopting a similar mode of analysis, whereby I apply an ecological or physical environmental lens to particular theatrical performances of elements of Scottish culture, I hope to tease out the movements between local, grounded elements (in a given performance site, for example) and a wider circuit (of national or international socio-economic markets) that may appear to have become stabilized through the work’s labeling as “national.”
The ecologies proposed and scrutinized by Kershaw take multiple forms. He suggests that theatre should be a topic of interest to ecology and, likewise, that we need to consider the ecological principles at work or made visible by theatre. Kershaw points to the properties of an “ecotone,” where two or more ecologies meet. In nature this might take the form of a beach or a riverbank. Kershaw argues, “Ecotones often produce new hybrid life-forms as a result of the ‘edge effects’ characteristic of the meeting of ecosystems.”

At these always-in-motion sites of interaction exist the potential for cross-pollination or re-organization. An ongoing process of commingling, the ecotone unsettles binary assumptions about two seemingly disparate and stabilized sites. The changes that occur, these *edge effects*, undoubtedly impact the constitution of each of the ecologies involved. The potential strength of the NTS, as I see it, is in its continual deployment of different performance sites and events that re-work the ostensibly familiar and known images, tropes, and geographical sites of Scotland. As Kershaw is also interested in rupturing the perceived distinction between nature and culture, his analysis works well with the driving principles of Actor Network Theory, as well as the archaeological conviction that a natural environment works in tandem with and reveals the relationships, habits, and nature of its inhabitants evidenced from a process of stratigraphy, a reading between the lines. As I consider the edge effects and contradictory elements within particular NTS productions, I locate the materials that constitute the specific performance and its relationship to the kind of nation-building and Scottish-branding enabled through the cultural apparatus of the NTS.
This chapter focuses on two performances of *HOME*, the NTS’s inaugural production in February 2006, and two productions of *Black Watch*, which premiered during the Edinburgh Fringe Festival and later took place at the Barbican Theatre in London. *HOME* consisted of ten site-specific productions that occurred across Scotland (in cities, towns, woods, disused buildings, and on a ferry) during the same weekend. Ten theatre directors devised the pieces, with a team of designers and performers, in response to the question posed by the NTS: “What does Home mean to you?” From the diverse performances that highlighted regional social, economic, and geographical differences, I concentrate on two productions of *HOME* that occurred in the island communities of Lerwick, Shetland and Stornoway, Lewis. Of the ten performances, these two occurred at the northern corners of Scotland, far from Scotland’s capital city and the NTS’s administrative hub in Glasgow. Reading the environmental and dramaturgical layers of these performance events provides insight as to how the NTS designed and curated its arrival through the construction of different local/national theatrical homes.

Next I read two productions of *Black Watch*, a strikingly different scrutinizing of what it means to be Scottish (at home and abroad) and the kinds of concerns voiced by Scots who live and work in environments quite distinct from those who actively took part in or were implied through the performances of *HOME*. Based on interviews with Black Watch soldiers who returned to Scotland after completing two tours of duty in Iraq, the production commented on Scotland’s ambiguous relationships with its own military history, its purpose in Iraq, its position in the United Kingdom (and the British Empire), and the kinds of violence (emotional, physical, psychological) engendered by a history of
military engagement, driven by a masculine ethos. Unlike the productions of *HOME* that took place in one location during a short period of time, *Black Watch* has traveled throughout Scotland and England and has ventured overseas to sites in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States. The movements of this production, essentially a case study of a specific located Scottish regiment contending with a hostile physical and political environment, provides a constructive point of comparison with *HOME* to recognize the contradictions that produce a part of Scottish social identity through its circulation beyond Scottish borders.

The desire of the NTS to create an array of performances—from small-scale, site-specific pieces to grand technologically-sophisticated stagings, from children’s shows to ensemble touring productions, from a reinvigoration of classics adapted by contemporary Scottish playwrights to new work emerging from home-grown and international artists—signals a telling departure from a single creative trajectory that aims to encapsulate or define Scotland or its theatre. This kind of national theatre, whether the Finnish Theatre in Helsinki or Dublin’s Abbey Theatre, consolidated itself through nationalist aims conceived around a unifying language, vernacular history, and intellectual elite that sought to open its doors to populist audiences when needed. For the NTS, the performances of ten distinct *HOMEs* temporarily established a network of performance sites that questioned individual and collective experiences of place, landscape, and community. Several months later, *Black Watch*, whose central group of characters is a contingent of Scottish soldiers at home in a pub and abroad in Iraq, was composed through verbatim dialogue, technological spectacle, poignant choreographed moments,
song, and macho camaraderie. It localized a global conflict in an emotionally complex way that used Scotland’s military past to question its present position in Iraq. Each of these productions, then, HOME Shetland, HOME Stornoway, and Black Watch took as its starting point local accounts and nuanced relationships between a particular place and its peoples. These engagements were then layered with various theatrical conventions and performance technologies to produce a given performance venue (ferry, disused shoe shop, Drill Hall) and to connect to spectators.

By resisting an overarching metanarrative to frame these performances, but devising them with fragments of dialogue, sensory experiences, quotidian movements, and/or references to a current crisis, each of these theatrical events produced and responded to a space “under construction.” These complex performance spaces coupled with the various types of labor that took place within them (scenic construction, choreography, sound and lighting design, the installation of television monitors and speakers, and the memorization of dialogue, narration, and songs) enacted particular ecosystems that blurred distinctions between natural and cultural elements. As I consider how two HOMEs and two productions of Black Watch operated in dialogue with the physical landscapes of Scotland and socio-political issues of local, national, and global import, I argue that the potency of the NTS’s fragmentary, pluralistic mode of theatre-making lies in its challenging of the imposition of stereotypical Scottish icons and tropes through its re-staging of multifaceted relationships with particular geocultural aspects of contemporary Scotland. These theatrical ecosystems (with their combinations of human and non-human actors) collaborated with the NTS; while the cultural institution provided
the resources to generate the performances, the productions, in turn, reorganized and redefined the NTS. The desire of NTS organizers to root performances in distinct localities and to circulate productions across Scotland and beyond its boundaries reflects its need to carve out culturally specific spaces for theatre practitioners in Scotland.

Just as I began to unpack the multiple human and non-human actors that constituted the networks of relationships that produced the “national drama” of *Rob Roy Macgregor*, here I examine another seemingly monolithic concept, the national theatre, to parse the multiple events, ideologies, and practices that have compressed together to give it its current shape in Scotland. I track how the NTS has redefined the notion of a national theatre as a concrete edifice from which individuals and institutions make proclamations about the state of a nation and turned it into a moveable, processural articulation of the various elements (cultural, geographical, social, political, economic) that comprise Scotland. I take a cue from the NTS’s attempt to reshape this notion as I read and dismantle their own grappling with monumentalizing concepts such as home as nation, tradition, heritage, and the military. By considering the ecotones of each performance event (a docked boat, a house’s threshold, a military’s frontlines), I point to the blurring of binaries (public/private, nature/culture, past/future) that reveal the ambiguous questions (implicitly or explicitly) posed by these performances. These spaces of uncertainty produced by the NTS also gesture toward the political ambiguity of Scotland’s current governance (i.e. devolution).

Before moving into my analysis of these performances, I present a brief genealogy of the development of the NTS to identify how this model of a national theatre
has utilized Scottish theatre traditions in its design and programming. I then ask how two 
*HOME*es and *Black Watch* presented a multi-directional route for future Scottish theatre 
productions through an emphasis on process-based, partial narratives and collaborations 
between individuals, environments, and objects. A theatre-making comprised of 
fragmented creative methods and compelling local stories not only reveals the complex 
terrain of Scottish theatre in the early twenty-first century, but this mode of artistic 
production counters the unifying ideas that construct and disseminate a single, 
harmonious nationhood. By focusing not on the similarities but on the differences 
between residents of a particular physical territory and/or citizens of a given geopolitical 
entity, I expose the ongoing performances (of relationships, ideologies, and 
environments) that operate in concert to produce the nation, which offers creative ways 
for a nation to adopt to the shifting socio-economic conditions of Europe. For my reading 
of *HOME*, I turn to the Scottish islands, places that retain specific socio-cultural histories 
based on their more remote geographical locale. I then move to the urban sites of 
Edinburgh and London with the productions of *Black Watch* to compare how the socio-
cultural, political, economic, and architectural layers evident in each performance space 
and across a span of two years shaped the the material elements of the story’s staging in 
two distinct cities. With each production, I ask what kinds of “hybrid-forms” and layers 
of meaning were produced? What kinds of conflicting stories did these performances 
embody in their individual environments?
The Road to the NTS

As I discussed in Chapter Two, many theatre productions adapted or reworked from the texts of Walter Scott and Joanna Baillie, among others, became identified as “national dramas” that toured throughout Scotland and across Britain in the nineteenth century. As the British Empire (and its industries) boomed, cities expanded, filling with various forms of entertainment. According to theatre historian Martin Banham, two forms of theatrical enterprise blossomed in Scottish cities, predominantly Glasgow, during the first half of the twentieth century. While organizations like the Glasgow Repertory Theatre (and then Glasgow Repertory Company) (1909-1914) and the Scottish National Players (1922-1947) performed for a predominantly middle-class audience as they promoted new work by Scottish writers, other companies such as Glasgow Workers Theatre Group (1937-1940) and Glasgow Unity Theatre (1941-1951) sought out working-class or popular audiences. The constitution of these companies indicated a shift away from the theatre hegemony of middle and upper-class audiences (attending performances in Theatre Royals) used to shore up a nation’s cultural capital and a turn toward addressing the socio-economic problems developed from rapid industrialization. Although these two sets of companies developed and performed for different audiences, they each incorporated a great deal of touring into their programming in order to introduce their particular brands of Scottish drama to areas across Scotland and, in the case of the Scottish National Players, to London.

Amid this fervent period of Scottish theatre-making, in the 1930s the Saltire Society (which continues to exist today) attempted to re-infuse a sense of Scottish culture
in the arts, literature, music, history, and environment of the nation. Nearly two decades later, in 1949, its Honorary Secretary, Robert Hurd, published a letter calling for a Scottish national theatre, suggesting that public subscription, the national treasury, and local authorities pay for such an establishment. While a National Theatre for Scotland did not emerge during this campaign, the following decade in London, Queen Elizabeth II laid a foundation stone at a South Bank site, beside Festival Hall, for the construction of a National Theatre for Britain, ultimately completed in 1976. While some saw the establishment of this national theatre as a landmark event, others wondered what the specific site and building of this theatre meant. Which citizens of the England, Britain, or the United Kingdom even had access to a theatre on the South Bank of London? Would it present the “English national drama” of Shakespeare, modern play texts by Anton Chekhov and Henrik Ibsen, or contemporary work by Brits?

While this National Theatre was under construction in the early 1970s, a very different kind of theatrical body was taking shape up north. In 1971, John McGrath, Elizabeth McLennan, and David McLennan formed the self-proclaimed socialist 7:84 Theatre Company based on a statistic that 7% of Britain’s population owned 84% of its wealth. After touring throughout England, Scotland, and Wales for two years, the company split into 7:84 (Scotland) and 7:84 (England) in 1973. The theatre contingent sought to “relate to the distinct historical, cultural and political traditions that existed” in Scotland. The company aimed to use theatre “for political intervention in the socio-political process…to play in non-theatre spaces…[and to] take theatre to people who typically did not have access to it.”

This model highlighted mobility and access,
presented an impassioned political agenda, and endeavored to create intimate engagement between performers and spectators. It challenged the distanced positioning of an audience within a proscenium theatre (such as in the Theatre Royals) and made visible the kinds of exploitations of labor sustained by Scots. Its agenda and repertoire (written predominantly by McGrath) nodded to the Workers and Unity Theatres of the 1930s and 1940s. 7:84 Scotland worked for several years as a collective, sharing the profits (were there any) and the labor of theatre productions and touring.

7:84 (Scotland)’s famous Highlands and Islands tour of McGrath’s *The Cheviot, the Stag, and the Black Black Oil*—a play that *re-played* moments of Scottish history, from the Highland Clearances to the 1970s discovery of oil off Scotland’s northeast coast through music, dance, song, and storytelling—combined all three company objectives by operating primarily in community halls spread across remote areas of Scotland. The localities highlighted in this production spoke to the specific areas in which 7:84 performed, including Aberdeen, the Isle of Skye, Stornoway, Ullapool, and the Orkney Islands. Theatre scholar Linda Mackenney observed that 7:84’s “subject was local in the true tradition of popular drama, but its appeal was national, and even universal.”120 This Brechtian-influenced company spoke to the increasing economic and class divisions present in Scottish society and tried to address both local and global concerns regarding the exploitation of natural resources and peoples.121 These 7:84 touring productions fashioned a collective network of Scottish communities who were encouraged to reassert a voice in local and national policy-making since they already contributed to the economic welfare of the nation through their labor. By circulating the stories of these
different parts of the country, 7:84 called attention to common problems experienced in Scotland due to the ongoing control of Scottish lands and businesses by English proprietors.

Nearly fifteen years after the success of The Cheviot, the Advisory Council for the Arts in Scotland held a forum in 1987 to discuss the development of a national theatre. Participants included Scottish theatre practitioners and representatives from national theatre organizations in Scandinavia, also interested in finding creative ways to forward their changing national agendas through cultural venues and offering suggestions to a European neighbor. Following this event, and throughout the 1990s, advocates for a national theatre campaigned in various socio-political and cultural arenas.¹² Yet, arguably, the real impetus for the actual formation of the national theatre came through the devolutionary process that resulted from the 1998 Scotland Act as I discussed in my introduction. Concerns about the nature and status of any national theatre in Scotland persisted, though. Would such a theatre replicate nineteenth-and twentieth-century models that saw the legitimation of a particular group of playwrights, canon of dramatic literature, or performance venue in one city? Would it displace funding from extant companies? Would it be located in Edinburgh or Glasgow, arguably the political and artistic centers of the country?

**Developing a New Model**

On December 1, 1999 representatives from the Scottish theatre community and Members of Scottish Parliament (MSPs) on the committee for Education, Culture and Sport met to discuss the national arts campaigns. Hamish Glen, chair of the Federation
for Scottish Theatres (which, at that time, consisted of thirty of Scotland’s producing theatre companies) forwarded a NTS model that would “enhance the existing infrastructure, exploit more fully the existing financial investment in Scottish theatre and provide a national and international platform for Scotland’s most popular performing art form.” So this configuration, which has changed somewhat in the past nine years from its conception, was launched in 2004 with the appointment of a young Englishwoman, Vicky Featherstone, as the Artistic Director. The NTS received £7.5 million of Scottish Executive funds to establish its board and first two seasons. After those two years, it would receive £4 million annually to support its work. The artistic team chosen by the NTS’s board of directors represented, for critic Joyce McMillan, “a dazzling roll-call of some of the brightest talent in contemporary British theatre, most of them still under 40 and all of them bringing to the table a rich mix of Scottish and international experience [emphasis mine].” The constitution of the board became an early indication of the direction of this endeavor. Alongside Featherstone, who had successfully run Paines Plough Theatre in England would sit Executive Producer Neil Murray, a twenty-year veteran of Scottish theatre and recent director of Glasgow’s Tron Theatre, and Associate Director of New Work, John Tiffany, a director and former Traverse Theatre literary manager. Scottish playwrights David Greig and Liz Lochhead came on board as the NTS’s Dramaturg and Associate Artist, respectively. With a range of creative and administrative experiences, these individuals have all been involved in the creation of new work that addressed local and global issues, as well as dynamic re-writes and re-stagings of theatre classics. Not only were their experiences diverse, but their
backgrounds—from south Wales, England (Manchester and Surrey), and Scotland (Edinburgh and Motherwell)—represented a wide geographical spread in Britain, suggesting a commitment to seeking out creative and engaging ways of producing theatre that would appeal to audiences across the British Isles.

The NTS was designed as a producing body, not a funding organization like the Scottish Arts Council. While it may commission artists and co-produce with theatre companies, it provides more support than a signed check. Being directly involved with the creative process of any project means that it can produce performances of all kinds across Scotland. In the NTS Manifesto, Featherstone explained the company’s intention to:

create theatre on a national and international scale that is contemporary, confident and forward-thinking... we are taking theatre all over Scotland, working with the existing venues, touring and creating work within the theatre community. We have no bricks-and-mortar institutionalism to counter, nor the security of a permanent home in which to develop. Flexibility, mobility and ephemerality characterize this traveling institution. Featherstone marked this national theatre as an extension of the “theatre community,” the dynamic ecosystem from which it has emerged. Concerns about the NTS swiping all of the most talented playwrights, directors, and performers (and taking a deep chunk of the financial resources for the entirety of Scottish theatre) have certainly played on the minds of practitioners, though. While I do not presume that everyone in Scotland’s artistic sectors were (or are) thrilled with the development and programming of the NTS, this
organization’s lack of a concrete and steel home, a physical building, means that it can invest in and build upon the artistic foundations already present in Scotland to engineer its future. It is this kind of flexibility and innovation, I argue, that the Scottish Parliament, in approving and funding the NTS, wishes to broadcast to other European countries. The NTS not only serves as a cultural apparatus which supports artistic practices in Scotland, but it also serves as an indicator to those outside of Scotland that this small nation can mobilize and promote itself effectively. To examine how the NTS began to dismantle the notion of a national theatre by creating multiple small-scale events to announce itself to Scots, I turn to a localized set of performances that occurred in diverse settings across the country during a cold February weekend in 2006.

**Natural Homes/Theatrical Houses**

Considering its remit to tour, to partner, to create, and to engage, how did the NTS, the self-proclaimed, “theatre without walls,” launch its inaugural season? Mostly by defying expectations. The individuality with which these **HOMEs** emerged reflected an exciting heterogeneity among artists and within the NTS. No individual in Scotland would experience all of the productions, nor would a single production team create the overall design or tone for the projects. These decisions challenged a notion of conceptual cohesion (materialized in a designated National Theatre building, for example) and offered in its place a collection of singular experiences that took place on the coasts, and in the cities and towns of Scotland. These individual performance ecologies, complete with specific modes of transportation, production materials, community involvement, and the transformation of buildings, woods, and a boat into performance venues, aimed to
connect these ten locations while dispelling the idea that a performance by a national company could define the space, community, or ambitions of a nation. These “simultaneous stories-so-far” were produced by creating experiences that harnessed the cultural, geographical, and social diversity of Scotland, while simultaneously emphasizing the importance of differentiation. Not only was the theatrical trope of a unified event interrupted, but by making each production free to spectators, the shows also resisted a traditional hierarchy of access, physically marked in the venue of a Theatre Royal, for example. In fact, organizers hoped that 10,000 spectators would witness these inaugural performances. Sounding more like attendance figures at a rock concert or a sporting event than a night at the “theatre,” this ambitious plan re-thought what spectatorship might mean for NTS audiences. During the five-day run, in Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Shetland, Stornoway, Caithness, Inverness, Dundee, East Lothian,
and Dumfries, performance venues emerged from an abandoned factory, high-rise building, forest, community halls, and an art gallery.

Adrienne Scullion, co-organizer of an archival project of the events entitled *Homing In*, interpreted the NTS’s intention to create an alternate perspective on Scottish theatre: “Responses and retorts to the myths of Scottish theatre were very clear in the thinking behind and implementation of *Home*. Scottish theatre is one marked by playwrights not directors; [so, instead] employ ten directors to ‘author’ new work.” In this dramaturgical process, then, the sites of performance became the dramatic texts, and readings of particular places translated into the sensorial, individual, and collective experiences of the productions. Reworking the process of building a theatrical production—from the environment instead of a playwright’s pages—invited a reinterpretation of past theatrical practices. Investigating the ways that nations within the UK and its theatres dialectically engage with one another, Jen Harvie argued that site-specific performances “can enact a spatial history, mediating between the past and the present… but also between the identities of the past and those of the present and future, as well as between a sense of nostalgia for the past and a sense of otherness possibly felt in the present and anticipated in the future.” Harvie’s argument identified a mediating process whereby the resonances of the past inform present and future creative articulations, anxieties, and questions. A similar process was at work in the *HOME* productions, which sought to put distinctive local stamps on the shows as they collaboratively enacted this national organization, created and designed because of changing dynamics on global political stages.
The spatial histories of two particular *HOMEs*, Shetland and Stornoway, occupy the next section of this chapter. I intentionally situate these two island performances side by side in an attempt to articulate how they might be seen as metonymic of the larger process at work in the NTS in its breaking down and reconstitution of ideas related to the Scottish nation. These two performances—one on a docked ferry and the other in a disused shoe shop—provide alternative perspectives to witnessing and taking part in a theatrical encounter of home. While the Shetland production highlighted the necessary physical and emotional journeys that accompany life on its island communities, the Stornoway performance pointed to an aspect of the city’s industrial past and dual linguistic identity. Both productions, through different means, called attention to the labor involved in constructing and maintaining one’s home. The peripheral locations of these two performances also demonstrated the NTS’s attempt to link the urban centers of Scotland with its islands, which act as intriguing geographical borders to the Scottish “mainland.” As dynamic ecotones, these sites and the performances that took place within them amplified the complexity of the specificities of the *HOME* projects and the NTS at large. Since I was unable to attend these performances, my readings of these *HOMEs* are mediated through several different perspectives garnered by interviews with designers and spectators of *HOME* and culled from reviews of the pieces.

**A Tethered Crossing**

*HOME Shetland* occurred on a docked Northlink Ferry at the Holmsgarth Ferry Terminal in Lerwick, Shetland, off Scotland’s northeast coast (the boxed area in the upper right-hand corner of the map on page 115). With “6,000 years of history,” evident
in the rock formations that comprise Shetland, these islands boast a wealth of cultural, archaeological, and zoological resources. Shetland maintains a mixture of Scottish and Scandinavian heritage, which filters through, amongst other elements, the language and music that emanate from this northern locale. These islands contain a much-lauded musical history with countless talented musicians (primarily fiddlers) temporarily emigrating from Shetland to perform on stages across Scotland, Britain, and Europe. These musicians and their “Shetland Sessions” have become a staple of Edinburgh’s summer festival season. Collectives of musicians spring up around the island, and, through the easily transported instrument of the fiddle, these musicians merge traditional tunes—reels and jigs—with contemporary sounds to blend a unique sound for Shetlanders at home and away. This fiddle music played a poignant role in HOME Shetland.

Setting one of the HOMEs in Lerwick, Shetland extended the network of NTS inaugural sites to include a locale likely viewed as being on the far edges of Scotland. On these islands that lie nearly equidistant between Scotland and Norway, islanders and visitors rely on ferries for the transport of people, goods, and news to and from the Scottish mainland and elsewhere. Lerwick, Shetland’s main port, is ideally located for transport as a node between the North Sea and the northeast Atlantic Ocean. During the past forty years, more than £60 million has been invested in the redevelopment of the port, ensuring that it keeps up with the changing tides of industrial and transport needs due to, for example, increased tourism in the form of cruise ships. In addition to its
more remote location, this production explored the labor of generating the concept and lived reality of home through several theatrical elements on board the ferry.

“Everyone on this ferry route is on a journey either to or from their home—a place where lives and stories cross and connect,” observed director Wils Wilson. The vacillating motion of travel connected the performance, and ultimately a part of the NTS, with a particular part of life in these Shetland communities and with other modes of transport (buses, trains, planes) that usher people to and from their homes elsewhere in Scotland. Ferry travel, a potentially mundane practice, involves a physical mobility as well as imaginative and emotional motility; this production, experienced on the docked boat, attempted to capture these different elements of motion. Designed as a “multimedia experience,” the production utilized recorded music, visual projections, live performers, recorded narrations, and individual interactions with those onboard to compose its performance. Entrance onto the ferry was mediated through an introduction inside the ferry terminal. Shetland Arts Drama Development Officer John Hasswell recalled:

Chintzy table settings in the ferry terminal with servings of home made soup and opaque artwork preceded the journey onto the boat. Personal headsets guided the visitors (a more appropriate word than audience) around the boat, the public areas, private cabins and a spectacular ending on the cavernous car deck. As written by Jackie Kay and Jacqueline Clark there was a narrative thread, especially in the glorious dialect monologues by the latter. However more rewarding was the collage of intertwining
lives thrown together for a moment in time animated through words, music and a huge cast of both professional and community actors.\textsuperscript{133}

The headsets provided visitors with an individualized route through the encounter; the narratives, through poetry and prose, wove together sights and sounds. The particular ecosystem created by the event included objects (the tables, artwork, headsets), recorded narratives, and movement of bodies around the boat. The cast included professional and local (amateur?) performers, revealing another convergence of bodies and stories within the space of the ferry. While some performers may have taken the twelve-hour ferry crossing (as opposed to a short flight) to get a better sense of the world in which they would imaginatively inhabit, other actors might have walked or driven to the ferry from their homes in Lerwick or elsewhere in Shetland. The performance did not present to spectators one single narrative about Shetland’s economy, its location in the sea, or the lives of those who work or travel aboard the boat. Instead, it destabilized this home and indicated the necessary participation of these performance visitors.

*HOME Shetland* visitor, Scottish theatre critic Mark Fisher, offered another pathway through the performance while he, too, acknowledged the spatial and temporal commingling onboard the ship:

Everywhere was a sense of life – past, present, maybe even future – as we walked past whisky drinkers at the tables, a lonely woman gazing out to sea, wartime lovers strolling in the breeze, children nestling down to sleep on the reclining seats, mechanics and sailors walking purposefully by…It was hard to know if we were watching ghosts or if we ourselves were
ghosts. In one sequence of unsettling intimacy, each spectator was given a key-card and sent into a cabin where an actor – in my case a teenage girl – unpacked her things, visited the bathroom and leafed through old photographs.\textsuperscript{134}

The production broke down distinctions between public and private areas as audiences wandered from the main deck into individual cabins, from a space of collectivity to one of intimacy. Bodies and objects blended together with the environment of the ferry to unsettle temporal borders as participants encountered, moved around, or observed current and former inhabitants (the ghosts?) of the island. Fisher also noted an overlapping of realities that occurred: did the visitors silently observe embodied tales of the past being re-staged or did they become ethereal witnesses to the movements of present lives? On board the bodies, objects, sounds, and physical routines presented pieces of multiple narratives that the histories of this island and its people into its storytelling.

The performance’s dramaturgy incorporated the rhythm of the sea—a gentle swaying back and forth—into its embodied and discursive narratives. The sea acted as a natural choreographer whose ebb and flow might cause a passenger to mis-step while crossing the ferry’s deck or whose sudden lurch might make a visitor feel nauseated. In this way, the structure of the performance resisted delineating a cultural space (the collection of Shetland residents and visitors) from a natural environment (the sea beneath the boat’s hull). Anthropologists Pamela Stewart and Andrew Strathern assert, “Memory and place, via landscape (including seascape), can be seen as crucial transducers whereby the local, national and global are brought into mutual alignment; or as providing sites
where conflicts between these influences are played out.”

*HOME Shetland*, instead of forwarding a unified narrative, a single presentation of what it meant to claim a Shetland or Scottish identity, used the land- and seascapes to create a phenomenological encounter. At this particular ecotone, the dock (where the land of Lerwick meets the harbor, sandwiched between the North Sea and Atlantic Ocean), the potentially strong currents can make for treacherous travel. This dock is also a busy place: from here one may travel elsewhere in the Shetland Islands, south to the Orkney Islands or Aberdeen, or east towards Norway. This site, then, acted simultaneous as a destination and as a starting point, a fitting description for the NTS, which acts as both the culmination of decades of dialogue regarding the artistic infrastructure of Scotland and as an inaugural and innovative launching of a cultural endeavor. Additionally, like the Rob Roy steamship that accumulated stories, goods, and news along its routes, this ferry, through its dozens and dozens of voyages, has become a palimpsest of activity; during this performance it was revealed as a “vortex of behavior,” where actual and imagined activities were re-staged on the different levels of the ship. The layering of the performance—evoking curiosity, nostalgia, confusion, apprehension, or voyeurism from its visitors—revealed the myriad affiliations and relationships that a Scot could have with her own national home as she actively participated in its construction and maintenance.

One of the most frequently cited parts of *HOME Shetland* took place through the convergence of audio-visual technology, harnessed to evoke a strong emotional response. According to arts journalist Andrew Burnet:
We end up on the car deck, where 40 pristine white overalls dangle: the discarded skins, perhaps, of departed ferrymen, suspended in a swirl of fiddle music and projected vintage photographs. Here, where the new Shetland mingles with the old, the voyage ends on a whimsical, melancholic note that gently reinforces the sense that home, for Shetlanders at least, is an idea marked by impermanence and parting. Curiously, performance reviews of HOME Shetland listed anywhere from forty to one hundred boiler suits suspended in this moment. Spectators disagreed on the number of evacuated “bodies” hanging, possibly due to the video projections displaying scenes from across Shetland that were projected on and behind the suits or because of the distracting quality of the music emanating from within them. Hidden speakers allowed fiddle music to bleed out from within the overalls, operating as surrogate beating hearts for these absented persons. These overalls, indicative of the labor required onboard these ships (steering, charting, mopping, dusting, tying, guiding) hinted at the effort involved in theatrical production (building, painting, cleaning, moving, choreographing, memorizing). And these kinds of labor also gestured toward the necessary maintenance of a local community such as Lerwick or a geopolitical entity like Scotland. The men and women for whom these overalls stood in may, in fact, view this ferry as a home away from home, a site where friendships are forged through the daily duties involved with helping the inhabitants of and visitors to Shetland back and forth across the sea.

For audiences of this performance, the fiddle music acted as an additional mode of transport between the present and the past as it alluded to the rich musical terrain and
strong community ties carved out by music over time in these islands. The symbolism of
the iconic fiddle was revisited and revised through this performance. As the music,
produced by the strings resonating within the body of the fiddle, figuratively energized
this performance space, the sound connected the labor involved in ferry travel to the
aesthetics of the art installation or performance event onboard. These musical notes
chimed in with the fragments of narratives, the sounds of footsteps, and the recorded
instructions that contributed to the sonic-scape of the performance. The projected images
shown on and behind the hanging boiler suits replaced the three-dimensional bodies of
Shetlanders (who would actually flesh out these suits) with two-dimensional moving
pictures of life in Shetland. For theatre scholar Trish Reid, this production “produced a
tangible sense of how far, for Shetlanders at least, ‘home’ is an ephemeral notion often
characterised by separation.”138 This sense of separation is a necessary condition of
thinking through the concept of Scottish nationhood, historically positioned as distinct
from England but connected through various socio-cultural, political, and economic
institutions and practices. Scotland is continually produced, practiced, and performed
through a networks of relationships between objects, relationships, and practices, not
unlike the kinds of labor enacted daily onboard the ferry. Within the ecosystem of
Lerwick (with its commercial history, collection of docks and boats within its harbor, and
its placement at the meeting point of two tremendous bodies of water), the ferry is a
shifting organism connected to those who work and travel upon it as well as to the sea
life forced to chart a new route at the ferry’s approach. This dynamic site of activity puts
into motion ideas of travel, home-coming, departure, and loss that resonated with other

HOME productions exploring other aspects of dwelling in Scotland.

Am Broin/An Toibh (“Inside/Outside”)

On the isle of Lewis (top left corner of the map on page 115), in the Outer
Hebrides off Scotland’s northwest coast, HOME Stornoway presented quite a different
perspective, experience, and scale of home for its creators and observers. Like Shetland,
The Isle of Lewis or Eilean Leòdhais (its Gaelic name, meaning “marshy island”), boasts
a particular cultural identity embedded in its socio-geological roots and evidenced by its
standing stones, brochs (circular drystone structures), and Iron Age forts. Steornabhagh
(derived from “Sjornavagr” or “steering bay” in Old Norse) is the only city on Lewis, and
its economy includes, according to the Explore Scotland tourism agency, “traditional
businesses like fishing, Harris Tweed and farming, with more recent influences like
Tourism, the oil industry and commerce brought about by the digital revolution and
communications.”139 This city of around 7,000 inhabitants, like many other Scottish cities
and towns, sustains its fiscal health by promoting its local heritage and traditional crafting
alongside its ability to utilize developing communication and transportation technologies.
So Explore Scotland fashions Stornoway as not drastically different (or remote) from
other parts of the country; it has found a way to usefully combine traditional practices
with modern and contemporary modes of business. Continuing to filter through much of
socio-cultural life on Lewis (and its southern neighbor, na Hearadh or “Harris”) is the
language and music of Gàidhlig (“Gaelic”). Scotland’s highest concentration of native
Gàidhlig speakers resides in Lewis; they speak Gàidhlig at home, in school, and during
Sunday church services. Even supermarket aisles include the Gàidhlig words for household items like glasraich (“vegetables”), aran (“bread”), and biadh na peata (“pet food”).

In response to the NTS call to interrogate dachaigh (“home”), a team of designers, led by Stewart Laing, worked with the An Lanntair Arts Centre in Stornoway to put Stornoway on the NTS’s dealbh-diathcha (“map”). Together, the team crafted a structure that echoed the Shetland ferry performance in its diverse composition and multiple narratives, but this dachaigh also afforded spectators an opportunity to watch a process of assembly, the construction of a house. Informed by interviews with local residents, HOME Stornoway erected a taighe na lùidhag (“doll house”) in the storefront of the former Nazir Bros. shoe shop on Sràid na Eaglais (“Church Street”) that spoke to the history of doll house manufacturing in this Scottish city. The doll house created for viewers simultaneous inside/outside perspectives on the ambiguous happenings within, which suggested a necessary dual focus to consider the place of the Scottish nation in the lives of its inhabitants. As spectators encountered the rooms of the doll house, two narratives—one in Gàidhlig and one in Beurla (“English”)—described the settings to them. The narrators alternated between their stories, complementing one another’s accounts of the rooms but not directly translating the same text into two different linguistic registers. The dramaturgical choice to create a bilingual setting embraced the linguistic identifiers in this Scottish locale and offered at least three possibilities for cultural affiliation during the performance: those who spoke Gaelic, those who spoke English, and those who were bilingual.
The scale of this project was necessarily altered to mesh with the design concept, resulting in a single site of performance, the former shoe shop, but with the various rooms-in-miniature set up on tables around the space. Here spectators encountered different kinds of ecotones in the form of thresholds between public and private spaces. First, visitors crossed the threshold of the shoe shop, which signaled the changing economy of Stornoway: from an industrial workplace to a service economy that facilitated tourists. Next, they walked by the threshold of the doll house, which began as a fragmented collection of miniature rooms scattered around the store front. The tour through the rooms of the doll house was both physical (spectators walked by each table and peered inside the rooms) and imaginative (visitors imagined scenarios based on the commentary overheard). In addition to a foyer, sitting room, kitchen, basement, bathroom, and a teenager’s bedroom that spectators looked at and heard about, they also encountered the doll house’s attic. From a platform that stood higher in the room than the other tables, audience members climbed a ladder and put their head through a hole in the floor of the attic in order to see inside the space. Spectator and theatre scholar Kathleen Gough noted the unsettling experience of poking her head through the attic floor, “I spied a closet door opening out of the corner of my left eye—perhaps no more than six inches from my face. Within seconds a small doll-child popped out of the closet with what I remember as a sinister expression on her face….Before I could take it all in, the doll-child appeared to slam the closet door shut.”

Playwright and Isle of Lewis resident Ian Stephen was struck by another part of the home tour:
When it came to the performance we were indeed led back and forth in time, in intimate groups. Lighting and music was expertly arranged to be unobtrusive as the model-makers led you through, referring to their clipboard notes… Okay, Stornoway houses don’t have cellars but you realised pretty quickly that the scenes within the walls were not contained by the laws of physics or any other known conventions. So exquisite details in the various rooms represented peat-preserved axeheads or the contemporary debris of a possible murder scene. The single beam of a pencil torch could take you through the miraculous harmony of decaying arrangements within an abandoned house.¹⁴²

The performance became a multi-layered site of exploration and excavation, complete with curious, yet purposely positioned, objects in a constructed environment that began as a series of scattered locales. The arrangement of these objects coupled with the presence and participation of the designers in outlining their individual contributions revealed the labor of constructing a taigh or dachaigh and the elements that signify particular relationships, circumstances, or traumas. It is this physical creation of particular locales and the interweaving of narratives that work to reinforce ideas of belonging, homecoming, or collectivity and that speak to, in the case of this location in Stornoway, a shifting economic imperative from industry (the shoe shop, the doll house manufacturing) to the embracing of tourism. This awareness enters into a dialogue with other villages, towns, and cities across Scotland undergoing similar changes.
Upon seeing the “decaying arrangements” of potentially menacing objects and hearing the ambiguous and possibly conflicting narratives, a viewer might endeavor to piece together these layers for herself. But she would need certain tools to help her efforts. Writing about the tools needed to dig at an archaeological site, Michael Shanks observed that one can

pick up the slightest of distinctions between archaeological deposits, even those invisible to the eye... To be understood, what is found by the archaeologist must be connected with its context, whether fine layers of ash deposited over the years of use of a hearth, building rubble left by masons or accumulated deposits of a town garbage heap. Stratigraphy is a foundation of archaeological analysis and interpretation. ¹⁴³

In the Stornoway performance, the tools utilized by visitors to unearth the stories of this site derived from the physical and audible layout: size of the shoe shop, small objects within rooms, arrangement of rooms, direction of a light beam, and pieces of narration. With each room, different objects took focus, appearing either to support or to refute ideas produced by the previously viewed room. Left with the remains of a household, a spectator may have attempted to order the imagined events to gain a greater sense of familiarity with this unknown and disassembled home. The frame of abandonment perhaps connected certain elements but kept the spectators distanced from ever knowing for certain what had taken place. The conventions disregarded or abandoned in this piece did not only include the tropes of theatre staging—seated and separated audiences, a central plot, hidden theatre-makers—but also empirical principles of everyday life—how
we understand our own daily engagements with time and space. The “miraculous harmony” understood by Stephens did not occur through the creation of a sonic terrain, as noted in the use of fiddle music in the Shetland project, but through a strategically assembled visual field. The size and arrangement of the walls and floors of each room provided a limited space in which certain narratives were, at least temporarily, imagined and produced.

Project co-designer Minty Donald admitted that the project was “very rooted in Stornoway…It wasn’t theatrical performance at all in a [traditional] sense.” This HOME removed theatrical conventions in a way that resonated with the NTS’s entire inaugural undertaking in order to foreground this specific environment with its social, linguistic, and industrial meanings. For her contribution, Donald designed the teenager’s bedroom after interviewing Lewis teens. Trying to capture some aspects of the teenagers’ dreams in her design, Donald devised “animation [that] projected over [the room] based on some of their dreams in a soundscape.” This soundscape added to the interspersed English and Gàidhlig language and provided an audible texture to contend with the visual features of the objects and images. While the fiddle music and images projected on the hanging boiler suits in Shetland called attention to the musical traditions of the islands and the physical efforts invested in boat travel, this blending of sounds and objects attempted to evoke an ambitious and hopeful future. Other rooms in the doll house produced vastly different responses from visitors, however.
Visitor Kathleen Gough felt most drawn to the abandoned sitting room designed by Moira Maclean, a fear-ealaine ("artist") from Lewis. In her design, Maclean included scraps of wallpaper she found in a trèigte ("abandoned") Lewis house. Gough suggested:

Maclean’s narrative of who may have lived in this house and who occupied this room also served to locate the production of ‘Home Stornoway’ in the domestic, regional and national sense. The sewing table, spools of thread and other everyday domestic objects that litter the space suggest that the home’s sole occupant was probably a woman who had outlived her husband. Facing the fireplace is one, lone, red, dusty chair with an empty wine glass on the armrest. Domestic bliss it is not.  

The intimate scale of the event perhaps magnified the gleamed meanings of the individual rooms. Like the attic and foyer scenes, something disharmonious, even sinister, permeated some of the stories and relationships, as well as some of the objects that stood in as the accumulated deposits of the house’s former occupants. Continually, spectators encountered the opposite of a sàr ("ideal") setting, situation, or home. The dimensions of discontentment, distrust, or disuse evident in many rooms complicated the storylines spectators pieced together as they move from one room to the next. Competing stories—a possible murder, a sinister doll-child, the dreams of a teenager, a lonely or abandoned woman—occupied this space at different times and at the same time; their stories echoed within the performance space, and the surviving objects tacitly gestured toward compelling moments in forgotten or re-animated lives. The mapping out of different functions indicated by the rooms (bathroom, kitchen, sitting room) also pointed
to the kinds of processes undertaken by different spaces of the nation (manufacturing, commerce, agriculture, tourism) that contribute to the functioning of local and national economies. By moving between these rooms, the viewers and designers physically connected these productive spaces that spoke to the processual nature of an individual home or a collectively performed nation. Upon seeing the final “product,” the re-assembled house, which appeared as a single entity, the spectators carried with them their knowledge of the processes underway inside.

After the tour alongside the different rooms was completed, the designers slotted the rooms into the frame of the entire doll house structure, which stood at about four feet high and sat on its own table in the performance space. The doll house was then closed shut; the individual room interiors disappeared from view. As smoke started to rise out of the chimney, video projections played in the windows of the house. These images revealed fairly mundane activities—people brushing their teeth or having dinner—that corresponded with the rooms just seen. The spoken narratives came to an end. The house appeared as a solid entity, and the spectators were then left outside of its walls, across its exterior threshold. In talking about the impetus for the project, director/designer Stewart Laing explained, "We're trying to subvert the traditional notions of doll's houses which tend to be very backward looking, Victorian or Edwardian, and aspirational. They're to do with idealised living. We're taking more interesting ideas of home and putting them into miniature." The production compressed and challenged assumptions of life in Stornoway by presenting competing and contradictory stories and objects within the individual rooms that began as separate entities and then were ordered into a single
home. In the creative team’s re-direction of the ideal and traditional, symbolized and made material by a doll house in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they questioned the separation of public and private spaces and the engendering of the Scottish nation as a domestic and/or feminized sphere. By beginning the performance with the separation of rooms, they suggested a fragmented and incomplete process that moved away from a sense of Victorian decorum. Also, by constructing this home within a disused shoe shop, the production called attention to the type of manual labor necessary to fashion a sense of comportment and social interaction. The shoe shop, now standing as its own kind of debris (like the left objects in the rooms), contrasted the bourgeois qualities admired and promoted by the doll house. By reducing the scale of this Albannach (“Scottish”) home, this event provided simultaneously optic and haptic perspectives for its viewers while, like the other HOMEs, it resisted a metanarrative, a completed or unified articulation of home.

In the days leading up to the run of HOME Stornoway, residents of and visitors to the city could view the construction of the doll house through the shop windows. “People could come in and chat to us while we were designing and making the rooms,” recalled Donald, “but when it came to the performance we had blinds which we pulled down - at the beginning, but as part of, the performance.” These pre-show viewings added another layer to the processural nature of this production of dachaigh by making the duration of the building process a visible component to the “final” showings. The active civic participation of these individuals, through their questions and suggestions, shaped the production and resonated in the physical movements of those who attended
the performance. As the designers imagined, planned, constructed, and rehearsed their individual rooms and narratives, they decided what to include in their small-scale performance sites and how to arrange these materials.

Each of these dramaturgical decisions that carefully constructed and curated the look and feel of the production called attention to the overt labor as well as the work happening “offstage” that craft a national narrative or construct a national space of assembly (like the Scottish Parliament, which I discuss in Chapter Five). Each of the processes (embodied and discursive) undertaken becomes seemingly compressed or ordered into a unified structure (the rooms within the dollhouse), but teasing out these contradictions shows the instabilities hidden by the ordering and the layers of meaning embedded in the structure. “The stratigraphy,” argue Pearson and Shanks, “may be susceptible to processes of folding, faulting and erosion, which may lead to discontinuities, inversion and disappearances and the reassignation of detail.”

Throughout HOME Stornoway the spectators/visitors/houseguests played an active role. Depending on their route through the doll house rooms, their experience of the audio-visual technology and live-action narration, and their decision whether or not to climb the ladder, spectators collaborated to produce a particular genealogy of the performance event. The viewers, positioned as “outsiders,” on the threshold of the disassembled and then reassembled Victorian home, carried with them their own “discontinuities, inversion[s] and disappearances” as their physical and audible reactions added to the soundtrack of the bilingual event.
Final Housekeeping?

In her final assessment of HOME Stornoway Kathleen Gough proposed, “Perhaps this is the story the dollhouse was trying to tell: things that do not fit neatly into one narrative still find a way to be organized under one roof.”151 In the performance, the multiple stories and seemingly disconnected arrangement of objects generated this particular dachaigh. This method of organization and assembly extended beyond this particular performance site and into the other HOMEs crafted and performed simultaneously across Scotland’s cities, towns, and villages. This dramaturgical arrangement also alluded to the larger cultural and political matrices at play in the formation and programming of the NTS. The performances at Stornoway and Shetland, taken as case studies of the NTS, suggest a need to produce multiple stories that combine the efforts of individual artistic practitioners, the specificity of each performance site, and the verbal and physical participation of local community members gathered together. Each of these elements works in tandem to make visible temporary moments of storytelling through both carefully planned and unexpected arrangements of materials, sounds, objects, and bodies.

The crafting of individual spaces (the doll house rooms and the ferry cabins) within the larger housing structures forwarded a collaborative, fragmentary mode of inquiry into complex and shifting understandings of home, place, territory, locale, and dwelling. Reflecting on the dispersion of the HOME projects across the country, Minty Donald said that it was “interesting to know that these things were all happening but not actually have any sense of what the other ones are like.”152 Involvement in one project
often precluded, as in Donald’s case, experience of others. An individual experience of an NTS HOME (as a designer, performer, spectator, or some combination of the three) perhaps allows for a closer engagement with and excavation of a performance site enabled a richer understanding of the composite that is contemporary Scotland, at least as it was arranged in February 2006. This inability to know what else was happening during the unfolding of the HOMEs also suggested that within a seemingly small country like Scotland exists an incredibly diverse, vibrant, and multi-layered terrain, a kind of large-scale event, that becomes impossible to understand, experience, or fully grasp by an individual. The ecotones of these sites alluded to and generated a blurring of natural and cultural elements representing the overlapping impact of physical environments with those who reside within them. A Romantic understanding of nature as an escape from the industrial, modernizing world cannot be applied to the models of performance forwarded here because they interweave stories of physical environments and social relationships. Instead, HOME offered an exploratory time and space to question one’s relationship with the physical structure of a boat or building, the surrounding physical environs, and the geopolity of Scotland by existing in multiple places across the nation and introducing open-ended narratives.

If the doll house can be taken to symbolize Scotland-in-miniature, then in some small way this new perspective allowed for different angles with which one can re-view or reconsider the internal workings of a home, a homeland, a national home. And if the ferry enabled physical mobility within a contained and anchored site, perhaps it signaled the necessity of imaginative journeys through the songs, music, and stories experienced
onboard. While safely docked, the performance offered the possibility for Scottish citizens to feel both nostalgic in their connections to their roots and adventurous in imagining life beyond Scottish shores. These two (of the ten) HOMEs questioned the relationships between objects, individuals, and the construction of narratives and indicated the need for flexibility and adaptation. These two performances also re-routed theatrical conventions by opting for more devised, site-specific, multi-media, and process-oriented modes to localize a national event and to involve spectators, visitors, occupants, and ghosts.

These inaugural projects also gestured toward the need to rethink Scotland and Scottishness by reworking those instruments used to transmit Scottish identity at home and abroad. Theatrical events like the Shetland and Stornoway HOMEs, deployed familiar tropes of Scottish culture—the fiddle and Gaelic language—by placing them within a contemporary discourse of what it might mean to be at home in one’s country and all the problems that might come with that (a possible murder, a voyeuristic experience). The connections between the musical history of Shetland, the physical and figurative body of the fiddle, and the daily workings of a ferry’s crew suggested different kinds of labor. Like the re-animation of the fiddle in Shetland, the Gaelic language, viewed by many as a symptom of a dying or at least irrelevant or out-of-date culture, became reinvigorated and connected to immediate processes: the construction of a particular performance site (the doll’s house in Stornoway) and the inauguration of Scotland’s nascent National Theatre. The excavation and experimentation exhibited in each of these sites introduced seemingly familiar stories and spaces to audiences through
a complex dramaturgy that layered sounds (languages, narratives, footsteps, recordings, music), objects (doll furniture, miniature rooms, boiler suits, tablecloths, bodies) images (video projections, an assembled house, a ferry passenger), and participant-spectators (designers, musicians, narrators, visitors, guests) within a complicated and undulating field of ideas.

**Black Watch: Blurring Boundaries and Battling Histories**

Fast-paced dialogue, audio-visual technology, choreographed bodies, haunting music, and a questioning of duty in national and imperial terms allowed *Black Watch: An Unauthorised Biography* to flesh out a compelling socio-political and theatrical landscape for the eponymous military regiment. The production proposed a very different kind of local experience of Scottishness than offered by the *HOMEs*, rooting itself in a masculine embodiment of nationhood. Developed by playwright Gregory Burke, director John Tiffany, and a creative team of actors, designers, and technicians *Black Watch* dramatized personal tales of fighting and fatigue; soldiers battled with enemy combatants, their own politicians and military leaders, themselves, and Scotland’s past. The project began with Burke interviewing Black Watch soldiers who had served in Iraq in 2003-2004 and had recently left the regiment. With these stories he created a working text that incorporated moments from interviews alongside fictionalized scenes at the regiment’s actual base, Camp Dogwood, in Iraq. As Burke shaped the script, Anderson created new arrangements of decades-old military songs used to recruit soldiers, and Steven Hoggett choreographed moments of hostility and poignant intimacy to help this band of brothers to personify separation, loss, frustration, and fear. In its tying together of dynamic
elements of technology, movement, song, and script, the production resonated throughout Edinburgh and Scotland and has received thunderous applause during its nearly two years of touring throughout the UK and abroad. In this section I concentrate on two productions that I attended in August 2006 (at the Edinburgh University Drill Hall) and July 2008 (at the Barbican Centre in London). I compare elements of these two productions as I dig through the layers of history and theatricality embedded in the production, which have prompted some theatre scholars and practitioners to compare it to John McGrath’s *The Cheviot* in terms of its powerful re-telling of the complexities of Scotland’s socio-economic and political past and present.

Originating around 1725, the Black Watch (*Am Freiceadan Dubh*), or 42nd Royal Highland, Regiment of the Foot, played a significant role in dozens of domestic and foreign military conflicts. The battalion, primarily comprised of men from Dundee, Perthshire, Angus, and Fife, began their work in the Highlands, keeping watch to prevent smuggling and thieving. Soon after, and throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they were deployed to bolster imperial military campaigns in the West Indies, Fort Ticonderoga, Crimea, India, and Cypress to grow and sustain the British Empire. They built up a well-respected reputation through their determination, military prowess, and fierce loyalty. “During the First World War,” wrote military historian Diana Henderson, “the regiment gained honours in every theatre of the Western Front as well as in Macedonia, Egypt, Gaza, Palestine, Crete and Burma.” They were dispatched throughout Europe and Northern Africa during World War II and subsequently saw action in Korea and Kenya. Their global reach has clearly been considerable. Serving as
peacekeepers in Northern Ireland from 1970, the Scottish soldiers of Black Watch became a more permanent fixture in areas across this other British substate. And in 2003, the contingent was sent to assist the American-led invasion of Iraq. The following year soldiers were redeployed to Iraq where they moved from the fairly-secure British base in Basra to a camp nearer to Fallujah. Here they ostensibly supported American troops leading missions to clear insurgent-entrenched areas close by. As the Scottish men moved into more dangerous territory, an area dubbed the “triangle of death,” media coverage of their actions intensified, in part, because the move was seen as part of George W. Bush’s re-election campaign in the United States. At the same time, government officials in Britain began discussing the possibility of disbanding the Black Watch or merging it with another regiment due to dwindling funds to support the military. Addressing the intense media coverage in 2004, Lieutenant-Colonel James Cowan, commanding officer of the men at Camp Dogwood, told reporters during his return to the UK, “As a battalion we have never actively sought the limelight. We have had it thrust upon us.”

On March 28, 2006, to the dismay of many soldiers and civilians across Scotland, Black Watch was merged with other Scottish military regiments to become the 3rd battalion of the Royal Regiment of Scotland. As this new configuration took shape, interest in this particular military contingent increased across the country. By the summer of that year, several texts about the history and genealogy of the Black Watch had been published and displayed in bookshops through Scotland and were featured prominently at that year’s International Book Festival in Edinburgh. The long, respected history of the military regiment and possibly the view that it had played such a prominent role in
securing the ever-expanding borders of Britain’s Empire through its continually shifting and relocating frontlines led to these textual examinations. The image of Scotland produced by the continual deployments of the Black Watch was one of strength, solidarity, commitment, and loyalty.

In the “Director’s Note” to the published text of *Black Watch*, John Tiffany wrote that Vicky Featherstone had asked playwright Gregory Burke to follow developments of the Black Watch after the troops had returned from their 2004 tour in Iraq. Tiffany, Featherstone, and Burke then decided that they would develop a “highly physical piece of political theatre,” that centered on this story as part of their first season. Discussing the dynamic nature of the production’s genesis, Featherstone explained, “There was no thesis; there was no play that we discussed.” Similar to the *HOME* projects, this production emerged from the material circumstances of and personal engagement with localized sites: the interviews conducted by Burke, stories told by the men, and the Drill Hall in which the show initially took place. In addition to the present circumstances of British and Scottish military affairs, Tiffany admitted that past Scottish theatre productions inspired and shaped the development of *Black Watch*, with their use of “cabaret, spectacle, passion and honesty to communicate with their audiences.”

*Black Watch* utilized a documentary-style format that spliced together scenes where the Writer, ostensibly Burke, interviewed the returned soldiers in a pub with moments (both mundane and extraordinary) of the troops at Camp Dogwood and elsewhere in Iraq. In the pub scenes, the young veterans played pool to amuse themselves and swapped stories of their war experiences; in the barracks they played out various
forms of male relationships: they were brothers, rivals, colleagues, partners, combatants, and friends. These public spaces became performance venues for the men to act out their courage, fears, and desires; women existed as reminders of home or as flattened-out fantasies, as I discuss later in the chapter. The production staged an historical awareness of the military’s history as it revealed anxieties about the future of the regiment through its unstable and, at times, insecure position in Iraq. The shifting back and forth between Scottish pub and Iraqi barracks produced an unsettling effect in the soldiers as they transmitted the threat and execution of violence from foreign soil to their domestic homeland as the regiment formulated to watch became the object of the spectator’s gaze. One soldier, Cammy, acted as the production’s narrator as he directly addressed the audience during the scenes at home and abroad and operated as the Writer’s main interlocutor.

Arguing for a cultural materialist analysis of theatrical production(s), Ric Knowles forwarded that “cultural and ideological work done by a particular production may…have been mediated by the cultural and… theatrical conditions through which it has been produced.” The cultural and theatrical conditions that likely influenced this production of Black Watch included the tense atmosphere generated from the deployment of Black Watch soldiers to Fallujah coupled with plans to merge the battalion into a kind of mega-Highlander outfit. The performance’s placement within the Edinburgh Fringe Festival also impacted the look and feel of Black Watch. The Fringe Festival, a frenetic and diverse performance environment, operates as an interconnected artistic enterprise that grows larger each year. Before analyzing specific moments in the Black Watch
production, I first consider the artistic environment of the “fringe” as an ecotone, a site where different performance ecologies (local and international productions, for example) connect and impact one another and the artists, spectators, critics, and tourists who comprise them.

**A Festive Ecosystem**

In the ever-expanding Fringe (the 2008 Fringe featured over 31,300 performances of more than 2,000 shows) that stretches the seams of Edinburgh’s cityscape and population, artists find a forum for creative expression, communal celebration, cashing in on new audiences, and exporting their own brand of theatre-making and cultural performances to spectators in the Scottish capital.\(^1\) The 2006 Fringe season, in which *Black Watch* became a sold-out success offered dozens of shows dealing with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the politics of terrorism, broader foreign and economic policy concerns, and the increasing distrust of the UK and USA alliance.\(^2\) *Black Watch* joined the ranks of these critical productions, while maintaining a certain respect for the soldiers who answer this particular call of duty.

Jen Harvie considered the Fringe as a site that simultaneously enacts a “benign capitalism, offering a welter of choice” (the most recent figures hint at such a view) and a “hypermarket’, where production values and audience choice are undemocratically determined and standardised by neo-liberal market forces.”\(^3\) These market forces impact, among other elements, who is able (financially and physically) to travel to Edinburgh, who can take a financial risk by entering a show into the festival, and the labor employed (or volunteered) at venues across the city. The Festivals carve out their
own capitalist space as well, generating around £75 million for the Edinburgh and Scottish economy. In Edinburgh Harvie also observes a worrying process of “Disneyfication” taking place, whereby the city can be reduced to “an apparently cultural homogeneous entity that is seemingly fully understandable through a handful of simplistic categories, images and [festival] maps that leave out large swathes of the city.”

Interestingly, although the Fringe was created in 1947 by artists wanting to display alternative theatrical prospects to the more bourgeois Edinburgh International Festival, work produced by Scots in the Edinburgh Festivals has never consistently (if at all) been at the forefront of programming. Black Watch, however, through its local and transnational historical narratives, its language, and its questions pertaining to the role of the military in colonialism practices and the economic viability of soldiering, injected a complex Scottish story into the matrix of the Fringe.

Describing the significance of Black Watch in Edinburgh, Scottish theatre scholar Jane Sillars noted that the production tackled “one of the most live global political issues” via a “located set of stories.” If aspects of Edinburgh life that are packaged and sold to tourists on holiday suggests a homogenizing process of Scottishness, then a production like Black Watch may, in its own idiosyncratic way, be attempting to resist this practice, at least, perhaps, in its initial incarnation. Instead of generalizing about struggles in a climate of war and terror, Black Watch staged the impact of a history of soldiering on a specific community in Scotland; it foregrounded a small group of Scottish men who discussed, argued, embodied, and fought over their reasons to be in Iraq and their
complicated interactions with their fellow comrades as well as outsiders trying to understand them.

Why did this located set of stories take place at the Edinburgh University Drill Hall? Tiffany admitted, “I knew I wanted to perform the piece in a space in which we could create our own version of the [Military] Tattoo, with seating banks down either side of an esplanade. This we found in Edinburgh, in an old drill hall near the Castle that was being used as a car park by the university.”\(^{167}\) The environment of the production was of paramount importance to its director; the Drill Hall’s somewhat cavernous space and high ceiling allowed for a great deal of flexibility for the many scene changes and room for the towers of scaffolding erected on either side of the stage. Designed by John Cooper and William Taylor and built in 1904-1905, the Drill Hall, this “pop-up theatre space,”\(^{168}\) sits up a short, nondescript driveway (Forrest Hill) from Forrest Road, which curves into George IV Bridge. The Drill Hall’s design includes Scottish Baronial features, a Gothic revival style of architecture popular in the early nineteenth century. The building makes up part of a complex designated as a Category B site for Historic Scotland. According to the Historic Scotland website, a “B” listing is given to buildings “of regional or more than local importance, or major examples of some particular period, style or building type which may have been altered.”\(^{169}\) The site acted as the University of Edinburgh Territorial Army Centre and School of Artificial Intelligence when it received its Historic Scotland listing in 1975.\(^{170}\) In 2006, spectators queued for the nightly production of *Black Watch* alongside Sandy Bell’s, a cozy pub that serves up traditional music with its whiskeys every night of the week. Lit torches on the exterior
wall of the Drill Hall added to its Gothic appearance as they welcomed spectators into the three-storey space.

As I made my way inside the newly-fashioned theatre I walked through a large clear plastic tarp that created a permeable boundary to the performance site within the hall, a kind of threshold that I physically pushed aside. Loud, recorded music filled the space as I entered and chose a seat among the two flanks of raised platform seating.

Flutes, drums and bagpipes echoed throughout the hall, amplified to reach every corner of the hall and familiar to the arriving spectators since similar sounds waft out of many tourist shops in the capital and cascade down from Edinburgh Castle during the Tattoo. These dynamic, sensory-filled moments of the pre-show entertainment paralleled the feel of a mini-Military Tattoo. The Tattoo, whose actual nightly performances during three
weeks in August take place just a few hundred yards from the Drill Hall, has become a world-renowned event with tourists flocking from dozens of countries and tickets selling out for the shows months in advance each year. Begun in 1950, the ninety-minute performance features bagpipes, flutes, drums, and company marching with concluding fireworks. Forty countries have been represented over the years, and during its three-week run, audiences of approximately 217,000 fill its bleachers. Revenues in 2007 reached a staggering £4.8 million. Between the sales of tickets, as well as CDs, DVDs, and other kinds of memorabilia, the Tattoo is big business.  

Ian Jack, a writer for *The Guardian*, observed, “People sometimes forget that Scotland has a strong tradition of militarism—three centuries of blood and death in the British cause that has been made folksy and cuddly by the kilts, pipes and drums of the Edinburgh Tattoo.” The Tattoo celebrates the apparent triumph of nationalist and imperialist endeavors in Scotland and the UK, particularly given its inclusion of performing regiments from around the globe (including Canada, South Africa, Australia, and Trinidad & Tobago). The use of the Tattoo to frame *Black Watch*, combined with its physical proximity to that performance, added aesthetic, historical, and violent resonances to the NTS production, coalescing in an ambiguous relationship between the spectacle of violence applauded during the Tattoo and the documentary-style piece that occurred within the Drill Hall.

These introductory moments within the Drill Hall foreshadowed a celebration of military prowess, precision in performance, liveliness, and spectacle that attempted to conceal the physical, emotional, and mental violence enacted by such military campaigns. On the walls, projections of the Saltire Cross bounced across the floor and ceiling,
landing briefly on spectators before continuing to dance around the space. The central set piece used throughout the production was a pool table. Acting as a focal point or activated hub-on-wheels, the table functioned as a site of leisure in the interspersed pub scenes, as a womb from which soldiers were symbolically birthed as they tore through the lining from within, and as a military tank en-route in Iraq whose unexpected breakdown led to a horrific expression of death. The table perhaps also suggested an element of playing or gaming that pervaded the men’s responses to one another, even during dire situations. Apart from a few chairs and a stool—used by the Writer during his interviews—two sets of large metal scaffolding provided the infrastructure of the set. Large video screens were attached to the scaffolding, alternately airing political speeches regarding the status of the Black Watch regiment, football matches, and actual footage of moving tanks and air strikes in Iraq. The skeletal nature and height of the scaffolding created depth to the production and offered the men another level of playing space, high above spectators.

Although considering the performative elements of gender does not comprise a substantial part of my project, the all-male cast of *Black Watch* and the masculine behaviors demonstrated, ostensibly in service to protect the Scottish nation and the British state, deserve at least a moment of attention here. In the production, the framework of military activity, and fighting in Iraq in particular, created a hyper-masculine environment where men acted and reacted aggressively and, oftentimes, emotionlessly. The public spaces represented in the production (the pub, barracks, and football match on television) lent themselves to a sense of competition and one-
upmanship while at the same time also asking of participants (patrons, soldiers, players) to incorporate principles of solidarity and teamwork in their daily labors. Women only obliquely appeared in this male-dominated configuration via silent letters and emails received from home and posters of naked women that adorned the men’s lockers and wagon. The women, symbols of home and desire here, did not have a voice and could not provide an alternate perspective to the functioning of these soldiers abroad or their own feelings of separation or isolation garnered by this arrangement. So if the masculine spaces were those that were public, dangerous, and active, then the presumed feminine spaces correlated as interior, domestic, and passive, a perspective of nationhood where men secure the borders in order for women to reproduce and stabilize their individual homes. By including such spectacular elements of choreography and audio-visual technology, however, the production implied a performative gender where, as Judith Butler observed, “the artifice of the performance can be read as artifice.”

In Black Watch the conditions of war generated an excessively virile context in which the men must exist and work together. This stepping into a gendered role was made especially visible in the production when a male television news crew (a journalist and a cameraman) entered the barracks to interview the soldiers about their experience. Cammy reluctantly began to answer the crew’s questions and then, after a series of explosions, another soldier, Fraz, ran into the barracks wearing only a towel. As the men fell to the ground and covered their heads, Fraz jumped on the reporter while another soldier turned the camera to face Fraz and the reporter. Adopting a heroic stance, down on one knee beside the reporter, Fraz smiled broadly as his muscled chest demonstrated the good
health and self-discipline needed to soldier effectively and to protect those positioned (literally or figuratively) as weaker than this band of brothers.

Throughout the play unexpected moments moved spectators into different affective relationships with the unfolding events and interactions between characters. One such moment occurred after the men swapped foul-mouthed insults and engaged in combative “macho” behavior. This aggressive mood abruptly shifted to a softer, somber choreographed ritual where the men received letters from home. One by one the soldiers entered the performance space and passed a bundle of letters to another soldier, extracting his own correspondence from the pile. Each man opened his letter, read it silently to himself, dropped it on the floor and then, using sign language-like gestures to “re-read” the letter, he embodied the story that had traveled thousands of miles to reach him. The choral letter-opening depicted a collective of bodies, each enacting his own individual needs, losses, and desires circulated by these hand-written texts. As sons, brothers, husbands, partners, fathers, and friends, they received the words of their loved ones through their bodies: tales of new babies, broken hearts, deaths, longing. These letters, discursive bridges that momentarily connected the soldiers to their roots in Scotland, produced a deeply personal, intimate, and emotional element into the masculine context that pointed to a complex relationship between the performance of self-assuredness and vulnerability, breaking down the seemingly monolithic entity of a soldier. This sequence also imaginatively mapped an intricate set of places and identities that blurred a distinction between domestic and foreign, home and abroad, as the men each temporarily
relived their lives in Scotland, despite being thousands of miles away from their families and homes.

In exploring the layers of family tradition, military history, personal duty, and collective honor that have compressed into this moment of army service in Iraq, two concurrent sequences in the production, Lord Elgin’s recruitment of soldiers and Cammy’s parade of historical regimental uniforms, exemplified an ecosystem of objects, personal and national narratives, and bodies that shaped this production. In the first sequence, Lord Elgin (the infamous late-eighteenth/early-nineteenth-century army recruiter and ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, responsible for taking the Parthenon’s “Elgin Marbles” and selling them to the British Museum) charged into the space, threateningly wielding a large sword. “Now as you know,” he told the men (and us) as he placed the sword on the pool table, “my ancestor led his men at Bannockburn [site of Robert the Bruce’s heroic victory against English troops] and is buried nearby at Dunfermline Abbey. He led his men in a fight for freedom from the tyranny of a foreign power and the need then, as now, for Scotsmen to serve their country in its hour of need is as great.”

Lord Elgin’s theatrical use of the sword created a historical loop in which ancestors and descendents existed in the same time and place through his discursive construction. Elgin simultaneously linked past and present causes—freedom from tyranny—and obscured the explicit differences between these historical moments: fighting on Scottish soil against invading troops as opposed to fighting in the desert of Iraq as, arguably, invaders in service of another nation and Empire. As Elgin continued to sell the idea of army recruitment to the men, he again pointed to the significance of, I
discover, Robert the Bruce’s sword. When the potential recruits expressed concern about
getting paid for the patriotic duty of soldiering, Elgin responded with tempting and
distracting images of travel, guns, football, drink, and exotic women. The issue of
compensation for services rendered did not receive much explicit traction in the
production, except for the final moment (which I discuss later in the chapter), but it did
link to the socio-economic class of the majority of these foot soldiers, recruited from
predominantly working-class areas where a young man’s primary options for
employment exist in the form of manual labor (working in mines, quarries, or oil rigs, for
example). It is this kind of rugged, self-disciplined, and courageous masculinity sought
and shaped by the military recruiters. Elgin sealed the deal with a song, “The Forfar
Sodger,” that told the story of a young man enlisting in the army, a “nobler thocht
[thought]” than the pursuit of an education. Elgin was flanked by two dancing soldiers
who displayed a grace in their light-footed Highland dancing moves, another gestural
contradiction to the brutish, masculine demeanor required of the troops. Eventually
Cammy, the target of this final pitch, learned the dance and joined these “force
multipliers,” used to increase rank numbers. The next sequence where a sartorial pageant
staged key moments in Black Watch’s history amplified this blending of choreography,
music, and soldiering.

What one London review labeled as “little more than an animatronic museum
exhibit,” offered a wide swath of Scottish history within a tightly-structure
performance during the middle of the production. Stage directions set the scene:
Music. A red carpet rolls out, and as Cammy narrates the following history of the Black Watch the other soldiers manoeuvre him around the stage dressing him into and out of significant and distinct uniforms from the regiment’s history. They resemble a squad assembling and disassembling a military cannon.  

The following parade enacted a miniature history play, showcasing different times and places through the manipulation of Cammy’s body. I quote at length from Cammy’s monologue to give a sense of the storytelling at work in the scene. “We started before Culloden,” he told us, “We dinnay really ken [know] when. 1715, or maybe 1725. When Scotland was an independent nation we were fucking mercenaries tay half ay fuckin Europe. But it was 1739 when we really threw our lot in way the British.” With military precision, Cammy was turned, flipped, lifted, suspended, rolled over, and adjusted as the other soldiers dressed him in different uniforms across the battalion’s life span of nearly three hundred years. His narration continued throughout:

We’re warriors. We’re Celts. The thing about the Celts, apart fay being an oral culture and disappearing fay history, was that they looked upon warfare as sport. It was their fun. It was what they did to relax. Since 1745 the Black Watch has fought all over the world. A lot ay the time we’ve been used in tribal conflicts. We’re good at them. We’re a fucking tribe ourselves.

His comrades lifted and re-dressed him. Throughout the sequence, after each section of text and correct application of a new uniform, Cammy walked on the red carpet to one
side of the audience seating, turned, posed, and smiled. A large flash bulb went off with accompanying sound. The picture-taking temporarily froze the action before the men rushed out and continued with the parade. “We’ve got a lot ay links tay North America….They fucking love us over there. Cannay get enough ay the history ay. All the shite they dinnay have.” Turn, pose, smile, picture.

   In the Second World War we were at Dunkirk but we got left behind way the rest ay the Highland Division. We reformed and fought through Sicily and Italy to Monte Cassino…We got sent tay Africa tay crush the Mau Mau rebels. We’d been in Africa before of course…In Egypt, where we’d been in 1917 too. Before we went tay Palestine tay take Jerusalem. Then Syria tay drive out the Ottoman Turks. Which we did in 1919, in Mesopotamia. (Beat.) Mesopotamia? (Beat.) Where the fuck have I heard that before? (Beat.) Oh…aye. (Beat.) Here we are. (Beat.) Again.\(^\text{179}\)

This military parade-cum-fashion show catalogued historical events and military engagements with very little, if any, commentary or context. The onslaught of places and times overwhelmed me as I attempted to map the complex terrains of these conflicts in the seconds that rushed by. The language and storytelling implied a wide circulation of these Black Watch soldiers across continents, far from their homes in Scotland. Also, the narrative hinted at Scotland’s complicity with atrocities that have occurred over nearly three centuries for the safeguarding of imperial power. Throughout this pageantry, with each camera’s flash, Cammy smiled, silently acquiescing to history’s quotidian account of his military lineage.
“To historicize the present,” argued Ric Knowles, “…involves resisting any naturalized understanding of the writing of history as the construction (and completion) of the justificatory autobiographical narratives of nation and community, masked as the objective or transparent recording of historical fact.” This parade sequence articulated a complex relationship between the past and present through the coordination and participation of the soldiers. The manipulation of one soldier’s body visually symbolized the changing appearance of the Black Watch amid the continuity of a military legacy. This particular narrative of Scotland’s past, in being replayed in the middle of a play about these soldiers’ more immediate experiences in Iraq, pitched the military history as an ongoing story that incorporated new faces and accoutrements, but, in some ways, bore an eerie resemblance to past conflicts, relationships, and practices. This double movement—back and forth through time—resisted the justificatory logic that Knowles warned about by not presenting a naturalizing process but instead exposing the interplay between socio-cultural relationships (historical characters, the men’s connections to their past) and the idea of protecting the natural territory of Scotland through enlistment. Since the play did not offer a broad critique of military engagement, opting instead to root itself in the present ficto-consciousness of these soldiers depicted within a local environment (their pub) and discussing a familiar set of experiences (their time at Camp Dogwood), this sequence did not claim to create historical truths or facts through its portrayal of events. We might read the scene as an archaeological dig of sorts that provided visual evidence of the manipulation of history-writing through the contortions of the narrator’s body and disciplined movements. Cammy walked the viewers through the story of the
past but he became a passive object within the account as the stage directions likened him to a “military cannon.” The rolling tides of history incorporated this narrator’s body into its currents, and the supporting cast of soldiers did not refute nor add alternate viewpoints to this single account given. The unfolding of this single point of view aligned with biographical or historical texts that streamline a myriad of practices, conflicts, objects, and bodies into an easily digestible and stabilized entity.

Writing about this 2006 production, Joyce McMillan observed:

Burke's play does not represent the last word on the history of Scotland's most famous regiment. But it does represent a massive step forward in our understanding and recognition of a vital part of our national story, and - potentially - of the relationship between Scottish theatre and the widest possible popular audience, both at home, and far beyond our shores.  

McMillan situated this performance in Scottish theatre history, announcing its, and these soldiers’ and actors’, negotiation of their place at home and abroad. Like the actual service of the soldiers who traversed deserts, mountains, cities, farms, coastlines, forests, and jungles, McMillan saw this production in motion—on tour—seeking wider audiences, continuing the discussion of Scottish history and the ability of theatre to help tell that story. This kind of touring process not only widened the geographical connections knitted together (through the letters and naming of former battle sites) within the production, but it also added complexities to the ongoing socio-political production of the contemporary story of Black Watch. By sending the production on the road and back to places of former colonial contact and conflict, seeking financial benefits as well as
growing international awareness of the NTS, this venture could be viewed as artistic exportation or as cultural ambassadorship.

**Another Tour of Duty**

And tour, *Black Watch* did. At last count, across three continents. In March 2007, *Black Watch* began its road trip across Scotland, England, Wales, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.[^182] For nearly two years, the cast and crew of this production have trodden on or near some of the same sites that Black Watch soldiers have traversed since the eighteenth century. Each of these theatrical destinations exists as part of the UK, its former colonies, or the current British Commonwealth, making a comment about the extant markets for Scottish touring productions overseas cultivated, at least in part, from the UK’s violent colonial past and from Scotland’s concerted efforts to woo North Americans with Scottish ancestry back to the land of their forefathers (as seen in the Homecoming Scotland 2009 campaign). At each of these performance venues, the *Black Watch* team converted warehouses, drill halls, football academies, and other large performance venues to accommodate the grandstand seating, scaffolding, and necessary technological hook-ups of the show.

To consider how *Black Watch* has continued to provoke assumptions about Scottish nationhood and history, I focus on its reincarnation at the Barbican Centre in London that I attended in July 2008, nearly two years after I first viewed the production in Edinburgh. Writing about the European touring of a different site-specific performance event, *Gododdin*, created by Brith Gof Theatre in Wales, Jen Harvie suggested, “In transferring this site-specific piece to other sites—and, indeed, markets—Brith Gof risked
not only losing certain memories but also summoning other unwelcome ones.” So what potentially has been lost and/or gained by this production’s move from Edinburgh to London (after many stops in between)? Its temporary London home comprised one component of a complex site—the Barbican Estate—began in the 1950s after World War II bombing had demolished thirty-five acres of the City in London. One connection between the play and the site, then, existed in the destructive nature of warfare in terms of corporeal and collateral damage that shaped the narratives of these events.

Rough concrete dominates the complex’s Brutalist design, creating a large-scale bunker-like edifice, perhaps resembling other kinds of edifices constructed during wartime to house soldiers. Completed in 1982, at a cost of £156 million, the seven floors of this centre contain cinemas, a theatre, a concert hall, a library, an art gallery, restaurant, cafes, and lounges. An enormous amount of commerce takes place beneath its concrete roof, proving quite a contrast to the performance milieu of the Edinburgh Drill Hall. Theatre events comprise only a small portion of the events taking place at the Barbican, and the 2008 production of Black Watch was slotted into its “bite08” schedule. “bite,” according to a Barbican press release, was created at the Barbican in 1998 as a six-month period of showcasing international performances, “inventive and pioneering work that permeates the borders between theatre, dance and music.” The 2008 season lasted the entirety of the calendar year with performers from the British Isles, Europe, New Zealand, South Africa, the USA, Brazil, and Iran taking part. Like the military circulation of Black Watch soldiers who watched, patrolled, and defended particular lands and peoples, the production’s placement within this international context once
again brought its stories in touch with foreign shores. My own re-acquaintance with
*Black Watch* was mediated, first, by my own travel to reach the Barbican venue and,
second, by the architecture of and activities within this performance complex. Before the
show, I wondered if the ambiguous statements about Scottish soldiering and its colonial
history would cohere into more pointed critiques, or be received by a London audience as
a more overt commentary, regarding the use of Scottish soldiers in British imperial
campaigns or the ongoing war in Iraq. Essentially, what elements of the production
would this new performance venue, so unlike the physical environment of the Drill Hall,
alter in the show?

After making my way through the busy, early afternoon streets of a sunny
summer day in the City, the capital center of commercial London, I headed down
Charterhouse Street and passed Smithfield Market. This track took me from the
cosmopolitan arena of high-rise office buildings and boutique shopping and into the
gritty, working-class East End. Making my way inside the Barbican, positioned as part of
the cultural Renaissance of this particular end of the metropolis, I was struck by just how
much activity was occurring on the venue’s several floors. Not only were other theatrical
productions taking place that day, but the concert hall was overrun with King’s College
graduates and their slightly intoxicated family members (at least one of whom donned a
kilt), mingling in the open space between the hall and the theatre. I could not help
comparing this entry into *Black Watch* to the one I previously experienced on a chilly
Edinburgh night with pub music spilling out of Sandy Bell’s as I queued outside the Drill
Hall. This pre-show environment appeared too comfortable with its big plush seats and
posh bars on every floor. The lit torches and stone walkway outside of the Drill Hall was replaced with fluorescent lighting and a decorative, though well-tread, carpet leading into the theatre. Knowing how the main narrative of this matinee production was meant to unfold, with soldiers scurrying about trying to protect themselves during moments of gunfire and commenting on the physicality of soldiering, I missed the earlier stripped-down performance venue. The general admission seats of the Drill Hall were replaced by reserved seating at the Barbican, and a few subtle signs of the theatre’s temporary renovation remained visible as a large curtain blocked off an area of (ostensibly proscenium-arranged) seats. The commercial nature of the Barbican slotted the poignant site-specific performance of *Black Watch* into just one of several events taking place, removing elements of its located connection to its environment and evacuating some of its political potential. The working-class soldiers depicted in the embodied story stood in stark contrast to the kilt-wearing graduation attendees next door.

Watching the performance for a second time in London, just a few miles from Westminster where decisions about the British involvement in Iraq and other military campaigns are made, I grew more aware of the production’s self-reflexivity concerning its own creation. Not only did the characters express to the Writer their concerns about how he would portray them in a staged performance, but the sequences of interviews displayed the difficulty, if not impossibility, of accurately rendering personal responses to the war into written text. “What was it like?” the Writer hesitantly asked the soldiers with his audio recorder at the ready; his query elicited responses that ranged from incomprehension and silence to overt aggression. At one point during the Writer’s
reluctant interrogation, a soldier prepared to illustrate the trauma of the experience by inflicting bodily harm on the Writer. The impasse of communication between the men and interviewer resonated with the earlier pseudo-sign language that the men used to “read” their letters. Throughout the play, the men revealed an inability to speak, to record, and to portray; the production grappled with these dilemmas as it used different mediums (song, sound, dance, stylized movement, fight sequences, silence) to hint at the necessity of not constructing a single or central narrative of these experiences. These disconnections appeared even more salient to me within the Barbican space, with its physical dissimilarities to the Drill Hall (in terms of its commercial enterprise and physical comfort level). I experienced more difficulty placing the Scottish localities in the play; the thickness of the Scottish accent appeared more of a novel characteristic of the soldiers than as a marker of a working-class identity as it did in Edinburgh. This performance environment (Barbican, “bite”) abstracted the specific locale of these soldiers (represented by the Fife pub and observations such as Lord Elgin’s mention of nearby Dunfermline) into a Scottish entity that appeared to emphasize this disjuncture between an embodied experience and the language used to describe it.

Viewing the final sequence of the play for a second time also produced a more critical response from me. When a deadly explosion of a roadside bomb killed three of the soldiers, the sound of the blast ricocheted off the walls and the large plastic tarp (through which I passed during the Edinburgh production but only saw from my seating in the Barbican) fell to the ground to reveal three bodies covered in blood suspended from the ceiling. As a melancholic Gaelic tune signaled mourning, the bodies were
slowly lowered to the ground; expressions of terror were frozen on the men’s faces as their contorted bodies were carefully removed from the harnessing by their comrades. The moment called for a plaintive pause, and as Cammy resolutely folded up the plastic tarp, he informed his commanding officer that, upon return home to Scotland, he would leave the unit. Comparing military service to “the shipyards, the pits,” Cammy offered, “It’s fucking knackered. Don’t you think it’s knackered, sir?” Perhaps part of an unrehearsed thesis of the production followed in the officer’s next line, “It takes three hundred years to build an army that’s admired and respected around the world. But it only takes three years pissing about in the desert in the biggest western foreign policy disaster ever to fuck it up completely.”188 This line provided a relevant note of political commentary on the current position of the Scottish military given the interplay between several government and military officials; it also suggested a corollary between labor in the military and the physical toll taken by other grueling, thankless forms of employment. By equating these labors, the line perhaps briefly de-politicized the specific argument regarding the place of the military in Scotland’s present, but it simultaneously re-politicized issues of class in the military. These working-class Scottish soldiers are sent to take part in military campaigns to ensure the ongoing socio-political and cultural stability of residents in the UK, some of whom were seated in the Barbican audience.

The closing movement sequence elided the actual traumas experienced as a result of military policy decisions and the attempt of a theatrical medium to portray them. It also reinserted the Tattoo-like performance spectacular into the violence of militarism that took the lives of both soldiers and civilians on a daily basis:
Music. The bagpipes and drums start playing ‘The Black Bear’. The soldiers start parading. The music intensifies and quickens as the parade becomes harder and the soldiers stumble and fall. The parade formation begins to disintegrate but each time one falls they are helped back onto their feet by the others. As the music and movement climax, a thunderous drumbeat stops both, and the exhausted, breathless soldiers are left in silhouette.¹⁸⁹

This sequence was emotionally charged as the actors appeared poised at each re-playing of the formation, throwing their body forward, assisting their fallen mates, and rejoining their regimented ranks. The music reverberated in my chest as a bagpiper-cum-soldier began to play a mournful song before the recorded music filled in the space and narrated the movements onstage. What might sound like a canned formulaic song when divorced from the production seemed like an anthem for the men who crisscrossed the stage and exerted such physical efforts again and again. This choreography continued for some minutes, and at its conclusion, many spectators, including myself, applauded with tears rolling down my face. While this final sequence depicted a deep-rooted loyalty between the men, it also seemed to bookend the opening references to the Tattoo: where the actual blood, violence, and death have been erased from the narrative by the spectacle of the precision, talent, and colorful aesthetic of the marching military musicians.

The staged death that preceded this moment (in both the Edinburgh and London productions) marked the death of three actual Black Watch soldiers: Private Scott McArdle, aged 22; Private Paul Lowe, aged 19; and Sergeant Stuart Gray, aged 31. Yet
in the performers’ ability to stand up and rejoin the regiment’s formation after falling to
the ground, the theatricality created further ambiguous statements about the place of these
men and their army regiments. The Black Watch, like other military outfits, calls for
individual sacrifice for the greater good (the battalion, the army, the nation, the Empire).
So, on the one hand, the loss of the three men would have been enveloped and
redistributed by the remaining soldiers. On the other hand, though, the loss of those
individuals would have impacted the lives of their brothers-in-arms. So while the
production deconstructed this kind of politically-evacuated celebration of soldiering
(through the dialogue, silent movements, and construction of masculinity), it
simultaneously commemorated a determined, sacrificial, self-disciplined sensibility
displayed in the characterizations of the soldiers. During this final sequence that required
skill and stamina from the actors, perhaps I would have felt less celebratory of the actors
and more disturbed by the inability of the theatrical work to reconcile the devastation,
loss, and failure of policy in Iraq, if the play had ended with Cammy’s leaving of the
regiment and not a musically-infused demonstration of physical will.

The Barbican production of Black Watch, which contained most of the actors
from the first production and the same dramaturgical structure, positioned its audience
much like the smiling Cammy, unapologetically listing the places of military combat,
without questioning his (or our) complicity in governmental policy-making. In the
Barbican, the energy gathered from the production’s inaugural performances in
Edinburgh was dispersed as the highly specific national resonances (embodied, for
example, in former Black Watch soldiers seated in the audiences during the evening
performances) became abstracted into an “international” showcase of compelling performance for those audiences able to buy theatre tickets, make their way to the Barbican, and watch the shows. I am not suggesting that the Drill Hall performance solved the kinds of socio-economic problems brought up by the production, but as this event comprised the entirety of the Drill Hall programming, *Black Watch* became a singular, complex multi-layered event. While it competed with other shows taking place during the Edinburgh Fringe Festival, it did not contend with other commercial activities taking place within a venue. The national characteristics depicted in both places, however, revealed a constructed masculine environment viewed as necessary to safeguard Scotland, as well as Britain. And the NTS’s choice of including a story of this military regiment during their first year of programming suggested that the political awareness of past Scottish theatre companies would continue into this new century.

**Stories Located and Set Adrift**

The collection of Scottish *HOMEs* acted as a “trip-wire around Scotland,” transforming particular cities, structures, and natural environments into temporary performance venues where artists, spectators, and environmental histories engaged with one another. The stagings of *Black Watch* across three continents presented the concerns of this Scottish regiment to audiences thousands of miles away from Scotland through sophisticated audio-video technology and politically-charged narratives. *HOME Shetland*’s locale articulated the need to think mobile-ly while staying anchored at home. This gesture reflected the fluidity of Scotland’s political process as it has rejected a stable or fixed historically-constructed identity and has entered into a process of *devolution* in
order to navigate new routes for political configurations and alliances. *HOME Stornoway* offered an introspective analysis and close read of the labor involved in constructing particular local and national narratives through the careful arrangement of various materials into miniature ecosystems that, when viewed collectively, proposed contrasting views about what it means to be at home in Scotland and what it mean for an outsider looking in. *Black Watch*, with its intricate choreography, reworking of familiar stories and images, and presentation of a complex socio-economic and political military terrain presented a history of Scotland layered with violence, loss, camaraderie, silence, and physical labor. Each of these productions also revised seemingly known, familiar, or understood aspects of Scottish culture. The fiddle music of Shetland, Gaelic language in Stornoway, and tribal mentality mediated by bagpipes in Edinburgh/London/Iraq all received closer inspection and reinterpretation to make them part of current discourses of local, national, and global import (employment, warfare, post-industrial landscapes, travel, and tourism).

That the NTS exists as a building-less collective, that it is home-less enacts particular innovative limitations for its creative programming, including its decision to embody or retell particular stories and to utilize and adapt specific Scottish environments and landscapes. With this arrangement comes an insecurity and instability about the staging ground of a particular performance event, yet at the same time, it also carries with it the thrilling possibilities of risk-taking, mobility and a desire to find a story suitable to a particular site and vice-versa. “Architecture is a massive problem,” suggested Featherstone, “[it] defines if you’re the type of person who goes into the building or
Joyce McMillan concurred, “Any building has its threshold.” The NTS exists on an artistic plane beside its twentieth-century antecedents like the Scottish National Players and 7:84 (Scotland) in its desire to take Scottish theatre to the various locales that constitute Scotland. It also continually points to the ambiguities of the Scottish past and Scotland as a homeland by constructing different kinds of thresholds, or ecotones, (the dock, the doll house threshold, and the shifting frontlines) that blur boundaries between nature/culture and local/national and reveal the interconnections of different organisms in a specific environment.

Theatre scholar Loren Kruger suggested that historically “the notion of a national theatre offered aesthetic autonomy as a consolation for the lack of political power.” In the case of Scotland, its national theatre has evolved, in part, from a movement of some political autonomy from London to Edinburgh. The NTS offers a performance of process: the land itself is traversed and utilized in multiple, mutable ways and relationships (between objects, sounds, bodies) are stitched together and ripped apart. And perhaps this particular cultural institution can make the case for an independent Scotland even more immediate to its citizens by throwing contemporary moments into sharp relief with historical contexts and asking what resonances have carried forward and what discontinuities lie in an ostensibly familiar place. As this occurs, Scottish artists negotiate multiple post-devolution identities as Scotland contends with its place in the UK, in Europe, and on global stages.

Like its productions, the NTS emerges from multiple dialogues, experiences, relationships, and locations. Adrienne Scullion observed that the relationship between the
NTS and the “cultural infrastructure” of Scotland is enmeshed in “the changing relationships of government to cultural development and provision, particularly at the national company level.” Here Scullion linked the complex negotiation of the NTS’s identity and placement in the terrain of Scottish artistic production. These nationally-branded institutions include the Royal Scottish National Orchestra, the Scottish Chamber Orchestra, the Scottish Ballet, and the Scottish Opera. Their constitution, as well as the relationships they have with one another, will likely alter as future economic climates, political maneuvers, and the desire of individuals to engage with the arts change over time. But perhaps the NTS, with its de-centered and mobile way of thinking and operating offers a way to weather future socio-political storms by staying flexible, taking risks, and forming a network of partnerships across the country.
Chapter Four

Spectacular Pageantry: Framing Scotland, Forging Scottishness

"In short, we are THE CLAN, and our King is THE CHIEF."¹⁹⁶ (Walter Scott)

Opening Ceremonies

Making her way down Edinburgh's Royal Mile on October 9, 2004, Queen Elizabeth II donned an unadorned bright pink dress with matching coat, accented by a purple hat trimmed with more pink. She was in Edinburgh to celebrate the opening of the Scottish Parliament building at Holyrood, the institution's permanent home after a five-year provisional residence in the Assembly Hall near the top of the Royal Mile. During the opening ceremony festivities, which included a procession down the High Street, the British monarch maintained her stately appearance and serious disposition. She had, of course, been to Edinburgh many times before, notably for the (re)opening of the Scottish Parliament at its temporary home, a new chapter in Scottish political history made possible by the Scotland Act, on July 1, 1999. Queen Elizabeth II’s involvement in the autumn 2004 ceremony, however, differed significantly from this earlier appearance.

In 1999 the Queen had worn an all-purple attire, which visibly marked her ongoing affiliation with the Scots (as the purple thistle is Scotland's national emblem) and also positioned her as a rightful participant in the proceedings that would undoubtedly lead to a rethinking of Scotland's position in the United Kingdom. Her attire in 2004 then, perhaps overtly signaled a new relationship between herself and the events occurring in the Scottish capital; her clothing choice could be read as a move to distance herself from her Scottish subjects, a stylistic signifier announcing a timely (if only partial) separation.
This exterior change hinted at the new role that the monarch would play in the future affairs of Scotland and its people and, combined with various gestures performed that day, stood in contrast to the meaning relayed by the words of the Queen and others. In his speech, Scotland’s First Minister at the time, Jack McConnell (of Tony Blair’s Labour party), emphasized the Queen’s continuing role in this new phase of Scottish governance:

“Your Majesty, our thanks. Your support for this institution has been appreciated. We are grateful for your good wishes, and we wish you well in all you do for our country. Five years ago, Scotland found a new voice in the land. Today we celebrate a new confidence in the country.”

The Queen’s own words echoed this collegial sentiment, taking it a step further as she united the political practices of Scotland and Britain in her reading of the Scottish Parliament’s history, drawing not “just on [its]… own heritage but on the best parliamentary traditions of Westminster, the Commonwealth and Europe.” She then presented a symbolic object, a newly created mace symbolizing political power designed by a Scottish silversmith to the Parliament to extend her sentiments. She observed, “The Mace reminds us that your procedures follow British and Commonwealth models.”

With these words and the Britishness denoted by the ceremonial object, the British sovereign marked the space of the Scottish Parliament as one imbued with British governmental precedent. The collaboration of different events on that celebratory day, though, created a complex statement about the future relationship between Scotland, England, the British state, the residual Empire, and Europe.

While the presentation of the mace attempted to materially connect different political systems, the handling of another symbolic object, the royal crown, performed an
act of separation. Instead of the Queen carrying the royal crown, an icon of Scottish sovereignty from the thirteenth century, into the Parliament site (as she had done in 1999), on this day the Duke of Hamilton undertook that honor. This strategic decision by ceremony organizers produced a figurative (and possibly foreshadowed) separation between the Queen and Scottish sovereignty by literally taking the symbol of Scottish rule from her hands and placing it in those of a Scottish aristocrat. During the event’s final, impromptu closing song, the ubiquitous “Auld Lang Syne,” as parliamentarians and guests joined hands to sing the words made famous by Robbie Burns, the Queen, according to BBC News, “appeared to sing discreetly although she did not hold hands with her neighbour George Reid, [the Scottish Parliament’s Presiding Officer] who was singing at the top of his voice.” Whether it was the overt demonstration of emotions or for some other reason, in this moment the Queen chose not to connect physically with the Scot beside her.

The procession that carried parliamentarians and guests down the Royal Mile and into this new site at Holyrood saw the residents of and visitors to Edinburgh fill the city’s High Street to welcome the new Parliament into the twenty-first century. Children, perched atop the shoulders of their parents, waved the Saltire Cross imbued with nationalist sentiments. Marching bands, including dozens of bagpipers, supplied the accompanying celebratory sounds to the scene. As MSPs (Members of Scottish Parliament) made their way down the High Street, banners bearing their geographical affiliation preceded them, locating them simultaneously within their diverse constituencies across Scotland and within Edinburgh as members of this re-fashioned
political body. Although I was not part of the gathered crowd in that capital city to witness these happenings, the Scottish Parliament's website (created to disseminate information on parliamentary procedure and to encourage e-participation in Scottish politics, which I discuss in the next chapter) circulates images of the waving Queen and the enthusiastic Scots by streaming it through cyberspace. These images include close-ups of babies’ faces along the parade route juxtaposed with aerial views of the crowd, the Parliament, and the city at large, including numerous shots of Calton Hill, located just north of the new Parliament site. This visual reproduction of the ceremony aims to provide numerous angles into this multi-faceted event, identifying the familiar and not-so-familiar faces that comprise the city and nation at a particular moment in time by alternating haptic and optic views of the Scottish capital.

In this chapter I want to examine the spaces of Edinburgh produced for and constructed by a different kind of spectacular event that took place on its streets nearly two centuries before. In 1822, novelist Sir Walter Scott, charged with organizing a pageant to welcome King George IV to Scotland, materialized his pro-Unionist agenda that sought to discursively and physically present Scottish allegiance to this monarch. This political pageant, a large-scale affair, ordered the appearance of a particular segment of Scotland’s population and deployed distinct modes of theatrical production to brand a particular version of Scottish history, culture, and politics to an audience in Scotland and abroad. The resulting pageant consisted of two weeks of processions, feasts, balls, and a performance of *Rob Roy Macgregor*; these events collaborated to display the city of Edinburgh, the residents of Scotland, and the resolution of a century of discontent.
between Jacobites wanting the return of a Stuart monarch and those Scots supporting the present Hanoverian monarchy. Unlike the 2004 parade that congratulated Scots gaining a degree of political autonomy, the 1822 pageant pitched the city and its peoples as loyal and contented participants within, and dependent upon, a larger British geopolitical entity.

Here I think through how the Edinburgh that was the early nineteenth-century Scottish capital city was an unstable staging ground for a grand display that disseminated particular constructions of Scottishness, primarily adapted from Walter Scott’s reading of cultural practices of the Scottish Highlanders and enacted through the bodies of those taking part. In Rhys Jones and Carwyn Fower’s article “Placing and scaling the nation,” they articulate the need to analyze notions of scale and place as being socially constructed when interrogating how certain sites come to stand for the nation through particular political and social institutions and practices. Edinburgh, a city notably linked to the Scottish Enlightenment, acted as one such site, operating as the urban stage intended to present and produce for the British monarch a Scottish nation that was self-disciplined, ordered, and a unified collective. The circulation of bodies (Highlanders, stage actors, attractive females) and objects (journals, pamphlets, paintings, theatre materials) helped to map out the space of the city and, by imaginative extension, the nation of Scotland. In analyzing how the pageant transformed particular aspects of Highland culture (tartan, bagpipes) into Scottish culture, which were then replicated by Scots and visitors alike, I situate discursive constructions that attempted to stabilize and unify the Scots alongside accounts of the physical surroundings of Edinburgh and the
bodies that occupied its spaces. I also consider the politics of spatiality taken up by Henri Lefebvre and Doreen Massey to help elucidate the stakes of such a dramatic undertaking.

In addition to reading the “power geometry” produced by the points of connectivity between spatial and social relationships, I look at how Walter Scott, the primary organizer and stage-manager of the pageant, forwarded George IV as the rightful and legitimate monarch of the Scots, a role into which George dutifully stepped as he donned a tartan costume from head to toe. Unlike Queen Elizabeth’s more recent apparel decisions to mark herself as associated with but separated from the Scots, George employed his attire simultaneously to lose himself (as a Hanoverian King) within the ceremonies and to locate himself (as a Stuart) within a Scottish genealogy. These efforts attempted to shore up his position and to ameliorate circulating discontent regarding his rule. As I scrutinize Scott’s dramaturgical ordering of the pageant, I turn to Actor Network theorists concern with the “orderings [that] take place in terms of language and materiality, through performativity and intervention.”

I assemble my analytical framework from various textual, pictorial, and performance “evidence” from this pageant that I use to identify important tensions between localities and circulations, significant slippages between metonymic performances and social encounters, and the active role of objects (documents, images, clothing) in shaping and re-playing bodily performances (such as the marching Highlanders and parading Edinburgh residents). I work to achieve a level of complexity that reiterates the movement between the general and the particular, as articulated by John Law and Annemarie Mol, by examining how human and non-
human “actors” collaborated to generate the events of the 1822 pageant that contributed to a larger scale performance of Scotland.

In parsing Scott’s role in this complex production, I focus on how his imagined and discursive construction of Scotland (present in his many novels and poems) was proposed to Scots in Edinburgh and elsewhere through personal letters and his "anonymously" written thirty-two-page pamphlet, *Hints addressed to the inhabitants of Edinburgh in prospect of his Majesty's visit by an Old Citizen*. This circulating text not only provided details about the scale, location, and schedule of the pageant events, but it also supplied specific instructions about how those in attendance, namely the Scots, should fashion themselves as loyal subjects primarily through their attire and behavior. I read these materials along with first-person accounts in newspapers and journals, as well as satires and cartoons produced in response to the King's visit. I also place George’s own letters, written to Scott after the pageant, within this complicated matrix of the perception and reception of the Scots and the production and construction of Scottishness. These texts created competing spaces of loyalty and affiliation for their readers predominantly in Edinburgh but also elsewhere in Britain. They sought to inscribe different kinds of relationships into the cityscape of the Scottish capital: for example, the *Hints* prescribed organized and disciplined social gatherings while the cartoons and satires demonstrated exploitative and immodest interactions.

Lastly, I scrutinize the Theatre Royal’s production of *Rob Roy Macgregor* performed for George IV at the end of his stay in Edinburgh. By placing this theatrical production at the end of the pageant, Scott ensured that George’s final images of Scotland
would be those of a contained and pacified Scottish past and a forward-thinking collective of loyal subjects that sought the applause of their King. This “command performance” reiterated the popularity of the production (in its fourth year of circulation in 1822), and it marked the importance of sensory engagement—particularly through visual and auditory means—within the pageant as a whole, calling for the total immersion of Scots in their performances of allegiance for George IV. The positioning of the audience of *Rob Roy* in these final moments of pageantry revealed the constructed appearance of active participation and the regulation of apparent illegitimate elements of Scottishness.

Scott’s strategic shaping of the pageant, coupled with the numerous, and at times contradictory, interpretations of the proceedings, I argue, exposed the laborious processes of nation-building that often render themselves invisible and the reliance on theatrical modes of production to materialize nationhood in this nineteenth-century moment. By not attempting to provide a catalogue of the entire pageant but instead selecting particular moments to analyze, I focus on how this event endeavored to forge a sense of aesthetic and socio-cultural wholeness. As Scott attempted to paint this grand picture with the bodies and spaces of Edinburgh, his activities also created the conditions for visitors to view particular events as distorted in some way, which fractured Scott’s unified image. This labor produced a *doubleness* where certain attributes and attitudes enacted, on the one hand, a schism that revealed and reiterated the differences between the Scottish peoples and, on the other hand, an echo or reflection, an altered appearance of a familiar object. Both gestures made visible the untenable attempt to produce unanimity. This
doubleness also appeared in the forms of theatricality utilized through and produced by the pageant. In a special issue of SubStance on theatricality, editor and theatre scholar Josette Féral argued that theatricality is a “process that has to do with a ‘gaze’ that postulates and creates a distinct, virtual space belonging to the other, from which fiction can emerge.” Féral suggested that either the actor or the spectator could “initiate” this process: the actor by participating in activity outside of the quotidian and the spectator by “tak[ing] possession of the action he watches.” The pageantscape translated the city of Edinburgh into a complex stage through the circulation of language and coming together of Edinburgh residents and Highland visitors in this particular locale. Visitors from London and elsewhere simultaneously framed the events through their individual perceptions that further shaped the events and their circulation beyond the city’s borders.

Stepping Into Character

In order to scrutinize the theatrical and performative nature of the pageant, by which I mean the elements that both materially and discursively enacted the spectacle, I begin with two of its notable “actors”: King George IV and Sir Walter Scott. Although George was the catalyst for this event, and historians such as Robert Mudie (1822), John Prebble (1988), and Steven Parissien (1995) contend that he was the focal point, I view the relationships between objects and bodies as more significant in the actual composition and choreography of the event. So instead of devoting this chapter to George’s role in the proceedings, I situate his perception of Edinburgh and the Scots beside those of several other visitors to the city. I begin with some brief information regarding George, however, since he did put Edinburgh (and indeed Scotland) into motion in 1822.
George, who first acted as Prince-Regent from 1811 and then reigned from 1820-
1830, decided, after a fairly successful trip visiting his Irish subjects during the summer
of 1821, to sojourn to Scotland in order to physically introduce himself to Scots and to try
to pacify rising Scottish antipathy to his reign. His advisers, anxious to keep the aptly
named "Prince of Pleasure" away from political developments in Europe and unsettling
actions in the British colonies, encouraged George to stay in Britain and visit England’s
northern neighbor. The British Empire had suffered a significant loss in the American
Revolution, and at the time of the pageant it existed as a patchwork of institutions at
home and throughout its colonial outposts, practicing different scales and styles of
governance. For example, governmental procedures in the British West Indies
demonstrated a definitively “British imprint,” while in India the hybrid nature of the East
India Company as a commercial, governmental, and military power made for a complex
relationship between the colony and its “Mother Country.” According to British historian
Linda Colley, even nearby Ireland, annexed to the UK in 1800 because of a fear that
Napoleon would use it as a “launching pad for an invasion,” maintained a tenuous
connection to the Empire because of an inequality of civil rights held by its
predominantly Protestant neighbor. Though the scale of British government had
ineluctably expanded in response to the needs of war,” argued historian John Gascoigne,
“the bureaucratic apparatus for dealing with the greatly increased scale of empire
occasioned by naval explorations of the Pacific and military success against the French
lagged well behind.” So the British Empire appeared as a stretched and possibly even
fragile entity, on shaky political ground across its colonial holdings. And this socio-
political and economic uncertainty and hostility echoed the political instability on British soil.

Significantly, no British monarch had visited Scotland during peaceful times since Richard II in 1650, and Walter Scott circulated this fact across Edinburgh to inflate the significance of George’s trip. In July 1822, once the King had confirmed his plans to visit his Scottish subjects on their own soil, the Scots had only a few weeks to prepare for his arrival. The royal visit, though, would not take George throughout the Highlands and Lowlands of Scotland nor to the bustling streets of industrial Glasgow. Instead, George spent the entirety of his fortnight in Edinburgh. Plans, then, centered on the Scottish capital as the chosen site for the King to see and be seen by the Scots. Edinburgh effectively stood in for the rest of Scotland, a localized surrogate for the diverse terrains and communities that comprised the nation, offering a manageable scale of entertainments for the King to enjoy. The coordination of this grand spectacle, which ostensibly showcased the talents, developments, and, most importantly, allegiances of Scottish subjects to their King, swiftly fell into the hands of recently named baronet, Sir Walter Scott.  

Scott, who worked as a lawyer in his youth and then achieved much acclaim from his writing, is arguably one of the first British writer of "historical" novels. These texts, fashioned from his research of historical events, persons, and places, penned with a wildly imaginative flair, moved throughout Scotland, England, and the European Continent. His early novels included *Waverley, Guy Mannering, The Antiquary, The Tale of Old Mortality*, and, in 1818, *Rob Roy*. These texts wove together detailed geographical
and political sites, particularly related to the Scottish Borders and the Highlands, with the lives of romantic heroes and heroines, dramatic personal conflict, and political maneuvers and contentions. Walter Scott remained anonymous as the author of several of these texts until 1826, just a few years before his death in 1832. Instead of naming himself as creator of these fictional tales of intrigue and romance, Scott relied on the success of *Waverley* as his literary moniker. "The author of *Waverley*" adorned his successive novels, creating an aura around his literary adeptness, although his identity was likely known by most throughout the British Isles. By remaining officially anonymous, though, he created a sense of unity and literary lineage in his writing, connecting his subsequent novels through a reference to his first great success.

In 1818, William Adam suggested that Prince-Regent George might bestow the title of baronet on the Scottish author, as a man who "has combined the power of illustrating history and antiquity with the splendor of genius, and yet faithfully adhering to historic truth and antiquarian accuracy." Four years before George's royal Scottish visit, then, Scott's convincing talents as historical illustrator circulated via the imaginative descriptions in his texts as well as through royal circles. George named Scott a Baronet in 1820, a moment that also pointed to the importance of Scott's "recovery" of the Scottish Regalia (royal scepter, sword, and crown), found in a locked room of the Edinburgh Castle in 1818. Shortly after this (re)discovery, Scott organized a parade to escort these royal treasures from the Castle down the Royal Mile to the Palace of Holyroodhouse. In this exhibition of Scottish antiquity and (antiquated?) political power, Scott coordinated an event to symbolically restore a piece of Scotland's past to its present. Here he
anticipated moments of the later pageant through his use of theatrical means to advertize and stage the moment, positioning the residents of Edinburgh as active spectators as they cheered on the procession. In the eyes of the monarch and his coterie, the immense popularity of Scott’s historical novels, combined with his ability to exhibit particular moments of Scottish history and his pro-Unionist stance, made him the ideal Scot to organize the Edinburgh pageant that heralded George IV’s rightful reign in Scotland.

Once Scott agreed to facilitate the royal visit, he began to arrange the elements and events that would develop into the pageant. As printed materials began to travel throughout the city, Scott wrote to Highland clans asking for their appearance before the King. He also negotiated with William Murray of the Theatre Royal to arrange for the popular Rob Roy Macgregor; or, Auld Lang Syne to once again take to the stage. And as he mapped and ordered the events, visitors from across the UK and elsewhere made plans to visit the Scottish capital to witness the theatrical display.

Edinburgh - a capital composite

“The form of social space is encounter, assembly, simultaneity. But what assembles, or what is assembled? The answer is: everything that there is in space, everything that is produced either by nature or by society, either through their co-operation or through their conflicts. EVERYTHING: living beings, things, objects, works, signs and symbols...Social space per se is at once work and product--a materialization of ‘social being’.”

(Henri Lefebvre)

Edinburgh operated simultaneously as a backdrop for and stage upon which these elaborate ceremonies occurred. I am primarily concerned with how the social space produced by and through this pageant endorsed a version of Edinburgh, a city that was a conduit for bodies, objects, and policies during the several days that comprised this spectacle. The orchestration of these pageant events positioned Edinburgh as both work,
ongoing socio-cultural practices and encounters, and as product, a symbolic and material commodity ready for circulation. Since the fifteenth century, Edinburgh had stood as Scotland's capital, and it maintained strong political and social ties with London. Glasgow, as I discussed in Chapter Two, with its physical proximity to the Highlands and its socio-cultural connections to its many clans (and their Jacobite sympathies) would have most likely been viewed as a threat to displaying a singular loyalty intended by Scott. While George IV sought alliance with his Scottish subjects, particularly those who might doubt his legitimacy as sovereign, it would be much easier for him to experience “Scotland” in the safety of one (likely more sympathetic) city than to actually encounter its diverse communities, such as the inhabitants of Glasgow or villagers in the Highlands, in their own landscapes. So it is not surprising that George allowed Edinburgh to operate metonymically for the Scottish nation during his visit, eschewing other regions of Scotland (urban and rural) that would have fragmented (physically and ideologically) his journey, offering competing (and likely hostile) versions of the relationship between himself and the Scots.

So how did such a singular perspective of a city and residents’ social being become materialized? A long-time Edinburgh inhabitant, Scott used the topography of the urban site to exemplify how discrete elements can be viewed in such a way as to produce an appearance of “wholeness.” The distinct sections of the city collaborated in an ongoing production of social engagement, commercial exchange, and political debate within and beyond the borders of the capital. As Lefebvre suggested, "it is helpful to think of architectures as 'archi-textures,' to treat each monument or building viewed in its
surroundings and context, in the populated area and associated networks in which it is set down." In composing a simultaneously performing and performance space, Scott utilized the new architectural developments in the New Town to call attention to the innovative nature of Scots, linking this particular cityscape to an ethos of industry and progress.

As I discussed in Chapter Two, Edinburgh's Old Town (nicknamed *Auld Reekie* for its terrible smell due to overcrowding and a lack of plumbing) consisted of medieval architecture with hundreds of buildings crammed together, fragmented by narrow closes and wynds. Prompted by the unsanitary conditions of the Old Town, combined with a period of prosperity in industrial Scotland and the activity of Scots in Westminster, the New Town was designed and built during the last decades of the eighteenth century and start of the nineteenth. The plans for creating the “archi-textures” of the New Town employed *Georgian* design that relied heavily on classical Greek and Roman features, rigid lines, and terraced, four-storey houses built closely together. A grid of broad streets traversed the area with park squares and gardens to complete the design. The aesthetic feel created here was (and still is) one of simplicity, order, and wholeness. Nature became tamed in the shape of neatly-landscaped park areas contained within the developing urban landscape. This kind of planning would appear throughout Europe, notably through the “long perspectives down broad straight thoroughfares” in Georges Haussman’s designs of Paris. In Edinburgh though, it was less about “creative destruction” of a pre-existing urban development and more of an entirely new annexed residential space to the fifteenth-century city. And while Haussmann’s developments drove the “proletariat
into the suburbs” because of rising rents in the city centre, in Edinburgh the landed
gentry, wealthy patrons, and aristocrats would initially call this new suburb home.

Within the ongoing production of Edinburgh, then, a winding medieval city
existed side-by-side with a modern, ordered site of civilized wealth and aesthetic unity,
creating a "mingling of barbaric wildness with modern elegance," as noted by one
observer of the 1822 pageant. 219 Beyond the borders of both the Old and New Towns lie
to the north, the Firth of Forth (an estuary extending to the North Sea) and to the south,
the expansive park area named the Meadows. Two volcanic rock piles become the eastern
and western boundaries: the Salisbury Crags and Arthur's Seat and Castle Rock,
respectively. In Nature Performed, Bronislaw Szerszynski, Wallace Heim, and Claire
Waterton acknowledged the improvisational character of nature and the fluid relations
between human and non-human materiality. They argue that “from a theatrical-
performance domain, nature in performance troubles the delicate boundary between the
staged event and the world outside that event, at times, bringing a too material and
presenced ‘reality’ into a crafted simulacra.” 220 In the spectacular performance of
Edinburgh in the 1822 pageant, the particular bounded spatial plane of the cityscape—
with its competing ideologies of progress and tradition—contained the bodies of visiting
Highlanders. As I discuss later in the chapter, their performance as loyal, protective
servants of the King deployed a particular theatricality, a crafted simulacrum, presented
in the visual field of the spectators and framed by the presence of the King and the
accompanying music. The distinct and substantial natural geographic features that shaped
the city's broadest boundaries created a network with the manicured squares, whose
appearance was meant to signify a domestication of nature. These natural spaces enacted a critical dialogue with Scott’s use of the Highlanders as an example of a disciplined present and stabilized past; the exchanges and interactions between the material heterogeneity of Edinburgh (the bodies, streets, buildings, goods, and landscapes), however, perpetually disrupted efforts to recount a unified narrative or to showcase a single perspective.

This merging of natural and urban features, at once co-operating and conflicting with each other, further demonstrated the commingling of different temporalities (geological, topographical, social) and different ways of assembling in and encountering Edinburgh. Considering how the two distinctive areas of the capital (the Old and New Towns) produced a visual impression, one observer of the 1822 pageant, a Londoner, recognized what he termed as the “marriage of the twelfth and nineteenth centuries, that, for its offspring, shews forth Edinburgh.” In this visitor’s interpretation, the city had birthed itself through the tension held between these disparate social spaces, thus producing the appearance of a unified Edinburgh. The topographical layout of the city became another important actor within the network of material associations that comprised the pageant. Like the pageant, its constituent parts were difficult to identify as one particular, unified object. “I will attempt no description of this extraordinary town,” claimed the London visitor, “Pen and pencil are altogether inadequate. It has a hundred points of view, and all essential to the resemblance.” These observations marked the city's pulling together—its assembling of itself—to present a picture of unity for the viewer. This process of theatricality was initiated by the spectator who pronounced his
inability to translate his embodied encounter into a written description, yet went on to
describe the city in great detail. His awareness of the city's "resemblance" implied a form
of theatrical doubling, a merging of “reality” and “illusion,” similar to the
aforementioned blurring of boundaries that occurs in the performance of nature. In this
spectacular staging, Edinburgh played itself, offering a visually consumable and
transportable likeness of the Scottish capital, reproduced through the multiple journals
and newspapers available for purchase. That the city was comprised of a “hundred points
of view” acknowledged the highly coveted vantage points, such as Calton Hill, where
spectators could peer down to watch the bodies move along the streets, as well as other
disadvantaged points left to those residents less financially and/or physically mobile to
navigate. Presumably, these residents, unwilling or unable to conform to the shape of
Scottish subjects as intended by Scott, were less welcomed, and therefore less visible, at
the festivities.

This excess of viewpoints also suggested the scale of the stage upon which the
pageant took shape. Yet while the city expanded during these two weeks, making room
for Scots from other parts of the country and visitors from outside Scotland, it was
simultaneously contained through a process of “encapsulation” in the accounts of its
visitors.223 “Nothing but a model can give the exact features of this strange, various, and
magnificent capital. But the minuteness of a model destroys grandeur.”224 This unsettled
comparison shifted the scale of the event and perspective of the viewer, moving from a
two-dimensional written account to a three-dimensional physicalization in a similar way
that the bodies of the exhibited Highlanders fleshed out the flattened pages of Scott’s
novels. By referencing the model, the observer also linked his experience of Edinburgh with a particular process of designing a theatrical stage space: rendering a design, producing a scaled-down materialization of the space, and finally constructing the set for a particular stage. The above accounts of this “extraordinary town” destabilized its quotidian performances by removing it from any one spatial framework. Edinburgh was caught between its reduction that allowed for an optic view of the city and its grand, stately, uncontainable performance as Scottish capital. The city and the pageant acted in dialogue with one another: the multiple perspectives of the city made it an attractive staging ground; the pageant’s showcasing of various aspects of Scottish culture, in turn, utilized the city as another event that viewers could apprehend and enjoy.

Recognizing the ongoing mingling of spaces and temporalities operating in a given site, geographer Doreen Massey claimed, “what is special about place is precisely that throwntogetherness, the unavoidable challenge of negotiating a here-and-now (itself drawing on a history and a geography of thens and theres); and a negotiation which must take place within and between both human and nonhuman.” In Massey’s formulation of the production of space, she foregrounds the important plurality of spatial and temporal overlapping: “here-and-now,” “thens and theres.” In 1822 Edinburgh, the landscape, architecture, and quotidian movements of its inhabitants shaped the Scottish capital. Its New and Old Towns mutually impacted and shaped one another through various impressions and practices of “here-and-now” and “thens and there.” A resident’s movements between both areas, then, crossed various spatial and temporal fields, producing and mobilizing the hybrid character of the city. Massey viewed the enactment
of this “throwntogetherness” at a place, which she defined as "collections of...stories, articulations within the wider power-geometries of space." The designs of the New Town architects and Walter Scott's *Hints* both aimed to present order in the place of the Scottish capital by defining social-spatial boundaries and creating distinct lineages (architectural, historical, genealogical) to shape the reception of viewers, including George IV. These spaces, however, could not be simply contained and categorized, despite concerted efforts by both city planners and Scott.

In Scott’s dramaturgical arrangement of the pageant, he chose particular sites (such as the Royal Mile and the New Town) to highlight the different aspects of Scottish culture that aligned with his ideology about Scotland’s active role within the production of Great Britain and the British Empire, two “wider power-geometries of space.” While the Highlanders marching down the city’s High Street depicted a pacification of decades of Jacobite hostility toward the Hanoverians, thus buttressing support for George IV through references to the past, deploying sites within the New Town highlighted the ingenuity and discipline of the Scottish subjects, ready for the future of the United Kingdom. When other Scots arrived for the pageant, their movements within the city interacted and intersected with the quotidian practices of residents, now forced to negotiate with and accommodate these other(ed) Scottish bodies. The performances of these new arrivals (Highlanders, Londoners, colonial subjects) mobilized significant social spaces that embodied the kinds of transportation, communication, and information technologies that knitted together the Empire.
Technological Imprints, Tracking Footprints

As the capital city, Edinburgh was a hub for multiple technologies produced through eighteenth- and nineteenth-century innovations in transportation, cartography, and optics. Here I focus on another form of knowledge production that significantly contributed to the organization, enactment, and reproduction of this pageant: printing. The circulation of printed materials throughout the city had a direct impact on how individuals saw, located, interpreted, and accounted for the composition of George’s visit. The competing forms of national “narration” distributed throughout the capital and beyond point to what Homi Bhabha described as a “cultural construction of nationness as a form of social and textual affiliation.”\(^{227}\) The relationships crafted through textual transactions carved out social spaces that disrupted a single narrative advocated by Walter Scott; the continued movements of these journals beyond Edinburgh fed into the blurring of borders between the reality and replica, the experienced and imagined versions of the pageant and Scotland *writ large*.

Edinburgh’s widespread and lucrative printing industry began in 1507 when King James IV granted a royal patent to merchant Walter Chepman and bookseller Andro Myllar to produce the first printed book in Scotland.\(^{228}\) Cities such as St. Andrews, Stirling, Aberdeen, and Glasgow developed their industries and markets in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but Edinburgh's early and continuing printing prowess shaped its social and literary history.\(^{229}\) Although Edinburgh's status as a powerhouse of publishing was notable in the early eighteenth century, its early nineteenth-century journal and magazine publications cemented its bookish notoriety. *The Edinburgh*
Review, founded by Francis Jeffrey, Sydney Smith and Henry Brougham in 1802, dominated the circulating journal scene until competitors appeared in the shape of The Quarterly Review, founded in England by John Murray in 1809 and championed by the unionist Walter Scott, and The Edinburgh Monthly Magazine (later named Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine) in 1817, published by William Blackwood and Sons. Each of these journals provided a plethora of information regarding local and national politics, imperial travel and trade, literary serials, and critiques of artistic pursuits, social gatherings and political affiliations. While the New Town inscribed familiar patterns into its topographical and architectural fabric, fashioning a residential space that engendered polite discourse, these circulating journals ordered events and landscapes, providing their readers with the ability, through their newfound familiarity with these topics and topographies, to virtually or imaginatively domesticate these distant lands, such as India or China. And while bodies and goods passed through the streets of this urban materialization of the Enlightenment, the words circulating in the journals traveled further, enabling the ideas of the writers a wider readership.

The ways in which these texts merged local and imperial places and economies created a textual collapsing of time and space, a form of travel writing across local, national, and transnational spaces: the monthly insert of Scott's Rob Roy sat between topographical accounts of China or India and news from London's markets. This form of literary production mapped distant areas within the circulation of texts on British soil. It also produced an imagined mobility and sense of cosmopolitanism for Scots (particularly in Edinburgh) who felt that they were keeping up with news from around the globe.
(thanks to imperialist pursuits), in addition to the latest literary successes and theatrical failures in Britain. Here the distinct geographical locales occupied by various bodies (those in India, the United States, or France, for example) were transmitted through these pages of palimpsests, formed by the “here-and-now” and “thens and theres” of their narratives. These translations, or processes of ordering, charted literary, political, economic, and geographic events and relationships. Vying for literate audiences in competing markets, these journals sought out their readership from across Edinburgh and other urban locales in Scotland. Within these mobile volumes, the debate over social issues and political alliances, through the pro- or anti-Union leanings of their editors, played out through their selection of texts from around the globe and with commentaries on newly published material (possibly from a competitor's publishing house). The social value of these journals developed as their editors marketed them as both purveyors of taste and as disseminators of relevant information. And just as the individual journals became synonymous with partisan politics, so too did the branding of the printing press shape a field of complex discourse, translating relationships, territories and political positions into circulating commodities.

Given this bustling literary backdrop that helped to mediate this royal pageant, it was not surprising that Scott, with his first-hand experience of the socio-economic benefits of the printing industry, published a pamphlet replete with clear “hints” on appearance and behavior during the King’s visit. This text, *Hints addressed to the inhabitants to Edinburgh*, made its way through the diverse sections of the city, explaining why the gathering masses should prepare to celebrate George’s arrival in
Scotland: “no real joy has, indeed, attended upon any royal visit to these walls, ever since
the period when James IV left his native soil.”230 In order to fill in this historical gap,
Scott instructed residents to welcome the King spatially (into the cityscape of Edinburgh)
and socially (into the Stuart genealogy). Scott’s text attempted to knit together a singular,
fashionable, and ordered space for Scots to gather in order to offer a stately exhibition for
the King:

the whole effect of the day must depend upon this single point. If the
crowd become for a moment unsteady or tumultuous—if once they break
their front rank, that is, the line of the constituted bodies—if ever they
begin to shoulder, and press, and squeeze, and riot—the whole goodly
display will sink at once into disorganization and confusion…The very
character of the nation is concerned here.231

Scott wished the crowd to represent themselves as a self-governing and disciplined
polity, a culmination of Enlightened thought. Achieving this unified picture took a
tremendous amount of labor, though. The process began with a performative gesture that
interpellated the inhabitants of Edinburgh into a single body, the “character of the
nation.” Scott also revealed the fragility behind this “goodly display.” The slightest
deviation in movement that changed the shape of this structure would lead to its utter
devastation. The façade would collapse and what would stand in its place would be
fragments of associations, relationships, and practices. The Hints proposed for bodies to
join together at various places throughout the city; the interactions between the
assembling bodies and the cityscape of Edinburgh would then produce a social space
imbued with notions of civility and polite discourse, creating the appearance of a harmonious unity. In this way, the collective bodies themselves would take on the form of an *archi-texture*, in dialogue with their surroundings, and would form a network of sites attempting to construct a pleasing aesthetic for the King. Yet, of course, this appearance of a comprehensive display necessarily relegated certain sites and bodies to the shadows, to remain hidden from sight.

And what was not displayed for the King’s eye or for the thousands taking part in the pageant? The Highland Clearances and 1747 Act of Proscription were two significant extended moments of Scottish socio-cultural history in dialogue with this spectacular showing. The devastating effects of the Highland Clearances occurred roughly from the late-eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century. Displacing thousands of Scots from their homes and forcing them to move to the coasts of Scotland or urban centers like Glasgow, or to leave Scotland entirely, the Clearances largely resulted from wealthy (primarily English) landholders realizing the profitability of farming cheviot sheep on their lands occupied by Scottish tenant farmers. These ongoing acts of displacement remained far from the scene of the pageantry spectacle. Additionally, the Act of Proscription, which outlawed the wearing of tartan for anyone except a designated military contingent from 1747-1782, adds a complicated perspective to the tartan spectacle that the pageant became, complete with a tartan-clad George IV, which I discuss later in this chapter. These violent actions were demoted to the hidden wynds and closes of the city when George IV entered. These overt *absences* from the discursive configuration and embodied performances of George’s visit are critical to include within
the matrix of the pageant where Scott labored to present a *whole* picture of Scottish history and culture.

Once Scott had used the cityscape to help assemble the elements of his plan (the schedule of events, the instructions for orderly behavior) the next phase was its execution. George IV’s entrance into Edinburgh occurred in stages; focusing on its constituent elements helps to explain how the pageant enlivened and re-figured Edinburgh. First, his ship, the *Royal George*, landed at the port of Leith, a strategic decision to distance this royal entrance from the image of conquering English monarchs who had stormed Edinburgh on horseback. Next, George made his way down the broad boulevard of Leith Walk, a route that showcased an avenue, described by Scott, as having a “noble” character beyond compare with any other street in Europe. This grand entrance created a depth to the King’s movements by offering thousands of pageant spectators, perched on hills, rooftops, and hanging out windows, a distanced visual encounter with their monarch. These opening moments also created the appearance of an unified audience taking part in the spectacle. This “goodly display” framed many of the events and encouraged a particular spatial and temporal proximity between the Scottish capital, the Scots and the King, which projected a degree of theatricality upon the city itself.

As the crowd stood straining for a view of the King, the capital city announced and welcomed George IV, as observed by another pageant spectator:

The Castle told, in a voice of thunder that the King was in his barge, and that in a few minutes his feet would be on the soil of Scotland. Another
gun told that Scotland contained her King; and the shout of gratulation
[sic.] had now begun on the shores of Leith, that was to be prolonged,
without intermission, like an accompanying river of sound, till Scotland’s
King had slowly proceeded through miles of his devoted subjects to the
Palace of Holyrood, now about to be awakened from the dull sleep of
ages, and to renew the glory of her old estate.234

In this narrative, although comprised of disparate segments, Edinburgh presented a
unified cityscape ready and willing to put forth its best face to show its loyalty, its
sensibility, its rationality, and its forward-thinking character to its sovereign. The sound
that accompanied this movement acted as connective tissue, linking important sites within
the body of the city and between the bodies of the "devoted subjects" brought together in
this momentous celebration; it created a passage, “movement between specificities,”
which resonated with the pageant’s overall mobilizing and ordering of places and
peoples.235 Like a one-act play, sans intermission, this movement of sound, via the
architectural and subjects' materiality, flooded the landscape in a unified dramaturgical
motion. This account also read this arrival as a revitalization, the awakening of the palace
(and arguably of Scottish history’s) "dull sleep of ages,” seemingly dormant from decades
of disuse. The “here and now” of Edinburgh met with the “thens and theres” of
Scotland’s past, forging a national consciousness of renewal. Also significant in this
observation are that the visual cues arrived after the auditory signals. Like a grand
theatrical event with the orchestra welcoming the spectators through its musical
composition, here the sound of guns (cannons) marked the moment before the King’s
body crossed the threshold of the stage. These guns did not instill fear into the enemies of
the Scots, however; the enormous scale of the spectacle placed them as part of the
celebration of the union of England and Scotland as they prompted the audience’s initial
responses.

In this moment the city performed as Scott had intended. In his *Hints*, he included
an adaptation of Robert Burns’s poem, “Carle, ’an the king come.” Interestingly, “Carle”
is understood primarily as meaning “man” in a general sense but, as noted in the late
nineteenth-century *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*, it may also
connote a *clown* or *boor.*

Part of Scott’s adaptation read:

Auld England held him [George] lang and fast;
And Ireland had a joyfu’ cast;
But Scotland’s turn is come at last…
Come, Tweeddale, true as sword to sheath,
Come, Hopetoun, fear’d on fields of death;
Come, Clerk, and give yon bugle breath…

In this assembling song, the city was anthropomorphized as soldiers joining a battalion. It
welcomed and embraced George, singing his praises as one unified urban locale made up
of different areas (Tweeddale, Hopetoun, Clerk). The song also positioned Scotland in
relation to the other British nations, England and Ireland, intending to prove the
supremacy of Scottish loyalty and dedication. Along with the circulation of texts,
Edinburgh topography, and Scots assembled along the procession route, the song acted
within and produced a network of materials that was the pageant. Another important
performance element, the gathered Highlanders, played a leading role in several first-hand accounts of the event. The participation of these men, who had traveled from, perhaps, hundreds of miles away, simultaneously supported the appearance of unity and a reconciled past and revealed the inadequacy of this staging of “Scotland.”

**Highlanders: marching, mediating, masquerading.**

Walter Scott authored the Edinburgh pageant: he coordinated the spaces for this royal performance and he shaped the interaction of the capital's inhabitants and its visitors. He acted as the purveyor of Scottishness as he determined which aspects were the most appropriate to show the King, such as the collaboration of different areas of the city. Scott infused Edinburgh with the bodies of clansmen intended to stand in for the Highlands and, more significantly, to display Scotland’s ability to mobilize those aspects of itself that depicted forward-momentum, such as a resolved past and the pride of its people in shaping the direction of the larger British kingdom. Writing to Lord Macleod on the Isle of Skye on July 22, 1822, the “Author of Waverley” announced:

> The King is coming after all. Arms and men are the best thing we have to show him. Do come and bring half-a-dozen or half-a-score of Clansmen, so as to look like an Island Chief as you are. Highlanders are what he will like best to see, and the masquerade of the Celtic Society will not do without some of the real stuff, to bear it out.\textsuperscript{238}

In his request, Scott blended the bodies of soldiers with their weapons, imagining that this aspect of Highland life, namely a military prowess and respected history across the globe, would showcase a commendable role of the Scots (an interesting comment to consider
given the performances of *Black Watch* nearly two centuries later). As he gathered together his cast of performers, Scott merged social classes, the men of Lord Macleod's clan, and those who constituted the Royal Celtic Society, founded in Edinburgh in 1820 by General David Stewart of Garth and several other "highland gentlemen." The aim of *this* Society, still active today (like the Saltire Society), has continued to be: "to maintain and promote interest in the history, traditions, language, and the arts of the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland and to encourage the traditional and correct wear of the Highland Dress."239 Although historians like Hugh Trevor-Roper have spent a great deal of time analyzing the origins of this “myth” of Scottish culture, I am less interested in its (in)authenticity and more concerned with how this signifying of Scottishness played out in the pageant in relation to the other materials that comprised it.240 The Royal Celtic Society’s active pursuit of this history and "correct” clothing arrangements introduced a formal and categorical nature to particular cultural practices, which proves particularly curious considering the outlawing of tartan for over thirty years in the mid-eighteenth century. These urban “societies” began to promote the most intellectually- and aesthetically-pleasing elements of a depleted population and its romanticized practices, echoing the polite discourse that circulated through the journals and created genteel spaces in Edinburgh. While this society’s development would make for an intriguing analysis, I wish to parse out the discursive layers of Scott's letter.

The “arms and men” that he hoped to exhibit for his King spoke to his process of physicalizing his novels, creating a three-dimensionality and semblance of wholeness to complement Edinburgh’s multi-faceted performance of itself. In addition, Scott
acknowledged that the "masquerade," like the imagined tales that he crafted, required a degree of authenticity, the "real stuff," to lend legitimacy to his (re)production. It was the bodies of these clansmen, then, that took on the shapes of Scott's resilient Highland heroes and acted as the containers of a seemingly remote (spatially and temporally) cultural landscape that existed beyond the sight of both George IV, as well as many Lowlanders, an idea that I explored more closely in my readings of Rob Roy in Chapter Two. As the author focused on these sure-to-entertain aspects of the Highlands that constituted visual spectacle, he keenly overlooked the ongoing violence enacted through an event like the aforementioned Highland Clearances. Scott also placed Lord Macleod in the role of “Island Chief” to “look” his part; the simultaneous production of actual and virtual, reality and image, entered into the discursive and visual field of this event.

The bodies of the Highlanders attested to a located and constructed sense of loyalty in the Scottish capital. They propped up the idea that regions across Scotland, like the distinct areas of Edinburgh, consented to work together to fashion a productive future for Britain. These visible bodies, then, became the foreseeable future of the nation, the Union, and the Empire as they connected visual spectacle with socio-political reassurance. In one account of the parade of Highlanders, an observer writing in Blackwood’s confirmed Scott’s aims:

then came marching along, to their wild native music, chieftains and clans—the descendents of those heroic and loyal warriors, who, true to their Prince, within less than a hundred years ago had pierced with their claymores into the very heart of England. They were now conducting their
lawful—their hereditary Prince, down to Holyrood—the Prince...enjoyed
the tossing of their plumes, their warlike and stormy music, and the varied
splendour of the garb.241

What was recognized and ultimately visually consumed by this procession of the men
who "guarded" George IV was a process of an ostentatious exhibition overtaking an
embodied history of violence and oppression, pacification by display. The "varied
splendour" of the military uniforms, which connoted bloody conflict and the Scottish
soldiers' ongoing military capabilities, were read as bright, colorful, plume-topped
signifiers of entertainment, aesthetically-pleasing costumes of dedicated stage players
(i.e. the Military Tattoo). The British monarch did not fear bodily harm nor national
retribution from these clans since this creative staging re-aligned the pasts of all of its
performers. These "natives," descendants of the “Bravehearts” of the Scottish past, met in
this exhibitionary space their "lawful...hereditary Prince." Here the branches of George's
Hanoverian family tree imaginatively reached into the Stuart line (that of Mary Queen of
Scots and James VI/I) to whom many Scots, as Jacobite sympathizers, still felt allegiance.
So in this seemingly trivial observation of George's enjoyment of the Highlanders' march,
I recognize not only the mutability of history designed to afford more sympathetic views
of George IV but also how the sartorial and social arrangement of the clansmen bled into
the "wild" notes of music that accompanied the soldiers. The alarming history of fighting
and rebellion, which could have been inscribed in the cannon fire during George’s
entrance, was buried in the colorful performance of the present and strategic designs on
the future. Here the disciplined sensibility made visible in the layout of Edinburgh’s New
Town and in the circulating journals and *Hints* trumped the chaotic disorder and ambiguous allegiances of the Scottish past. This kind of historical (re)production took place throughout imperial Britain in the nineteenth century, whether it was the displaying of the Highlanders’ “home-grown exoticism” or developing international exhibitions and world’s fairs that not only showcased the modern ingenuity of Brits but also their mastery of colonial indigenes from across the globe.242

**Double-Takes: (mis)readings and (dis)placements**

In Scott's creation of a single scaled-down "Scotland," he unwittingly generated a series of alternate spaces, multiple *Scotlands*, which vied for recognition on the mappings of the capital city and produced the appearances of doubles that accompanied the proceedings. Like the "wild music" of the Highlanders, at once contained within the city but perpetually escaping full comprehension and disclosure, these spaces existed both inside and beyond the pageant’s defined borders. A textual source that revealed this fissuring in the performance of unity existed in the observations noted by Omai, son of Omai from Tahiti. Omai's father had traveled with Captain Cook and was the inspiration for John O'Keeffe's play, *Omai, or a Trip Around the World*.243 As a product of cultural convergence and colonizing practices, this second Omai circulated throughout Great Britain as an outsider, translating his observations into social and textual affiliations, narrating his own version of this nation as he experienced it. Omai’s accounts were published in *Blackwood’s Magazine* and edited by Christopher North with a disclaimer: “The only freedom we permitted ourselves to take with it [Omai’s journal], was to lighten the uniformity of narrative, by the addition of titles to mark the beginning of the different
days, and the suggestion of a general title.” Not surprisingly, even these accounts were subjected to a temporal ordering and arranging. In his chronicle of the royal pageant, Omai first observed that Edinburgh was "no more the same" as when he had visited previously, suggesting that the preparations for the King's visit had caused a noticeable shift in the form and functioning of the capital, creating and producing an othered, doubled Edinburgh.

Although many of Omai's observations are informative and intriguing, I would like to explore two specific moments that best illustrate how Omai disclosed Scott's labor-intensive projection of a unified perspective of the Scots and contributed to the socio-cultural construction of Scotland itself. The first moment framed the King’s arrival in the Port of Leith. Omai saw the decorated ships in the harbor that awaited the King’s appearance, and he wrote that they were:

all covered with flags and ribbons, to be beautiful in the King’s sight, and to please him, for the King must not see things as they really are… and the moment the King’s ships appeared, they knew he would be pleased to see how they could fight his enemies: and they all fired off their cannons at one another; it was a sea-fight, and the sea was covered with smoke, so that I, Omai, could see nothing.

Here Omai offered an astute commentary on the theatricality of the royal visit. This covering over of the ships to make them more attractive existed in tension with the apparent "sea-fight" Omai believed to be taking place. Here he mistook the celebratory firing (that echoed the guns firing in Edinburgh) as a demonstration of military prowess,
a performance of power and a showcase of British naval ability. Whereas other observers located the decorated Highlanders as loyal guards and light-hearted entertainment for the King and other spectators, here the violence seeped out from the stately showing, producing a contested space of threat. The cannon smoke also decreased the visibility of the event, and this temporary sensory impairment produced an ability to configure a different meaning to the moment. While Scott’s staged reality obscured actual events occurring in Scotland (and Scottish history), here the visual screening that resulted from the smoke exposed a closer proximity to and comprehension of continuing cultural conflicts.

Omai managed to crack the façade of the "complete picture" orchestrated by Scott by allowing a sense of threat and discontent back into the pageant, re-writing Scott’s re-writing of Scottish history. He also disclosed the imaginative construct at work in the pageantry: “for the King must not see things as they really are.” Again, if sight was a predominant mode of knowledge production in this Edinburgh of 1822, then Omai alluded to an intentional blinding that took place when a theatrical construction of Scotland and its peoples replaced Scotland’s contested history with Britain. Might this reflection also unwittingly refer to an event such as the Clearances that actively made invisible those rural Scots whose performance of citizenship was considered unproductive and, therefore, disposable?

Later in his account, another apparent misreading pointed to an even more complicated understanding of the relation between monarch and subjects in this fashioning of the Scots’ culture practices. Omai found it strange that no one could go
before the King wearing his own clothes but instead had to don “curiously made” clothing. Omai placed his own otherness in relation to the residents of Edinburgh who, unbeknownst to him, enacted Scott’s *Hints* to dress themselves in tartan. In a particularly theatrical maneuver, this visitor moved from the role of distanced spectator (like those perched on rooftops) and into a position of participating performer in his response to the call for “proper” attire:

So I, Omai, thought I should like better the spotted clothes of cloth of tartan, as this people call it, to go before the King…; and so my Captain took me to a merchant who had these clothes, and I, Omai…was a Celt, in a philabeg or petticoat, with heath in my bonnet hat, and a sword and pistols, and a purse apron. And nobody knew me for Omai…because I was a tartan Macgregor,—that was my name…And I, Omai, was no more the same Omai than I was before, and knew not myself even in a mirror glass.246

Unlike the observers seated upon Calton Hill and other spots reserved for prime optical viewing, Omai sought a more haptic view of the proceedings. Weaving his way amongst the people and trying on the Scottishness that he saw available around him, his wearing of tartan alluded to the ease with which one could assume the character of a Scot; his active role-playing also demonstrated the impossibility of creating a congruous mass. Here, Omai lost himself within the spectacle; the constant negotiations that took place throughout the city resulted in his inability to recognize even himself. Instead, he stood as a faux-clansman, a Macgregor, having constructed his own makeshift Scottish identity.
He adorned himself with all of the proper and prescribed (and formerly proscribed) accoutrements, and once so costumed, his production of a Scottish self dominated his visual field. This gesture transferred the theatricality he recognized as a spectator to the ships in the harbor, where he took possession of the actions he saw, into his own conscious participation in adopting a particular signifier to better situate himself within the semiotic network of the pageant. This dressing up ultimately disrupted his own visual frame as his image overlapped with his corporeality, temporarily dislocating him in time and space.

The fashionable miscues continued. It was not only Omai who exhibited his own doubling via the tartan attire, but George IV, sparing no expense on his pageant frock, also desired to position himself in the center of the colorful procession. Unlike the conservative ensemble of Elizabeth II on her appearance on the Royal Mile in 2004, George IV wanted no one to mistake him as anything other than a Scottish-aligned and descended rightful leader, following in the wake of his alleged Scottish ancestors. Commenting on his approach to the King, Omai had a difficult time discerning the monarch: “So I went before the King; and I did not know at first it was the King, for he was not the King for this day, but only a Highlander, that was his dress.”247 In this moment, the monarch's position was temporally destabilized through a complex maneuver. Here Scott achieved the embodied act of his decree that "the king is …[our] CHIEF.”248 Scott's performative gesture adhered to the theatrical embodiment of George's stepping into character as a Highlander through his snug-fitting attire. George was not only made visible to the Scots in this moment, but he became approachable, an idea that
translated in an even more theatrical way during the production of Rob Roy. In the King’s appropriation of Highland garb, and in the cartoons and paintings produced depicting this moment, he too exhibited a form of identity crisis as the usual signifiers of his power and position remained unseen, tucked away in his closet. In his desire to identify with his Scottish subjects (however much of a veneer it was), he ostensibly mis-placed his own crown of sovereignty. It was Walter Scott, then, through his authorial orchestration and direction, who wielded the power of cultural production through his artistic arrangement of, and engagement with, the socio-cultural, economic, and political spaces created through this pageant in Edinburgh. And Omai’s readings punctured the ostensible harmonious image created by Scott’s arrangement. Another set of interpretations of the King and the pageant circulated outside of Edinburgh, in London. These texts painted pictures that supported those who believed the pageant was a trivial affair, attempting to forge a disingenuous connection between George IV and the Scots. The political cartoons and satires depicted not the multi-dimensional located environment of the Scottish capital and those Scots taking part in the pageant events; instead, they focused on an ambiguously signified Scotland, a passive background to the monarch’s antics.

**Sartorial Satires, circulating refutations**

I move now from Omai, with his efforts to participate fully in the royal events by moving through the staged and produced spaces of the pageant, and turn to the reception farther afield in London, the King’s hometown. These satirical images and texts re-centered the focus of the spectacle from the Scots and Scotland to George IV and his traveling companion, William Curtis. Satire here enacted a literary and theatrical
doubling, producing caricatures and exposing aspects of pageant actors not seen in the predominant pageant accounts published in Edinburgh. These satires also addressed a different audience than the one produced by and positioned through Omai's accounts, an audience likely familiar with George’s other trips outside of London. These satirical works re-arranged the events into a realm of playful yet pointed, and at times severe, criticism. Instead of painting the image of a stately patron and worthy sovereign, as illustrated by Scott, these images and texts characterized George as incompetent, ridiculous, self-serving, and even malicious. The monarch depicted here was far more concerned with satisfying the physical needs of his own body than with addressing the issues of the body politic, his subjects, in Scotland.

By setting into circulation a hyperbolic version of George and his journey to Scotland, these images reconfigured the socio-political space of the pageant from a display of mutual appreciation and respect exhibited by the Scots and George to a near erasure of the Scots and the site of Edinburgh. This process of revision made visible the mutable meanings of a given historical performance, such as George’s reasons for traveling north or his being slotted into the Stuart line. The additional perspectives of the pageant invoked by these works disclosed, along with Omai’s account, the impossibility of creating a unified urban space (Edinburgh), a loyal contingent (the Scottish people), or a central reading (as offered by Walter Scott). A prominent theme in these narratives was George's reputation for seeking pleasure, particularly in terms of his womanizing, which further fractured his patronly appearance and questioned his place as rightful ruler in Scotland (or anywhere for that matter). Additionally, just as Scott chose not to depict the
material consequences of the Highland Clearances or Act of Proscription, the ways in which the satires evacuated a physical Scotland from their framings aligned with the perception that this trip, and George’s interactions with the Scots, would prove inconsequential in altering his behavior or highlighting the politics of Scotland-England relations.

These satirical images and texts, published in London, were written during or shortly after George IV’s visit. I begin this analysis with two cartoons and their visual displacement of Edinburgh before moving on to the texts. Both images rendered a miscellaneous outdoor space as the setting, suggesting that the viewer’s focus should rest on the corporeal relationships in this encounter and not the particular city or landscapes generated by the pageant events. This ambiguity in locale might also symbolize George’s indifference or active disregard for any specific place when he was busy looking for a good time. Completely uninterested in the “history of thens and theres” of Scotland, George, instead focused on the immediate and familiar. In this first image (Figure 4.1) George stands centered with his companion William Curtis, a one-time Lord-Mayor of London and personal friend of George’s who accompanied him to Edinburgh, is seated on a large turtle. Leaning in a partial bow, George addresses the (presumably) Scottish people surrounding him as "My Loving Subjects." Several Scots kneel down beside him, touching the symbol-laden kilt, appearing to want a physical connection with their King. A rather portly George bows toward a man whose tartan dress is an inverse to George’s plaid. Wearing the same colors (brown, yellow, and blue), these two men draw attention to George’s attempt to blend into his surroundings as a “native” in order to appear like
the prostrate man. In the bottom left-hand corner of the image, a thin, scraggly-haired bagpiper plays near a patch of thistle, both acting as visible signifiers of Scottish culture (in a similar way to the inn that opens Rob Roy Macgregor). Positioned on the periphery of the central action, and nearly stepping out of the pictorial frame, the piper’s distance suggests to the viewer that focus should rest on George as the spectacle, not him.

At the center of events, George comfortably steps into his role as promiscuous womanizer, ripe with venereal disease. His cartoon likeness asserts, "'A great talker is seldom a wise man,' therefore the 'less I say the better' and have only to add, I had for a long time an Itching to see you but hope I shall not have an Itching when I leave you." Here George also takes on the role of the wit, tossing forth clever remarks that playfully imply suspicion toward verbose individuals who, one suspects, might be the writers and publishers of (anti-Unionist) newspapers and journals. Yet, George undermines any
potential legitimacy to his words by referring to his own licentiousness in the second part of his statement, suggesting that he too cannot be trusted. Any initial desire to converse and interact with his Scottish subjects transforms into a lascivious bodily desire for them. While in Edinburgh, Walter Scott has manufactured a tidy and hygienic interaction between Scots and their King, evident in Scott’s distancing arrangement: “upon the balcony of the Royal Exchange, opposite, another platform is to be raised, which is to contain what may be regarded as the representative of Scottish beauty—in the persons of several hundreds of the finest women in Scotland.” While Scott employed the spaciousness seen in the wide avenues of the New Town as a strategy for arranging bodies in Edinburgh, in the above cartoon, the space is condensed, limbs overlap, and George’s kilt is lifted up ever so slightly, hinting at a threat of contagion if George’s corporeality and the subjectivity of the Scots intermingle. The conflation of the King’s body (as body sovereign and as physical body) substantiate this threat.

This second cartoon (Figure 4.2) accompanied a short satirical text entitled The Northern Excursion. This image is titled: "GEORDIE and WILLIE--'KEEPING IT UP!"—JOHNNY BULL pays the PIPER." Like the first cartoon, this drawing centers on George and Curtis, who stand back to back, both blowing hot air from under their kilts into a pot seated between them labeled "Royal Earnings.” On the left, the overweight Curtis dons a blue and red tartan and displays the accoutrements of cooking and eating: a ladle, knife, fork, and a turtle. The turtle not only acts as a surrogate sporran for his kilt, but it also associates Curtis with turtle soup, a delicacy introduced to upper-class Brits by the Empire’s expanding reach across the globe. This makeshift tool belt
complements the string of sausages hung around his neck. His cap lies on the ground beneath him, and he dances to the music of a rather lean (in contrast to himself) piper who barely makes it into the frame. Willie shouts, "Geordie loves good ale & wine / and Geordie loves good Brandy / and Geordie loves to Kyss all the Girls / as sweet as sugar candy”—God Save the King Huzza my Boys!! I’m the Boy for a bit of a Jollification!

Play up Piper!!"251 Caught up in the performance of the piper, Willie reveals Geordie’s motivations for visiting “Northland”: to have a good time. His words paint a picture of Geordie compatible with the depiction in both satirical texts that emphasize the King’s corporeal desires and his lack of political conviction or motivation.

In the cartoon, Geordie stands completely occupied by several large-bosomed women, one of whom he kisses with his arms around her neck, not unlike Billy’s
sausages. Whereas the first image hinted at contamination through contact, here Geordie has taken the first step to achieve his desires. The woman stands at attention, either caught off-guard or obeying orders for a royal smooch. Geordie sports a yellow and green kilted ensemble, complete with blue and red tartan sash (to match Willie’s attire), and a large black-plumed hat, perhaps hoping to connect his image to that of the marching Highlanders he found so entertaining. The extremely portly King, with eyes open, reveals through his thoughts, as his mouth is otherwise occupied, that "The sweetest hours that ’ere I spent, it was among The Lassies O!” His words confirm Willie’s observations and illustrate the monarch’s marking of time while abroad. Curiously, a woman in the very center of the image, positioned in the background and behind the “Royal Earnings” pot, holds a fan over her face, preventing her from seeing the unpleasantness exposed by Geordie’s raised kilt and uncovered intentions. Although her face is veiled, her gesture sets her apart from the other smiling women as she acts appalled at the indecorum displayed before her. She represents a disjuncture between the civility suggested by Scott in his *Hints* and the crude conduct of the “Prince of Pleasure.” Both of these images, though produced outside the Scottish capital, contributed to the rendering of the events to a wide British audience. Instead of depicting particular characteristics of Scotland (in the shape of Edinburgh) or the Scots (Edinburgh residents or Highlanders), the images relied on general symbols of Scotland (tartan and bagpipes) to produce intimate, anonymous settings for these characters. Unlike Scott’s *Hints* that catalogued the hours and days that comprised the pageant, these images captured a single moment of impulsive and irresponsible actions; the Scots appeared passive or overcome with excitement. These
images branded the Scottish nation as a tourist destination, a venue for frivolity and not a place for serious political intervention or consideration of the social welfare of Scots.

The satirical work introduced by the second cartoon presented a play text with a meandering title that provided the first clue about its intended commentary: *The Northern Excursion of Geordie, Emperor of Gotham: and Sir Willie Curt-His, the Court Buffoon, &c. &c. A Serio-Tragico-Comico-Ludicro-Aquatico Burlesque Gallimaufry; Interspersed with Humorous Glees, Sporting Catches, and Rum Chaunts, by the Male and Female Characters of the Piece*. This text’s sprawling self-definition straddled numerous theatrical genres in a way that spoke to George’s attempts to fit into several historical contexts and contemporary social formations. *The Northern Excursion* utilized rhyming couplets to tell its tale, and after detailing the play’s *dramatis personae* and three settings (in Gotham, at sea, and in Northland), the character of the Poet-Laureate observed the difficulty of crafting great feats worthy of narration and praise from the King’s trifling pursuits. In thinking about Walter Scott's artistic management of the pageant, the Poet’s observations of his own labors were particularly apt: "What painful throes, what racking of invention,/ When kings perform what is not worth the mention, / To eke nothings into something grand, / And varnish matters with a master-hand." These nothings could be read as the imagined genealogy constructed by Scott to authenticate George's reign as well as to transform his *performances* on both sides of the border into something worthy of Scottish respect and appreciation. The necessary “invention” and “varnish” underscored the theatrical façade strategically and meticulously constructed by Scott.
whose authorial "master-hand" transferred his romanticized accounts of a Scottish past onto the bodies of Scots in Edinburgh.

Undertaking preparations for the journey in the play, Willie Curt-His introduced the tartan attire to George. Willie entered the scene "in a Cap, Plume, Scotch Tartan, Phillibeg" proclaiming that he is, 'Quite in character, my liege. Who goes to Rome should do as they do at Rome…You’re fond of altering the military dresses… An’t I quite the thing…?' By adopting the proper attire to visit the Northland (i.e. Scotland, also referred to as North Britain in the nineteenth century), these characters easily created a pretense of legitimacy, presenting themselves "in character" to the Scottish subjects. Curt-Else’s remark, “You’re fond of altering the military dresses,” highlighted the notion that a soldier’s outfit operates as aesthetically-pleasing decoration. This observation de-politicized the military history of Highlanders in a similar way as Scott’s desire to display “some of the real stuff” with the plume-topped soldiers on parade in Edinburgh. These strategic styling decisions recalled the fashioning of the entire royal event: showcasing elements of former and contemporary cultural practices and leaving out (or taking off) any potential aspects of Scottishness that might take away from an aesthetically-pleasing and unifying image. Quite the thing, indeed.

A second moment in The Northern Excursion exposed the illusions that played an active role in shaping the pageant by making certain elements (such as the Highlanders) hyper-visible and trying to erase other, perhaps less tasteful facets of Edinburgh life (such as the lower classes). In the satire, all Scots on display underwent a degree of transformation in order to make them suitable for King Geordie’s eyes:
I am delighted with the clean and orderly appearance of my Northland subjects. There seems not to be a rag in all the metropolis. I always considered them to be a proud people, and they have good reason to be proud. In their dress and deportment, they are all ladies and gentlemen. I am proud I was born a Northlander.254

For Geordie’s inspection, the Northlanders crafted new, more socially acceptable identities for themselves as “ladies and gentlemen” through adjustments to their physical appearance and comportment. The lack of “rags” in the city suggested a sweeping away of all elements (bodies, objects, or buildings) that might mar a coherent picture of order and uniformity. This response supported the idea, suggested by Omai, that the Emperor saw what he wanted to (and what those, like Scott, wished for him to see): the "clean and orderly appearance" of Scots who mirrored Scotland’s capital city and applauded a unified Britain. Geordie’s donning of a Highlander’s costume and his pronouncement of pride at being a “Northlander,” reiterated a transparent inauthenticity of the pageant proceedings and the King’s fashioned position as descended from Scots, though. The satire, however, cannot account for the full scale of the masquerade. In fact, just as the cartoons (re)placed Edinburgh with a non-descript background and hinted at its use as a tourist destination, here textual satire substituted the “metropolis” for Edinburgh. This equation disregarded the geographical specificity of the Scottish capital (and, by extension, Scotland) and the activity of Scots in shaping Great Britain and the British Empire.
The second satirical text was a piece of prose: *A Voyage to the North, In Search of a New Mistress, by an Amorous Old Dandy; Supposed to have been written by himself, with the assistance of Sir Billy Blubber* [William Curtis]. This satire focused on the recurring theme of the King’s desire to satisfy his bodily needs by describing the King’s plans to interact with the “Scratches.” As a droll euphemism for venereal diseases, the “Scratches” played the characters of the Scots to George’s "Old Dandy." At the beginning of the tale, the Old Dandy, concerned with appropriately attiring himself, stepped into his (im)proper character. Once so attired, he proclaimed, "In order to captivate the hearts of the Scratches no less than those of the ladies, I should inform my readers, that I had provided myself with a national dress, Cap, Plaid, Kelt, &c...The dress itself is admirably calculated for display."\(^{255}\) Resonating with Omai’s reading of the dislocated King after taking on the role of “only a Highlander,” this account depicted George’s motivation for captivating and winning over the Scots in their own "national dress." As I previously mentioned, the attire of Highlanders had, until shortly before this moment, signified on the one hand, romanticized culture worthy of passive nostalgia and, on the other hand, defiance and potential danger in terms of their military ability and the Act of Proscription’s prohibition of wearing markers of Jacobite sympathy. Upon his arrival in Scotland, the Dandy admitted, "no sooner was I in the *Land of Cakes*,\(^ {256}\) than I felt myself in every respect a native."\(^ {257}\) The Dandy presumed total transformation (from a Hanoverian to a Stuart) through his sartorial arrangement. This native persona could not be entirely fleshed out, though, until he crossed the physical threshold of the Land of
Cakes, again, like the “metropolis” of *The Northern Excursion*, operating as an evacuated substitution for the Scots’ territory.

In the text, as the Dandy prepared for his trip home after the pageant’s conclusion, he revealed his desire to secure his legacy by circulating a souvenir of his visit. Although one Scot suggested that he construct a snuff-box from a piece of his landing dock (at the Port of Leith), the Dandy explained, "understanding that cribbage is a game which the Scratches are famed for, I suggested that cribbage-peggs would afford a more wide circulation of the wood, and my suggestion is to be adopted."\(^{258}\) Although he had begun to circulate discursively across Scotland via the accounts published in newspapers, journals, and Scott’s *Hints*, as well as through visual means (the crowds watching his procession), here the fictionalized monarch desired a tangible marker of his visit and his perceived role as Scottish sovereign. Concerned with the production of a more lasting legacy, he chose a wooden surrogate that he believed would find the widest available markets, passing through the hands of ever more individuals.

The equation of the Dandy’s actions in the north to a game became fully realized in his next lines, "Thus I shall be perpetuated among them; gratifying thought for as long as cribbage is played, and as soon as the youthful mind learns to distinguish the *Knave* from the *King*, I shall be known and remembered."\(^{259}\) This account initially pitched its monarch as a buffoonish figure, but here the language suggested a more sinister characterization to him. The capacity to discern, to visually discriminate, the scoundrel from the sovereign, the tartan-clad Highlander from George and, perhaps by extension, Scotland and its people from the spectacular presentation of them offered through the
pageantry, became the ultimate challenge for an engaged spectator or player. On the one hand, the joke was on the Scots as the King imagined the instructive purpose of the game: to maintain the order of things by helping his subjects to discern the identity of their rightful leader. On the other hand, though, the joke was on the Dandy as he suggested his own commodification in the manufacturing and circulation of the game, which would break down the King’s mystique as distanced sovereign. The suggestion of this two-fold joke within the satirist’s pages, however, disclosed that the ultimate joke (from the perspective of London) was on Scotland, for it was here that George rehearsed his unruly behavior and it was these subjects who seemed only too willing to play the game.

These depictions of George, as one interested solely in the pursuit of debauchery (gambling, drinking, womanizing) detailed the behavior that worked against the kind of efficient productivity that fuelled Britain’s domestic and transnational socio-economic systems, its running of the Empire. Additionally, these textual and pictorial descriptions exposed those very behaviors that Scott feared might manifest in his fellow Scots, which led to his writing of the *Hints*. And whereas the *Hints* and Omai’s reception envisioned Scotland as a complex theatre in which the Scots acted in a play, following an organized script and donning appropriate costumes, the satires read those in Scotland as part of a nearly blank, stationary background, a stabilized landscape that fused together objects and bodies with no discernible sense of motion or ability to affect their surroundings. In a clever dramaturgical move, Scott organized the final event of the pageant, the production of *Rob Roy Macgregor*, as a culmination of the procedures of collective ordering and performances of allegiance evident in the staged moments that preceded it. As I return to
Edinburgh to examine this final performance, I ask how it created a dialogue between these two perspectives (Scotland as theatre for acting Scots and Scotland or Scots as flattened background), and how the King’s own reception of and participation within the theatrical environment created a complex performance venue that acted as a microcosm for the pageant.

**From Rebellion to Reconciliation: competing actors in Rob Roy**

The two weeks of events that comprised the royal pageant concluded in a performance of *Rob Roy Macgregor, or Auld Langsyne*, adapted from Scott's novel *Rob Roy* and staged at the Theatre Royal, Edinburgh on August 27th. As discussed in Chapter Two, several versions of *Rob Roy* traveled across Scotland and England after the novel’s publication in 1817 and throughout the nineteenth century. Considered an almost certain money-maker, theatres often incorporated one of the versions (most often the operatic or melo-dramatic form) when experiencing a lull in spectator numbers or needing to fill a slot for the Christmas and New Year holidays. The positioning of this explicitly theatrical production as the final performance in the pageant’s showcasing of Scotland created a dialogue between it and the staged moments and theatrical venues constructed during the fortnight. One could argue that these earlier events became the opening acts for this mainstage performance, which placed the King and his peoples in a different type of social configuration: instead of the boundaries of the cityscape, here bodies were confined within the walls of the playhouse, observing another kind of spectacular event unfolding in front of them. I understand this performance not as a simple theatrical representation that broadcast ideas about Scotland but as a final generative network of
material relations that collaborated with each of the other parts of the pageant to produce Edinburgh and a perspective of Scotland at this moment.

In *The National Stage*, Loren Kruger tracked the processes of cultural “legitimacy and legitimation” at work in nineteenth-century Europe with the rise of “national politics.” She argued, “In the official no less than in the critical discourse, the theatre is invoked as the appropriate site for nation building, as a legitimate public sphere.”

Kruger moved beyond a strict comparison between stage and house to examine the types of relationships and practices being defined as “legitimate” through and during these performance events. During *Rob Roy*, already understood as a work of “national” import, it was not so much the role of citizenship nor the shape of a public sphere that was being articulated; instead, while the plot and staging reinforced Scott’s stabilizing gesture at work throughout the pageant with his hints toward self-regulation, the theatre acted as another node in the network of “Scotland” produced by George’s visit. A theatre venue was a place for seeing, as much as it was a site for being seen. The spectators’ bi-directional gaze (toward the stage and other playgoers) focused in on social interactions. While they deemed acceptable certain practices, gestures, and movements within the venue, others were considered illicit; this process constructed and regulated social decorum. By setting the final pageant event within this theatrical space, Scott positioned his fellow Scots as active witnesses who would help to construct a particular brand of “Scotland” that would enter into the larger social imaginary of Britain.

The performance’s playbill announced the production as the “National Opera…WITH THE ORIGINAL MUSIC, AND APPROPRIATE SCENERY,
The use of “National Opera” to identify the production signaled that it was Isaac Pocock’s popular adaptation that the monarch experienced that August evening. The “original” and “appropriate” elements listed lent credence to an authentic or legitimate representation; the “dress” and “decorations” suggested the inclusion of the ubiquitous tartan and fitting accessories. The playbill went on to call for the spectators’ timely arrival, with detailed instructions regarding the organization outside the playhouse: “All Carriages will set down with the Horses’ Heads towards Waterloo Place, and take up in the Opposite Direction.” Even the horses had to fall in line with Scott’s *Hints*, ordered along the street, paralleling the bodies of Scots lined up to present organized propriety at every turn of the pageant.

Cultural geographers Margaret and John Gold argued that Scott had two major aims in his work: to depict the “customs and manners” of ancient Scotland and to illustrate its landscapes as both “beautiful scenes” and as “backdrops to characters and events.” This particular theatrical production of *Rob Roy* made manifest both objectives: the plot and characterizations (materialized through the acting and staging) enacted the performances of specific customs and manners, while the scenic design, replete with images of mountain passes, caves, and lochs, reproduced the imagined spaces of Scott’s fictional Scotland as self-contained scenes and spaces in which the characters encountered one another and, ultimately, worked on behalf of Britain. The production’s staging also incorporated an identifiable proscenium arch and all of the framing implied in such a theatrical convention, presenting a version of Scotland and this
particular thread of history that spectators could visually consume and enjoy, even laugh at.

As I described in Chapter Two, the play began with interior scenes and then gradually moved outdoors to fairly ordered environments in Glasgow and then more unruly exterior spaces in the Highlands. At one point, stage directions indicated: “The back of the Scene exhibits the distant Highland Country.”264 No further detail in the dramatic text expanded on the description of this Scottish locale. Here “Highland Country” stood in for all “wild” territory in the northwest of Scotland, despite differences between regions, villages, or geographical features (hills, lochs, forests, coastline, etc.). The romanticization of these images connected to the absence of a rebellious threat to the land or its inhabitants. If, as cultural geographer Karen Till claimed, “landscapes of state power have been analyzed as theater, a dramaturgical approach that captures the visual and routine nature of civic and state rituals,”265 then reproducing landscapes within a theatrical space created a second form of capture by containing the landscapes as images and placing them in close proximity with spectators. This move removed most sensory elements from the encounter with these landscapes (apart from the ambiguous “wild music” that introduced a scene), providing only a visual comprehension. In this case, the application of a broad stroke to indicate the Highland countryside depoliticized the history of the Jacobite rebellions and the ongoing displacements caused through the Highland Clearances. And this gesture to displace the ongoing struggles in the Highlands within the story of Rob Roy subsequently re-politicized these problems as something that needed to be withheld from public view. The rituals enacted as part of this pageant
offered an easily consumable version of Scottish lands and people in the forging of consolidated state power, creatively painted with a pro-Unionist brush.

As Scott carefully orchestrated this particular pageant event, he invited a mingling of social classes, as revealed in his letter to Lord Melville on August 25th. He noted that the performance would enable the “middling classes…who cannot pay their respects at Court or in the assemblies of the higher rank” to observe their King. The designation of this event as the royal “Command” performance legitimated this enactment of a contained and restrained Scottish past, full of quirky characters. Scott allowed this assembling of spectators from different classes to occur because confined within the walls of the theatre they, too, would be confined, unable to act freely or to alter the tone mandated by the pageant. While these spectators might have believed that they were actively rendering this moment of history through their presence, their participation was still strictly controlled. Theatre scholar Daniel O’Quinn suggested that in theatre venues in late-eighteenth-century Britain, “The public space of the theatre had become a site not only for modeling but also for regulating social practice.” This type of regulating practice began in the opening stages of the pageant through the processions and then, within the Theatre Royal, this modeling continued as certain groups were allowed in to observe and to respond to *Rob Roy* and their King. Part of the audience’s role in this event was fleshed out in Scott’s *Hints*, which informed spectators that during the show “the national anthem, with some additional stanzas written for the occasion, will be sung by the whole body of performers, the audience joining in the chorus.” By designating this environment as an ostensibly interactive space for performers and spectators, Scott
hinted at the production’s attempt to stimulate or at least to *simulate* Scottish loyalty and unity. The collective of performers enacted a "whole body" in a similar discursive maneuver as executed by Scott’s earlier choreography of the crowd within the city. Scott’s additional stanzas here paralleled the rewritten “Carle now the king’s come” and other threads of history that the Old Citizen wove together during his creative construction of the ceremonies.

The Hanoverian monarch’s letters to Walter Scott, written upon his return to London, addressed Scott’s meticulous organization of the proceedings. They provide another perspective on the reception of the events when read against Omai’s accounts and the satires drawn up in London. The King’s letters, written from the perspective of a third-person narration, addressed the *Rob Roy* performance: "Never were king’s emotions more gazed at, watched, obeyed, reflected, --than those of George the Fourth in the theatre of Edinburgh; and never yet did theatre echo and rebound with more unanimous, more tumultuous peals of affection and applause." If Scott and the theatre space worked to regulate social interactions here, then George, not surprisingly, believed that he occupied the role of model in this performance venue. As his subjects visually scrutinized him and his responses, George became the ultimate actor to be studied, applauded, and ultimately copied in this space. His reading of the performance environment found both a mimetic charge to the spectators to reflect what they saw but also an affective interpenetration. While Scott crafted elsewhere the conditions for Scots to revere George as their monarch and to embrace him as their own, this moment within the Theatre Royal achieved a seemingly successful integration of veneration and
appreciation for George through the King’s instructive behavior. The "echo" indicated a
doubling effect at work within the playhouse and throughout the pageant; through the act
of doing (marching, observing, lining up, singing), the pageant actors (Scott and George
IV, the Edinburgh residents, Omai, the Rob Roy performers, the Highlanders) created an
alternate experience to the one being presented. The social space produced in this theatre
building engaged both visual and auditory senses; like the cannon fire that announced
George's arrival and tracked his physical movements into Edinburgh, in the confined
space of the Theatre Royal, the waves of excited applause proclaimed George's presence
and approval, and, the King believed, the significance of his corporeal instruction.

A footnote following George's aforementioned observation reinforced his
assertions, though I have not located any similar accounts to support his claim: "The
performers are said to have observed, that the spectators in the pit were so engrossed with
the King, that they presented their profiles only to the stage." From George’s
perspective, his presence altered both the performance on stage and the audience's
response to it in the house. This moment generated an alternate theatrical display, framed
by the theatre venue and the positioning of visitors as spectators to the staged production.
The stage actors then physically repositioned their own dramatis personae to compete
with the royal character seated before them. The distraction articulated here necessitated
a moment of improvisation or revision, which commented on the larger revisions at play
in Scott's articulations of Scotland. These skewed profiles marked the unstable nature of
this theatrical space of encounter, interaction, and regulation. While the outdoor events,
the parades and processions, enabled the Scots to view their King from a distanced
perspective, here, as in the cartoons and satires, it was Scotland itself that stood
distanced. Despite George’s observation of a blurring of social boundaries, the limited
confines of these theatre walls, and the physical proximity amongst the audience that they
afforded, ultimately reinscribed the power dynamic between King and subjects. George
may have felt that “the public feeling towards him had softened—had mellowed from
unmingled awe to something of kindliness, and almost friendship;” however, without his
tartan uniform, he had resumed the distinct role of monarch. In doing so, he wrote
himself into this performance of the Scottish past, creating a façade of decorum and,
through his repeated interventions in the pageant, he perceived the transformation of a
relationship between his subjects and himself.

The production mediated this re-articulation of legitimacy by providing its own
modeling of social interaction in Scotland. To complete my reading of this event, I offer
two interpretations of a moment that occurred on stage and a form of cultural
(il)legitimation that resulted. Towards the conclusion of the play, the Lowlander Bailie
Nicol Jarvie offered a pessimistic reading of the Highlanders. In the King’s letters,
George observed that in the theatre: “There the humour of the inimitable Bailie Jarvie
doubly delighted the crowded audience, because it delighted their King, and because it
seemed to bring him [the King] nearer to the range of his ordinary sympathies—into
more of a sort of fellowship with him, than on any of the former occasions.” George
considered this moment as a spontaneous, good-willed, crowd-pleasing show of
fellowship, a form of nation-building in which the residents emulated their sovereign.
Despite the numerous previous encounters between George and the Scots during this
visit, it was this theatrical event that opened up the King’s “ordinary sympathies” and transformed his relationship with the rest of the audience. The crowd received Jarvie’s criticism of his fellow Scots through the King’s interpretation, legitimating this particular impression of the Highlanders, still imbued with the suspicions garnered by Jacobite sympathies.

An anonymous *Rob Roy* spectator provided a noticeably different account of this moment of performance:

On the night of His Majesty’s visit to the Theatre, the King laughed heartily at some of the peculiarities of *Baillie Nichol Jarvie*, (Mr. Mackay.) When the *Baillie* advises *Captain Thornton* not to put too much trust in the Highlanders... [h]is Majesty laughed immodestly at this character of the Highlanders, who had during his Royal visit pressed around his Majesty with so much devotion.²⁷³

Here George laughed at both the Lowland Scot, Jarvie, and at the Highlanders being characterized by him. The monarch’s laughter confirmed the circulation of the image of Highlanders as a cohesive group (as identified by Scott earlier in the pageant) and introduced (at least publicly) the notion that they were not to be trusted. The Highlanders existed as spectacular enjoyment on stage, just as they had been in the streets of Edinburgh. Like the two-dimensional backdrops framing them, the Highlanders depicted in the Theatre Royal were flattened, depleted of their vitality. This laughter also signaled a dismissal of the socio-economic conditions that did provide a real threat to the lives of
men and women living in the Highlands. The "devotion" that Scott worked so
meticulously to display ultimately gained no purchase in the King’s eyes.

This production of *Rob Roy* that closed the pageant occupied and produced an
intriguing socio-cultural space. On the one hand, it confirmed the application of the
theatrical and performative devices used throughout the pageant, providing an explicit
imagining of Scottish lands and peoples within the comforting confines of a proscenium
stage. On the other hand, this performance turned its attention to the theatrics of George
IV, who created a façade of himself by assuming a position that distracted, disrupted, and
disjointed what occurred around him. The script that he produced, not surprisingly,
centered on him as actor *par excellence*, training the eyes and minds of his subjects in the
Royal Theatre. His behavior, unable to be constrained within or limited to the stage, like
the Scottish characters depicted, ultimately appeared in excess, blurring the line between
King and knave. The playhouse was the ultimate site for intense scrutiny and for multi-
faceted performances. The two-dimensional scenery arranged and presented the active
territories of the mountains, lochs, and caves of distinct areas of the Highlands as
compressed replicas, devoid of political relevance. This process of domestication, like the
landscaping in the New Town, attempted to eradicate elements of unpredictability and
instability, replacing uncertainty with order and reform.

**Closing Curtains**

In reading across the types of stagings that the royal pageant produced in 1822 (its
use of Edinburgh’s cityscapes, the importing of the bodies and clothing of Highlanders,
and the theatrical production of *Rob Roy Macgregor*), I equate the operations of Walter
Scott with those of an aesthetic stylist, determining the shape, size, cut, and color of the cultural assemblage of Scottishness that he presented. His strategic decisions repeatedly reproduced a version of Scotland that acknowledged a domesticated and tamed version of its own history, a romanticized and reconciled past. However, at every turn, some element of Scotland remained hidden from view. Only specific details (imagined or actual) were filtered through the pageant to symbolize social interactions, cultural practices, and historical events. The collection of these details attempted to piece together a picture of wholeness, unity, order, and support to and for George, but it ultimately exposed a fragmentation of perspectives and competing imaginaries.

In trying to display a sense of loyalty to the King, the pageant prescribed a regulation of the social behavior of Scots for Scots in Scotland. The management of the orderly crowds and facilitation of the Rob Roy audience were the most visible moments of such instruction and regulation. The mingling of different social classes along the Royal Mile and within the Theatre Royal foregrounded an integrated society able to work and to live together, offering a model for the Empire at large. Yet at every turn, what fell out of focus, what was relegated to an ambiguous, glossed-over background were the political stakes of this social fashioning and these forms of theatrical articulation. The Highlanders and their “wild music,” the tartan and George’s nonchalant donning of it, and the picture-frame that enclosed the threat of Jacobites in Rob Roy all existed beyond the pageant’s production of Edinburgh as a literary, capital-infused, and commodity-consuming environment, representative of a new relationship with the British state.
Although literarily anonymous in his *Hints*, little doubt existed over the identity of Scott as the master of ceremonies. His ubiquitous presence at the events for George IV led some observers to comment on his active role. An anonymous spectator suggested:

> It is a pity that the author of *Waverley* should deem it important to figure in every part of a corporation pageant, and should suffer his friends, if such they are, to force upon him a feeling of vulgar vanity…Sir Walter Scott permitted himself to be put forward as director of the most trivial matters connected with the arrangements of the Edinburgh pageants.\(^{274}\)

Unlike typical theatrical production stage-managers, clad in black to blend in with their surroundings and working to ensure a smooth operation, effectively eradicating their labor, Walter Scott occupied the spaces of several images, as well as various newspaper and journal accounts of the Edinburgh proceedings. This particular report revealed a certain cynicism also circulating in Edinburgh about both the event, the “corporation pageant,” and about Scott himself, dealing with the “trivial matters” of the affair. It also questioned Scott’s acquaintances who played the part of “friends” and fed into Scott’s “vulgar vanity.” The notion of “vulgar” here is notable, given its inversion of the sense of decorum proposed by Scott to the Edinburgh residents and its curious parallel with satirical accounts of George’s actions that circulated in London and elsewhere.

Whether in the participation of clansmen, the disregard of the Highland Clearances, or the depiction of Scottish landscapes and political grievances as deactivated and contained backdrops, each of these actions contributed to the shaping of this pageant and opinions of Scotland and the Scots at this time. The pageant collected,
mobilized, and connected the bodies of marching and observing Scots with the outsiders who joined in the celebrations, Edinburgh’s architectural composition, circulating print and visual technologies, theatrical production materials, and traveling texts and images to craft a version of Scotland. These bodies, places, and objects, in turn, produced aspects of Scottishness grounded in specific places (Highland villages, Edinburgh printing houses) but circulated beyond Scottish borders to England and beyond. Walter Scott intended for this unified national production to demonstrate the industry, ingenuity, and flexibility of Scots as a cultural and socio-economic asset to the production of Britain and its Empire. The accounts of the proceedings by Omai, the satirists, and George IV, however, located different foci that identified multiple instances of a blurring between reality and fiction and a fracturing of Scott’s complete picture.

The dramaturgy of Scotland constructed by the pageant relied heavily upon the deployment of theatrical apparatuses (framed perspectives, symbolic props and music, a staged performance), but it also exposed the theatrical quality of political maneuvers (the King visiting Edinburgh, the removal of the Highlands from the pageant’s frame). Resonances of this pageant also remain, of course, in the streets of Edinburgh (with its George IV Bridge that bisects the Royal Mile) and in subsequent processions that have re-shaped its roads, neighborhoods, parks, buildings, and hills. The aforementioned 2004 procession that positioned hundreds of cheering Edinburgh residents, Scottish citizens, and invited guests along the Royal Mile to usher in the new Scottish Parliament reverberated with the 1822 pageant. Still lingering in the architecture of the city, the dress of its people, and the tensions between Queen Elizabeth and her Scottish subjects
(signaled through her clothing and gestures as well as decisions made by ceremony organizers), this pageantry performance enacted a complex space in which the arrangement of materials fused cultural practices and artistic production.
Chapter Five

Stages of Governance: The Scottish Parliament and its Festival of Politics

Introductory Images

The drawings exist as fragments. The earth tones—browns, tans, greens, golds, greys, and blues—catch my eye as, together, they indicate a rugged hillside, a large spade-shaped green leaf, and the horizon, an ecotone where land meets sea. Nestled beside and among these images sit sketched outlines of buildings and short pieces of descriptive text. I move a magnifying glass across the page to enlarge the minute reprinted handwriting and start to make out: “A. Main chamber. B. Committee Rooms. C. Public Presentation” and “The building of the parliament should seat in the place with the same…delicacy that organize[s] vegetal forms…leaves & trees had always bear [sic] an example…Remember [Charles Rennie] Mackintosh.”

As I turn the pages of Alan Balfour’s *Creating a Scottish Parliament*, the small chronicle that contains these illustrations of Catalan architect and designer Enric Miralles, I take note of the arrangements of bodies that exist beside or within the buildings and natural topographical features hinted at by the artist’s pencil. “I imagine that a Parliament building should be organized like a university campus,” Miralles jotted down. “To move from one place to the other has specific meaning.” A long, wispy leaf transforms into a grassy knoll upon which two figures sit: “The parliament belongs to the land…it is not just a new building along the street.”

Throughout the series of ten illustrations included in Balfour’s text, Miralles incorporates curved lines resembling plant stems that simultaneously divide and join
elements of his sketches: the land formations, building outlines, seated or standing bodies, and patches of collected words that add to the images without over-determining their meanings. I read the relationships between these elements as blurring a perceived distinction between nature and culture. The physical, social, and political spaces of the Scottish Parliament imagined by Miralles take as their inspiration the very earth upon which it will sit. Together, the images form a palimpsest of conceptual architecture and natural design that foregrounds the very ground beneath the politicians’ feet. “The still-emerging architectural conception of landscape,” observed landscape architect and theorist James Corner, “is less that of scenery, greenery, wilderness, and arcadia and more that of a pervasive milieu, a rich imbraglio of ecological, experiential, poetic, and expressively living dimensions.”277 This approach to design articulates the rich patchwork of relationships between natural and cultural realms. Miralles’s ground appears welcoming and malleable; the curved tiers of a shallow outdoor amphitheatre envelop those sitting within it.

In a subsection labeled, “In Performance,” Balfour acknowledged that “The politics of the Miralles imagination has made this Parliament an informal, restless place, seeking an experience of continual change...anti-authority, continually open to new ideas and possibilities. It confounds expectations, it makes no predictions, suffers no illusion.”278 This Parliament prefers growth and adaptation over fixity and predictability. Though seemingly “informal,” the Parliament acts as a site of law-making, a fixing of procedure and practice that will disseminate throughout Scotland. Although “anti-authority” in appearance, this complex will house those individuals voted into
government with the authority to represent their constituents through the legislating process. Particular contradictions, then, are built into the foundations of the political system symbolized by these designs. Performance becomes a crucial lens to view the Parliament because of the kinds of behaviors, interactions, and movements articulated by and embodied through its spaces. As part of a system that has shifted some issues of governance from London to Scotland, the Parliament attempts to enact a more participatory democracy by asking those visiting and working within its site to read, observe, scrutinize, speak up, question, and propose alternatives to the laws and political systems and institutions in place. Investigating the Parliament through performance theory and a paradigm of performance (technological, organization, cultural), as I discuss below, enables me to map the technologies, ideologies, objects, bodies, and discourses that have shaped its development.

Miralles’s drawings rehearse a method of assembling and collating materials from across Scotland and from within Edinburgh to suggest an organic and cohesive operation. The inclusion of natural topographies, such as coastlines, hills, and lochs within his drawings advocates for a geocultural awareness to develop fair and sustainable laws that benefit Scots and their varied communities. These drawings, then, indicate a potential for the Scottish Parliament building to incorporate its immediate surroundings and for the parliamentarians to remain cognizant of the impact of their decisions on the lives of those outside of the Parliament and the capital city. Devolution developed through the collaboration of several individuals (Scottish politicians, including Donald Dewar, former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Scottish nationalist campaigners, and political and
artistic activists); the Parliament designed here hopes to evolve through a similar ethos of contemplation, collaboration, and activity. This Parliament, once constructed, would not only function as an important meeting place for politicians, however; the buildings would also act as a festive hub for cultural events that would encourage participation from Scots across the country in the policy-making process. Thus the Parliament would perform (socially, artistically, technologically) in several different ways to produce Scottish policies during the first decade of the twenty-first century.

In this chapter I look at the Scottish Parliament primarily through two lenses to examine how the Parliament building, in its various forms as a physical, political, and cultural site operates metonymically as and for Scotland. I imagine the Parliament as a prism through which to view different kinds of nation-forming and democratic practices. I first consider it as a functioning complex of buildings designed by Miralles with sustainable elements. This building complex, as a house of governance, comments on the relationship between policy-making and social responsibility and between the conservation of land and natural resources and political accountability. I take a second look at the Parliament as a cultural and tourist venue in the Scottish capital, focusing on its development of a Festival of Politics that sets out to engender a form of participatory democracy that infuses debates and discussions about the welfare of its peoples with cultural practices and theatrical performance events. I consider the Parliament in these different ways (through its architecture, legislation, and cultural contributions) to probe its multi-faceted and contradictory arrangements, movements, and functions.
In addition to arguing that a complex network of relationships among bodies, objects, and practices produces this political space, my analysis also exposes important discrepancies between the proposed Parliament and its actual functioning, between its designs and its performances. For instance, as I examine the architectural components of the Parliament, I point to perceived shortfalls in terms of its sustainable design and management. In the case of the MSPs’ performances as legislators, their early policy programs took some steps to redress certain injustices related to the ownership and use of Scottish lands, but they hesitated to enact substantial changes that altered the notion of access in Scotland. The Parliament’s cultural practices, made visible through the Festival of Politics, creates opportunities for collective discourse surrounding important issues of social inclusion and freedom of artistic expression, however, elements of its programming reinstate particular social divisions and passive reception through its application of theatrical conventions. Each of these moments of incongruity or ambivalence, I argue, points to underlying tensions in devolution itself. While devolution offers the possibility of a more autonomous Scottish nation, Westminster’s Parliament retains control over significant areas of policy-making; simultaneously, as this political policy disperses power from the Parliament at Westminster, it also centralizes that power in the form of the Scottish Parliament. Furthermore, the Parliament’s use of performance to evaluate organizational and management efficiency chafes against its inclusion of performance events as modes of artistic expression. In each of these applications of performance (as technology, management, and cultural expression), distinct located qualities of Scotland (dialects, narratives, geological and topographical features) are
circulated (across Edinburgh and Scotland, and into an international cultural marketplace) in order to brand a particular kind of Scottish collective identity. This national character is comprised of a sense of social responsibility and accountability, a geocultural awareness, and an ability to adapt historical moments (both celebratory and humbling) in order to address current socio-political conditions.

The Scottish Parliament (its buildings and its political institution) exerts a power of governance over its peoples, evident in its contemporaneous manifestations as an architectural complex, a house of legislation, and a cultural venue. In examining these three facets, performance theorist Jon McKenzie’s delineation of “performative power” is quite instructive. In *Perform or Else*, McKenzie argued that *performativity*, as a modality of power, has replaced discipline, which had, until the late-twentieth century, acted as the hegemonic mode of knowledge production that affected embodied and social practices. Whereas the practice of disciplinary power constructs social and political mechanisms that stabilize subject and object identities and generate regulatory controls over physical movement and social interaction, the exercise of performative power introduces new aims for organizing physical and social interactivity. These goals include efficiency, productivity, and systemic operating principles of reflexivity and measurement. The operation of such performative power creates, what McKenzie identified as, a “new subject of knowledge.” McKenzie builds on Michel Foucault’s diagram of a subject within power conceived as a relational force. The subject resulting from this understanding of power exists as “subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge, both meanings suggest a
McKenzie develops this duality of the subject (identified by Foucault in the paradigm of discipline), into a fragmented, multi-dimensional subject in his paradigm of performance: a node in many networks at the same time. In the case of the Scottish Parliament, it becomes a node within and connected to various networks. As Miralles’s projected images, it exists a potential space of collaboration between legislators, citizens, natural and built environments, and technological systems. As a built structure, it is a composite of construction materials linked to sites across Scotland and forms a symbolic pastiche of Scotland’s heterogeneous ecologies. Within the Festival of Politics, the Parliament acts as a gathering place for artists, stakeholders, and policy-makers to celebrate the artistic creativity and participatory nature of Scottish politics and to brand commodifiable cultural goods for export. Through the frame of McKenzie’s performance stratum, the Parliament complex occupies all of these positions.

I read the Scottish Parliament as both a location within these networks (occupying various subject positions) and as, itself, a network comprised of discourses, bodies, objects, and histories. McKenzie forwarded, “The mechanisms of performative power are nomadic and flexible more than sedentary and rigid, that its spaces are networked and digital more than enclosed and physical, and its temporalities are polyrhythmic and non-linear and not simply sequential and linear.” McKenzie identified this performance paradigm as linked to post-Fordist modes of production and a globalizing economy; his sites of examination thus depart from the enclosed spaces of Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon and exist as the ostensibly open spaces produced by information and scientific
technologies. I argue that a similar multi-modal performance occurs through, within, and at the new Scottish Parliament. The Parliament performs itself through, and asks visitors to engage with, its physical and enclosed spaces, as well as those that exist as networked, digital, and/or embodied spaces. Through its architectural design and legislature enacted by MSPs, the Scottish Parliament performs certain technological and management functions. The buildings, designed and constructed with sustainable ecological principles, attempt to create more porous boundaries between the concrete and glass that comprise the building and its immediate physical urban and natural surroundings. Meanwhile, the buildings’ enactment as a cultural venue, made especially visible during the Festival of Politics (FoP), acts in dialogue with neighboring tourist destinations, Holyrood Palace and Our Dynamic Earth, and with various festival organizations in the city. Through its programming the FoP tries to connect the Parliament with Edinburgh residents and other Scots during a “down time” in the legislative calendar, linking the performances of the material site with the social practices occurring outside its walls and encouraging more interaction from Scots.

To discuss the kinds of local, national, and global qualities envisioned in the Parliament, I take a cue from Miralles’s sketches by asking what qualities of a Scottish nation does the construction of, and activity within, the building signal? If devolution presents a processual understanding of governance where a fully centralized institution (i.e. Westminster) transfers part of its political remit to institutions that exist in closer proximity to those areas being governed, it what ways does the constitution of the Scottish Parliament impede that very process or in what ways do its ecological principles
present a model for setting policy-making within the land of Scotland? Finally, I ask how and to what extent the Parliament defines, promotes, and enables accessibility for its citizens through these three modes of performance.

Parliament as Performing Complex

The selection of the designs of Miralles and team implied a particular proposition about the new Scottish government: that it was aware of European developments yet inspired by the physical surroundings of its own territory. The fragmentary, processural, and interconnected images depicted in Miralles’ drawings were materialized through a laborious, extensive, and expensive process of construction that occurred from 1999-2004, beginning with an important design competition. The six-person panel, established in 1998 and headed by Donald Dewar, former Secretary of State for Scotland and Scotland’s First Minister, reviewed seventy applications and interviewed twelve companies short-listed for the project. That none of the five finalists were solely Scottish firms (the majority of the applications were co-presented with Scottish firms) upset some in Scotland who believed that the project should be designed and constructed by Scots and Scots alone. Like the constitution of the executive board of the National Theatre of Scotland, however, multiple “outside” perspectives seemed an enticing prospect to deliver a project that would honor Scotland’s political past and propel its future movement within local, national, and international frameworks. The production of Scottish nationhood signaled by this decision required a transnational dimension. The panel eventually chose the designs of EMBT (Enric Miralles, Benedetta Tagliaturbe) of Barcelona and RMJM (Robert Matthew, Stirrat Johnson-Marshall) of Scotland to
materialize the Parliament complex. In a document published by the Scottish Parliament Corporate Body in 1999 addressing the Holyrood Building Project, Dewar acknowledged not only the “creative approach” of Miralles but the international design record of EMBT and felt that its “association with RMJM (Scotland) Ltd will ensure that a Scottish perspective is maintained in developing the initial design ideas into a building that is both aesthetically pleasing and a functional working environment for Scotland’s Parliament.”

The panel simultaneously wanted the perspectives of insiders and outsiders as they sought to design a place of governance that international audiences would respect and that Scots would find engaging and representative of their collective aims. Each firm added experience that matched the multi-purpose functioning of the Parliament. “An important part of EMBT’s work,” they explained, “had happened in Catalunya [sic] during the construction period that followed the Catalan national rebirth.” The team added an overtly political dimension to their proposal by suggesting a link between their home country and the state of affairs in Scotland in light of devolution. The notion of a “national rebirth” was certainly floating through Scotland in the form of political discourse and newspaper accounts and in cultural sectors (the Parliament’s first major discussion about a National Theatre occurred the following year in 1999). “Construction” signaled the possibility for both the composition of a physical building and the collaborative making of a foundational national(ist) ethos within Scotland. Here Catalonia emerged as a potential model for Scotland based on its carving out of a more autonomous space for itself within Spain’s borders. EMBT’s relationship with Catalan
national identity provided the design panel with an example of how architectural design could assist in forwarding larger political claims of self-governance and sovereignty.

EMBT’s partners, RMJM, contributed an appealing local perspective to the Parliament design:

The skill and experience of their practice is rooted in large scale, high-profile projects ranging from modern state-of-the-art office buildings to specialized acoustic and environmental design for auditoriums such as the Glasgow Royal Concert Hall. As well, their scope of work spans from detailed conservation of historic buildings like the Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg where they advised UNESCO, to rigorously modern interventions such [as] the Tron Theatre, Glasgow.286

The projects highlighted by this firm resonated with artistic, cultural, and social significance for Scots. The ability both to create contemporary designs of performance venues and to facilitate conservation projects of established cultural institutions hinted at the future functions of the Parliament as a place where cultural performances and conservation efforts would shape policy-making. This multi-faceted role of the Parliament would take shape in the buildings’ designated location in Edinburgh: Holyrood. The Scottish Parliament-to-be desired the opportunity to strengthen its own located communities across Scotland while simultaneously reaching beyond its boundaries to shore up socio-economic and political ties with Europe in particular. The pairing of these Parliamentary aspirations with fluid designs inspired by the very soil of Scotland and infused with a sense of political urgency for a nation to decide on its own
affairs fuelled the months to come as steel, concrete, oak, and glass began to take the
shape of walls, floors, and ceilings. The actual process of construction, though, tempered
the flood of civic nationalism that had acted as a catalyst for devolution. As months (and
years) passed and the budget rose from £40 million to £431 million, individuals across
Scotland expressed their doubts about the site’s efficiency and institution’s efficacy.
Moreover, shortly after work had begun on the site, both Miralles and Dewar died
unexpectedly, personal losses that some read as harbingers of a Scottish future full of
problems and inefficient implementation of projected ideals, i.e. a performance failure.

The Parliament that opened in 2004 asks those who visit or work within it to
constantly identify and/or make connections between its interior and exterior. This ability
to recognize, question, and possibly blur these distinctions suggests different kinds of
embodied movements and social interactions. First, this proposal rests on a degree of
transparency (windows, video screens, information technologies) that invites individuals
to track the process of governance, to scrutinize the gestures and rhetoric of policy-
making, and to propose alternative models of legislation. Second, this recognition
attempts to bridge a perceived divide between culture and nature (ostensibly stabilized
from a legacy of post-Enlightenment, industrial-era thinking that placed nature under
man’s control). It calls for guests to make imaginative connections as they walk through
the corridors and halls and sit in the rooms that comprise the space. Third, these
connections use arrangements of materials to highlight specific spatial and temporal
relationships between the Parliament, other areas of Edinburgh, and locations across
Scotland that encourage visitors to seek out more information about these places and to
narrate their own experiences elsewhere. One particularly complex, enclosed yet networked space within the Parliament, the Debating Chamber, serves as a useful focal point for an analysis of these different activities performed by the Parliament and suggested to its temporary inhabitants. Finally, a look into the Parliament’s projection of and compliance with goals of sustainability presents evidence of the contradictory and complex nature of the Parliament’s role within Scotland and the United Kingdom.

*        *       *

I think of Scotland and I think of boats. Always these boats are present in my mind, and by their shapes the building is defined:
- a Parliament on land and yet it floats;
- a set of shelters under upturned keels,
- an anchorage, a point of embarkation,
- a source of new light for an old dark nation,
- a place of thoughts, ambitions and ideals. 287 (James Robertson)

*        *       *

As expressed by James Robertson, the first writer-in-residence at the Parliament, in 2004, Enric Miralles resisted the idea that a parliament building should be a monolithic, intimidating, if not regal, site as fleshed out by particular government buildings in Europe and within the British Isles. This rejected paradigm, clearly illustrated in the Houses of Parliament in Westminster, established particular spatial and social relationships between government and citizens via its public spaces, architectural design, and placement in the city. These differences in design point to the kind of governance proposed and produced in Edinburgh that attempts to contrast the political authority enacted by Westminster. Externally, Westminster’s Neo-Gothic façade generates aesthetic unity and permanence often signified by the exteriors of palaces and
fortresses; the building complex’s inclusion of Westminster Cathedral draws visual connections between the overlapping of sacred and secular rule in Britain’s history.

Inside, the Parliament’s grand rooms and halls echo the stately qualities of this site’s external design through two- or three-storey vaulted ceilings, large archways, hanging chandeliers, statues of former Prime Ministers, and large portraits and frescos that adorn the walls. The throne in the House of Lords exemplifies the type of governance imagined here; individuals feel dwarfed and awed by the stature of their physical surroundings and, in turn, by those who walk through its halls and sit in its chambers on a daily basis. This is not a space for a non-legislating Brit to feel at home or as an active participant in the legislating process. Additionally, the design of the debating chambers of the Houses of Commons and Lords split the room into two sides that face each other, creating a very focused, if not confrontational, central point where speakers address their colleagues who either support or oppose them. While the grandeur of the structure diminishes those standing within it, the politicians working inside face a potentially hostile environment where debates can escalate into fights as opposing sides face off.

So if this is Miralles’s anti-model, then what does he do to revise the relationship between a site of governance and those it governs? His designs and environmental considerations propose a material awareness of the external and interior spaces of the Scottish Parliament. Instead of one grand building, the Scottish Parliament consists of ten smaller buildings of varying heights connected by halls and walkways that demand a degree of physical movement by the MSPs, guests, and visitors. Referred to as a
“campus” by Miralles, and as a “village” or “tiny city” by architectural critics, this complex foregrounds movement. Miralles’s identification of the Parliament as a

![A map of the Scottish Parliament Complex. Author’s Collection.](image)

... implies its operation as a pedagogical model for civic participation that, perhaps, encourages the questioning of extant modes of political rhetoric and procedure but also signals a kind of post-disciplinary performance space that catalogues and categorizes knowledge and stratifies individuals according to levels of proficiency. The buildings that comprise this complex exist as work stations for the MSPs and as meeting places for the legislators and their constituents (MSP Building, Towers), sites of debate, deliberation, and scrutiny (Debating Chamber), places for members of the public to gather and talk (Main Hall, with its café, crèche, and exhibitions), information hubs for the media (Canongate Building, Media Tower), and sites of management and research (Queensberry House, with its Dewar Room). Connections between these rooms exist as corridors, stairwells, elevators, and lobbies. When the Parliament is in session, an MSP may move from reading in her office to a Rural Affairs and the Environment meeting in a committee room to the Debating Chamber for Scottish Government Debate to the Garden Lobby for...
an informal chat with a fellow MSP and back to her office to meet a constituent. These required movements (to different interconnected buildings) imply a paradox, acknowledged by oft-cited Scottish historian, Christopher Harvie. In the Parliament, Harvie sees that “a new and open sort of government ha[s] bedded itself in.”

Part of the structural and ideological framing of the Parliament includes the ideas of openness and accountability. Moving through the site, the relative low height of many of the interconnected Parliament buildings potentially produces the horizontal public spaces that sociologist Zygmunt Bauman considers crucial to creating a discourse that leads to democratically negotiated social norms. Bauman observed that with increased urban development comes the eradication of meeting-places. It is at these meeting-places that Bauman argued “norms were created—so that justice could be done, and apportioned horizontally, thus re-forging the conversationalists into a community, set apart and integrated by the shared criteria of evaluation [author’s emphases].”
creating a complex of buildings as the Scottish Parliament, which includes various rooms for the public to enter, walk through, and watch proceedings, the Parliament attempts to incorporate many more Scots than its designated legislators into the process of policy-making. Outside of the Parliament sits an amphitheatre-like structure carved into the grounds where, it is hoped, Edinburgh residents and visiting Scots can discuss events and decisions, potentially having an impact on the processes taking place inside. This landscape design, while a provocative gesture, may prove mostly ineffective, however, given Edinburgh’s many grey and rainy days. In discussing one part of the complex, the garden-facing side of the MSP offices, architect Charles Jencks noted that “façade reveals his [Miralles’s] notion that in a large building, the system should not dominate over the individual, that small scale is the right scale for democratic institutions.” The Parliament’s Main Hall suggests this more appropriate scale with its low, curved vaulted ceiling that embraces those who enter. This ceiling, with its skewed Saltire Crosses designed by Miralles, might have produced a feeling of claustrophobia for visitors; however, a combination of the room’s width and a wall of windows compensates for its low height. Instead of the top-down style of governance symbolized by Westminster, the Scottish Parliament creates pathways towards more communal modes of decision-making that invite members of the public into these political spaces (the café, crèche, Debating Chamber). By creating the particular spatial relationships carved out through the physical structures of the Parliament, this political institution invites the possibility for a more ground-level mode of enacting relevant policy. The Parliament’s layout, part of its
technological performance, repeats this desire to reach out and become part of its surroundings.

In addition to the physical structure asking Scots to observe and connect to the legislating procedures, the Parliament tries to connect to its citizens by way of electronic media. As part of the openness and accountability tenets upon which the Parliament was founded, it sought to provide opportunities to participate in the political process via telecommunication technologies for those Scots residing hundreds of miles away from Edinburgh (possibly in a site like the Shetland Islands or Stornoway). Central to this project was the creation of a comprehensive (and somewhat unwieldy) website, accessible in both English and Gaelic. Through its daily updates, the website provides information not only about the Parliament’s process of governance and the physical Holyrood complex, but also about particular debates, acts of legislation, committee meetings, and projects taking place around the country (in primary schools, for example). The Parliament also sends out weekly updates through a listserv that provides subscribers with the details of agendas for committee meetings and Parliamentary debates. While “Holyrood TV” streams Parliament happenings to those, like myself, unable to watch meetings or debates unfold in person, the Parliament also offers a Text Service (or Seirbheis Teacs) for those trying to track down information materials or details pertaining to their MSP, Parliamentary membership, or procedures. The Parliament has also developed e-petitions that an individual or organization can post on its website for a period of time. This act makes it possible for citizens across Scotland to add their voice to a debate taking place elsewhere in the country. Through these electronic media, the
perceived distance between the Parliament and its citizens becomes condensed. Presumably, the coupling of this technological capability with the accessibility of Parliament information evokes a new kind of collective imagining of community negotiated through collective debate and contact with the unfolding of discussions and debate in “real” time. In this way, the Parliament hopes to invoke civic participation in virtual space for those citizens unable to cross the physical threshold of the Parliament.

Each of these technologies, however, requires a citizen (or overseas scholar) to contact or to connect to the Parliament via digital, wireless, or dial-up technology. The decision to implement these forms of communication may stem from a desire to encourage participation among younger citizens, those most likely to use these kinds of informational, mobile technologies in their everyday lives. As the price of these technologies decreases and the physical areas covered by these technologies increases, more individuals may access the Parliament and its MSPs through these formats. But how does the technology shape the organizational performance of the Scottish Parliament for its citizens? As far as I can tell, no studies concerning the short- or long-term effects of these technologies on citizen participation have been conducted yet. While this proliferation of Parliament information via communication technologies espouses a form of civic participation, it can also be seen as excluding individuals from the political process by, for example, making a dense website that requires a timely investment for a browser looking for a piece of information or reaching Scots living in more remote, rural locales without internet access.
Back in the Parliament’s physical structure, the mobility afforded by the dissemination of information meets the convergence of geocultural elements that identify a necessary tension between rootedness and movement that comprise Scotland’s political process. Its composition interweaves natural elements (foliage, trees, gardens) and a nature motif (leaves, twigs) into the exterior and interior of the buildings. Turf grows atop the roofs of some of the Parliament buildings, while wild grasses and trees (some native to neighboring Holyrood Park and others sent from areas across Scotland) fill in the external landscaping of the Parliament complex. A members’ garden, containing various plants and herbs that would have been cultivated in

Figure 5.3: Garden Lobby during the Festival of Politics’ "Open Day" in 2007. Photo by author.

seventeenth-century Edinburgh exists within the complex, just beyond the doors of the Garden Lobby. In this Parliamentary hub, not usually open to the public, small pockets of chairs and tables sit beneath twelve large leaf-shaped skylights that protrude into the communal space. These skylights, according to Charles Jencks’s reading of Miralles, indicate “leaf-forms, and the upturned boats found on many Scottish shores, and a shoal of fish—all three. These petals swim, or float, or nestle according to preference, over the
In discussing the dual functioning of a window, Lefebvre noted, “As a transitional object it has two senses, two orientations: from inside to outside, and from outside to inside. Each is marked in a specific way, and each bears the mark of the other. Thus windows are differently framed outside (for the outside) and inside (for the inside).” These Garden Lobby skylights invite the outside world into the political interior. In addition to the leaves, boats, and fish that Jencks reads into them, I also see eyes that peer in to scrutinize the movements and gestures of the MSPs. For those within the Parliament, meanwhile, these transitional objects become ubiquitous symbols of the need to maintain an outside perspective while being engaged in political deliberations.

Outside, concrete branches and twigs adhere to the walls, scattered amid leaf-shaped windows that form alcoves within the MSP offices that exist inside the complex. These alcoves provide light into the offices and double as “think pods” for the parliamentarians to use as they contemplate constituency problems and national policy. These seats, modified “inglenooks” or fireplace hearths, wrote Jencks, “are symbolic and performative. In effect, they are meditation-caves, places for each MSP to gain courage to act as an individual with a conscience.” These nooks simultaneously perform a functional role (as a seat) and enact a symbolic gesture (contemplation, deliberation). In these transitional spaces, the constant reminder of the very soil, rocks, and vegetation that comprise Scotland press these Scottish stewards to not get caught up in personal squabbles or partisanship but to consider the geo-social impacts of their decisions instead and to act accordingly. These windows also frame and visually order the external world,
though, which could lead to the perception of a stabilized environment or could reiterate a particular domination of nature by, for example, looking down upon the city streets.

The use of these geographical features hints at a primordial construct of nationhood located through attachment to a specific territory or place. However, the elements of mobility, evident in the growth and physical movement of the grasses and trees (and embodied through individuals passing through the Parliament complex) intimate the need to *not* stay fixed in one particular place or within one particular mode of thought. Like the Actor Network Theorists, philosopher Elizabeth Grosz, interested in the connections between the practices of philosophical thinking and architectural design, argues against a binary between nature and culture. Grosz asserted that

> The natural must be understood as fundamentally open to history, to transformation, or to becoming, as open as culture, as innovative, temporal, and historical as the purview of social, psychical, and cultural life. The natural is the domain of bodies, the domain of materiality, which is not to suggest that bodies and materiality are thereby somehow outside of culture.\(^{296}\)

By connecting natural elements to the socio-political fabric of the Parliament through its architectural performance, the very materiality of the Parliament complex fosters an ethos of interactive and improvisational thinking and working. Miralles’s drawings, realized in the structures of the Parliament, acknowledge an awareness of the importance of connecting cultural antecedents with future technological performances. The use of natural elements is an attempt to bridge this perceived gap, but they could also been seen
as tokenistic, aesthetically-pleasing arrangements of the physical space that do not actually impact those working on Scotland’s behalf.

When looking at how the Parliament’s early legislation correlates with this geocultural awareness, it becomes clear that thinking about how to promote environmental stewardship has been a priority for MSPs. A bill that abolished feudal tenure existed as part of the Parliament’s ambitious inaugural agenda. In place for hundreds of years, this system still allowed (at the end of the twentieth century) individuals to preside over matters affecting the use of land that they did not own outright but to which they had more of a say over the use of than those living and working on it. Likely, the Scottish psyche still suffered from scars created by the brutal Highland Clearances, those events carefully withheld from view during the 1822 pageant, nearly two hundred years before the Scottish Parliament’s remounting. The Parliament’s decision to include the stewardship of land within their first round of legislation revealed a desire to take back what they saw as being crucial elements of what makes Scotland—namely the soil, rocks, hills, coastlines, and farmland. This reclaiming of territory gestured toward a “national rebirth” that protected natural resources and ways of life (farming, fishing) dependent on these lands. Another early bill that passed quickly called for the establishment and conservation of National Parks, a process already carried out at sites in England and Wales. This bill safeguarded the natural resources of lochs, glens, and hills and created a path for further tourism ventures in Scotland with the prospect of boosting local and national economies.
As in the case of the National Theatre of Scotland, however, where Artistic Director Vicky Featherstone voiced the need to retain an element of risk-taking after their first year once critical reception and/or public approval threatened to impact future programming, the Scottish Parliament has also garnered critique about it not taking enough risks, especially in the challenging of land use and ownership in Scotland. A third proposed bill during the Parliament’s first session, which was not officially enacted until 2003, concerned another aspect of land reform. This legislative act, considered by some to be a “flagship bill” for the Parliament, established guidelines whereby communities would be able to purchase the land upon which they lived once an independent owner put it up for sale. This type of collective ownership would help communities to meet their needs and to find innovative ways to utilize their resources within, for example, agricultural, heritage, and tourism markets. The bill also set out to define a right of responsible access for walkers and climbers who had previously been unable to use particular paths or routes that crossed individually-owned parcels of land. Andy Wightman, who has written extensively on land use and ownership in Scotland, expressed his concern with the delay of enacting this piece of land reform legislation. He read Parliament’s hesitation as evidence of a “lack of radicalism and purpose and a growing sense that such powers as will be created [i.e. the Scottish Parliament] will make little, if any, change to the way Scotland is owned.” This comment reflected the views of many who wondered at (and continue to question) the efficacy of devolution and efficiency of the Scottish Parliament. Would their decisions improve the lives of Scots across Scotland or solely benefit those in nearest proximity to the Parliament or in urban
locales? Was it even possible to effect radical changes within the first years of the organization’s constitution? The Parliament, like the NTS, faced great expectations from Scots at the time of its inception. And the worry expressed over each of these institutions points to the ambivalent roots of each endeavor. Like the NTS’s HOME events, however, the Parliament’s quick enactment of these two early bills, and their eventual passing of the third land reform bill, indicates a desire to resituate Scottish politics (be they theatrical, legislative, or both) within the very specific locales of Scotland’s physical territory.

In addition to creating legislation that protects and links places across Scotland, the Parliament also forges symbolic and physical connections between its location in Holyrood and other parts of the city and country. Some critics of the Parliament argue that its post-modern, organic-looking aesthetic does not fit well with the stately buildings that reside throughout the city. These other buildings, arguably viewed as concentrations of political power during the capital’s earlier manifestation during the age of Enlightenment, present a hierarchical system of ordering not identified as a characteristic of the Parliament complex. In terms of its historical consciousness of Edinburgh, though, the Parliament produces a complicated fashioning of history by folding Queensberry House into its architectural arrangement. This seventeenth-century home belonged to James Douglas (2nd Duke of Queensberry), who became an extremely unpopular Edinburgh resident once Scots suspected him of accepting a bribe to gather support for the 1707 Treaty of Union, which sealed the fate of the former Scottish Parliament. Including Queensberry House into the design of the current Parliament creates a
provocative, ironic temporal and spatial loop with the historical conditions (both past and present) of the Parliament and of the transference of governance from Scotland to London and then (partially) back again to Scotland. This architectural gesture not only links the Parliament to its own contentious history but connects its current site to the pre-industrial and pre-Enlightenment era of the city.

Just beyond Queensberry House stands Canongate Wall, which runs along the northern side of the complex and, through its reinforced concrete construction, offers a degree of protection to the Parliament. Instead of standing solely as a defensive measure, however, the design of the wall incorporates stones collected from quarries across Scotland; the multi-colored and textured stones are a patchwork of sorts that represents the physical differences across the nation and the durability of the nation evident in its geology. Twenty-four quotations etched into the stones contain proverbs, biblical

Figure 5.4: One of the twenty-four Canongate Wall stones that bear an inscription. Photo by author.

Figure 5.5: The Canongate Wall with a drawing of Edinburgh based on a Miralles sketch. Photo by author.
quotations, and the words of eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and twentieth-century Scottish writers. The words evoke feelings of intense pride and sorrow related to different historical moments and to specific aspects of Scotland’s landscapes. This sweeping poetic journey across time and space acts as a form of heritage production that constructs a seamless duration of history, meant to infuse the imaginations and, perhaps, activities of those who walk along the way, read the inscriptions, and recall their favorite literary works. These words also physically connect to a stenciled outline of Edinburgh’s cityscape, an image based on a sketch by Miralles during one of his stays in Edinburgh. This engraving winds its way along the wall from the quotations and towards the public entrance. The view of Edinburgh depicted through the materiality of the wall connects this part of Holyrood to the buildings that reside further toward the city centre. From the inclusion of Queensberry House to the inscribed stones and Edinburgh sketch, the Canongate Wall provides a preliminary introduction to the Parliament by connecting this twenty-first-century site to the city and country in which it lives and for whom it ostensibly works. At the same time, however, the use of these collected and organized stones and quotations positions the Parliament as the bearer of these histories and sites, as a legitimated site that represents fairly the diverse peoples that comprise these communities.

In order to synthesize the relationships suggested by the Parliament in terms of interiority and exteriority, transparency, nature and culture, and connectivity, I turn to the Debating Chamber as a case study. As I enter the large room, I, like the MSPs and their guests, walk beneath an archway created by the Arniston Stones. Originally part of the
pre-1707 Scottish Parliament, these stones were then used as part of a bridge on the grounds of Arniston House, just outside Edinburgh, before making their political reappearance in the Parliament. These stones, like Queensberry House, offer a symbolic and material connection between Scotland’s political history and its contemporary political moment fleshed out by this Parliament. They also imaginatively link this Holyrood site with another area of Scotland where the stones temporarily resided. Inside the Debating Chamber, I feel somewhat disoriented by the spacious room with its tiered rows of seating and high ceiling that invokes a nautical design. The inverted laminated oak beams overhead thrust down toward the central space and are connected through a system of stainless steel joints. The ceiling resembles an upturned boat keel with its concave shape and plank-like wooded base. Images of the Garden Lobby skylights come to mind because of the ceiling’s curved shape. Sunlight (when cloud cover allows for it) pours in through the high windows that reveal both structural components of the Parliament buildings as well as scenes of the outdoors (birds flying, clouds passing, people walking). Many of these windows (see Figures 5.6 and 5.10) face the 129 MSP desks, positioned several rows deep in an arc, which can be rearranged as needed. This room’s shape distinctly contrasts the confrontational style of Westminster’s chambers, repeating the calls for social interaction and collaboration echoed throughout the Parliament complex. Charles Jencks believed that the room “opens up the sides, so that conversation and consensus come before disagreement, at least architecturally.”

Beyond and above the MSP desks, several viewing areas provide seating for journalists, guests, and members of the public who want to watch parliamentary proceedings that are
not mediated by the television broadcasts, enabled by the dozens of cameras and monitors scattered throughout the room. Writing about the performative nature of the architecture of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, Kiel Moe proposed that the complex systems of pipes that snake throughout the large complex operate as an “integrating hub” for the research laboratories, effectively creating their own experimental spaces. I observe a similar process of integration occurring within this Debating Chamber. The oak beams, direction of seating and placement of walkways, wires and monitors, microphones and lighting instruments, emphasize a certain knitting together of, for example, objects, technologies, political beliefs, MSPs, and journalists’ narratives. If performances in this space become solely based on integration (and consensus), with participants and spectators only locating points of common ground however, then the Debating Chamber leaves no room for discord and dissent, primary building blocks of democratic practices.
These moments of disharmony, ideally, help to develop the effective, far-reaching, and sustainable laws desired by the Parliament in its performing devolution as a way to address, for instance, issues of social inequality and access to, for example, natural, medical, and financial resources.

As the Parliament attempts to model a creative and attentive response to an uncertain political future, it simultaneously acts as an anchorage and as a point of embarkation, as identified by James Robertson in the aforementioned poem. Incorporating elements of sustainability into its material design and functioning becomes one way for the Parliament to understand and evaluate the kinds of maneuvers and relationships it practices. Architect Donald Watson argues that the notion of “sustainability” derives from ecology. Sustainable architecture considers elements such as energy efficiency, the quality of indoor air, pollution output, and the reuse of building materials as architects draw up building plans. Watson cites the work of Amory Lovins whose central argument Watson reads as “the basis of eco-technology, the approach that design, technology, and science applied creatively can leap-frog current practices with innovations that dramatically reduce energy and environmental costs while improving economic productivity.”

In this formula, then, the creative use of design and technological performance can ensure a more environmentally-friendly approach to building without sacrificing an economic imperative. In the case of the Scottish Parliament, this necessarily mindful mode of design emphasizes connections between the Parliament and its immediate surroundings.
The Parliament complex resides on a “brownfield;” the former occupants of this site contributed to an important Scottish industry: brewing. As home to William Younger’s eighteenth-century brewery and later the twentieth-century offices of Scottish & Newcastle plc, the Parliament’s location lies at an interesting convergence of points in Edinburgh, which I discuss later in this chapter. In addition to engineers and construction companies procuring construction materials from Scotland, Europe, and South Africa, they also created gabion walls by collecting stones used during the site’s previous incarnation as a brewery. This reuse of materials links the Parliament to the industrial and socio-economic history of this particular site, and this collaboration of local and international resources comprises the Parliament site. Inside, the buildings perform on several scales to achieve sustainability. Recycling takes place through a system that captures and reuses water; natural ventilation cuts down on the need for air conditioning during the (infrequently hot) summer days. In addition to the recycling bins and paper used from recycled waste, the building also purchases 100% of its electricity from renewable sources (wind turbines, hydro, and biomass) and solar panels on its Canongate building helps to heat water.

In assessing the technological performance evident in the Parliament’s architecture, the application of a quantitative evaluative framework reveals certain problems and inadequacies. These shortcomings expose, in part, the difficulty in technological performance as acknowledged by McKenzie since it “is itself a challenging and moving target.” When the Parliament was under construction in 2001-2002, BREEAM, a private consultancy, issued a series of reports that assessed the presumed
environmental impact of the Parliament. What kind of ecological footprint would it leave as it mapped out routes for a successful future for Scotland? The reports assessed the “performance of the building at certification,”\(^{308}\) (certification was completed well before the buildings were fully functional), rating three of the complex’s buildings as “Excellent.”\(^{309}\) While these assessments predicted a high-performing facility, recent information reveals that the Parliament has not yet achieved its environmental goals. Environmental correspondent Jenny Haworth of *The Scotsman* newspaper reported that the Scottish Parliament fell short of the EU’s January 2009 deadline of implementing Energy Performance Certificates (EPCs) in public buildings across Scotland. According to Carbon Trust, a UK-based consultancy, “The likely impact of EPCs should be to differentiate good from poor performers.”\(^{310}\) This evaluation, which rates buildings on a scale of A to G, aims to reveal shortcomings in the efficacy of building materials and design and in the accountability on the part of those managing its systems. Haworth reported that in the Parliament “A ‘draft’ Energy Performance Certificate, displayed on the wall of the visitor area shows two small sections of the overall building achieved a B rating. To be considered "good", it should have achieved a B+.”\(^{311}\) So, although the buildings aim to function sustainably and to become a civic and environmental model for other public institutions and buildings across the country, its current mode of operation has not yet hit designated benchmarks.

The two dominant ideas forwarded by the Parliament’s design and materialization are the need for collaborative movement and for adopting a geocultural perspective. First, the Parliament’s resemblance to a university campus as opposed to a single great
assembly room pronounces the need for MSPs to discussion, question, assess, and propose ideas and for these parliamentarians to work with other local and national governments. The number of buildings and the physical connections between them imply a desire to keep moving, to change positions or perspectives when needed, and to revise earlier gestures of governance (such as those produced in Westminster). But while they deconstruct certain types of government structure,312 they construct their own means of legislating and producing Scottish subjects who must contend with the current legislation process. Second, the buildings repeatedly call attention to the world beyond the Parliament’s walls: the passersby, sky overhead, plants and trees, and other city buildings. Parliamentarians have a responsibility to remind themselves of the ramifications of their decisions, although this informed perspective has not stopped some MSPs from being mired in controversy.313 The physical spaces address the aspirational qualities of the Parliament’s founding principles as they integrate a system between nature and culture that shapes and is shaped by the political process. Within this labyrinthine structure, both Miralles and Dewar imagined a type of nation defined by experimentation and improvisation as Scottish Parliamentarians labored to secure a positive and productive future. This future required the participation of Scots from various sectors who felt that they, too, had a stake in the Parliament’s success, and so MSPs and Parliament staff considered ways for the public to learn about and participate in the legislative process through creative and engaging means.
Political Performances at the Parliament

In this next section, I revisit the Parliament by way of its cultural paradigm of performance where efficacy (or an ability to effect social change), I argue, is linked to a claim to accessibility. The ability to promote and to ensure accessibility (among individuals, between institutions and individual citizens, and between Scots and the lands of Scotland) is an important indicator of the Parliament’s ability to govern Scotland. The modes of cultural performance that I explore here combine elements of the technological and organizational performances present in these buildings but they also position Scottish citizens as both active participants and as passive spectators, which suggests an ambivalence in the projected ideals regarding the involvement of Scots within this ostensibly democratizing process. I begin outside the Parliament complex by considering how its Holyrood location informs the actions taking place indoors. I then scrutinize the development and programming of its Festival of Politics established in 2005. As I move from the Parliament’s relationship to two specific neighboring cultural institutions and to the theatrical performances taking place indoors, I ask how the Parliament’s (social, culture, economic, historical) placement within the city enters into dialogue with other kinds of touristic venues.

I arrive at the Parliament nestled into the bottom of the Royal Mile after walking passed important civic and cultural institutions, as well as Festival performers, creatively impeding the progress of walkers. Glancing across Horse Wynd, I see the Palace of Holyroodhouse, the Edinburgh residence of Queen Elizabeth II and family. Drawing thousands of tourists each year, the Holyrood Palace, according to architects Ranald
MacInnes, Miles Glendinning, and Aonghus MacKechnie, “was Scotland’s key project of the later 17th century…the Stuart monarchy, proud of their ancient lineage, paraded the past, but also looked to the future, presenting a powerful architectural image of history and strength as well as great sophistication.” Built on the remains of a twelfth-century Augustinian monastery, the Palace was built to reflect the enduring character of the Stuart reign in Scotland, which, unbeknownst to them, would end a few decades following the building’s completion. By using a then contemporary Neo-Classical design that incorporated extant elements, such as a sixteenth-century tower, the Stuarts deployed history to signal a lasting future, enacting an historiographic intervention via their architectural arrangement.

The placement of the Scottish Parliament across the street from this site imbues the Parliament with several layers of meaning. “Abutting the city’s most historic axis,” observed cultural geographer Hayden Lorimer, “the parliament is embedded in tradition, a new point of interest punctuating the trip between castle and palace.” The ever-circulating open-top bus tours, which carve out particular pathways through and around the capital, transport visitors from one area of the city to another, from the Castle to the Parliament and Palace. While the architecture of the Parliament (with its post-modern and organic assemblage of materials) and the Palace (with its Neo-Classical design that foregrounds order and unity) stand in direct contrast to each other, both designs blend elements of the past with aspects of an imagined, sustainable future. The proximity of the Palace to the Parliament also visibly marks Scotland’s ongoing relationship with the British monarchy and the United Kingdom; its three flying flags—the Saltire Cross, the
Union Jack, and the European flag—signify a complex relationship with various
governing bodies and physical territories. Along with the Palace of Holyroodhouse,
another nearby building completes a triangle of tourist destinations in Holyrood,
accessible to visitors via that open-topped bus tour.

Our Dynamic Earth, an interactive, multi-room exhibition about the geological
and geographical composition of our planet sits just a few dozen yards south of the
Scottish Parliament. The site, built between 1997-1999 with funding from the
Millennium Commission, incorporated additional parts of the Scottish & Newcastle
brewery as well as the British Gas Works building for its foundation and topped the
extant bricks with glass walls and a white canvas-like structure that serves as its roof.
Several masts pierce the curved canopy roof, supported by connecting cables. Our
Dynamic Earth declares on its website, “Just as its neighbours the venerable Holyrood
Palace and the new Parliament building use architecture to suggest political evolution, so
Dynamic Earth uses architecture to connect natural history to human and civic life.”

Outside of the building, large slabs of rock denote particular geological eras while they
form a terrestrial frame for an outdoor amphitheatre that faces the south walls of the
Parliament complex. The exhibits inside stimulate awareness of contemporary
environmental issues through a genealogical display of earth’s evolution. The
presentation of the perpetual, reciprocal impact between the natural elements of our
planet and the practices of individuals and institutions makes me consider how my own
daily actions impact this cycle. In addition to serving this pedagogic function, though,
this tourist site also operates as a corporate venue, attempting to continually re-invent
itself in economically sustainable ways through gala dinners, receptions, meetings, and conferences.  

This trio of sites then—the Parliament, the Palace, and Our Dynamic Earth—marks Holyrood as dynamic, historic, environmentally-conscious, and adaptable: a multi-faceted tourist destination-cum-political and ecological workplace. Although each building makes visible different kinds of performances, they work in concert to strengthen the economic viability of this particular urban area. Walking across and gathering in their interstitial spaces allows MSPs, Scots, Brits, and foreign visitors to take in these very different but connected sites that call attention to the stakes and political consequences of the development of Scotland’s geography, history, and socio-cultural practices. And if I choose to do so, I can purchase souvenirs at each locale to remember my visits and wanderings and the pronounced and implicit missions of each institution.
The cultural performance paradigm of the Parliament not only exists in its relationship to these two buildings and institutions, however, but it has also taken shape through the Parliament’s liaison to a festive Edinburgh at its most bustling time in the summer months. Following the excitement generated by the Parliament’s opening ceremony in 2004, MSPs and staff discussed how they might find ways to inject that initial enthusiasm and welcoming atmosphere back into the Parliament site in the months and years ahead. They wanted to invite Scots and visitors into the place where legislators enacted policy while simultaneously exposing and promoting the Parliament’s interior as an exhibition site to visitors from elsewhere in the British Isles, Europe, and the world. The Parliament, like Our Dynamic Earth, also began to host events for world leaders (in the areas of politics and information technology, for example).\(^{319}\) Seeking creative ways to “bring politics to the people,” they took advantage of Edinburgh’s self-proclaimed moniker of Festival City when they created a Festival of Politics (FoP) in 2005.

By making use of the summer recess to stage various panels, performances, and discussions, the Parliament continued to produce an active political environment by inviting writers, performers, historians, journalists, arts administrators, and scholars to address festival-goers and to prompt debate about relevant socio-economic and environmental matters. Particular artistic events (musical concerts, theatrical performances) buttressed the discussions and debates. If the 2004 procession marked the opening of the Parliament’s building in a spectacular celebration of Scottish nationhood in which the citizens functioned as spectators placed along the central corridor of the parade, then the festival offered an alternative, dialogic mode of congress in which,
potentially, citizens engaged with the processes of government by attending and circulating between different sessions over the course of several days.

In order to track the social efficacy of this mode of performance at the Parliament, I situate the FoP in the larger Edinburgh festival atmosphere to ask what is at stake for the Parliament in joining the network of festivals alive during the city’s summer months. Concerning domestic affairs, the act of opening the doors to the wider public and constructing a less formal atmosphere for citizens seemed to enable the visitors to learn about the building and the activities of government. This, in turn, familiarized the public with normally distant or opaque processes of lawmaking and offered an opportunity to engage with legislators face-to-face. In terms of international relations, the Parliament promoted itself to a broader audience by capitalizing on the influx of tourists who pass through Edinburgh each August. These tourists then returned home with images and memories of Scotland’s active and user-friendly political system. Along with these potential benefits, however, several questions arise. Would this festival tend toward creating a more informed public or would its composition only highlight a narrow field of interests as it forwarded particular political ideologies to those in attendance? Would it, like the Edinburgh Fringe, be criticized for not being Scottish enough? Would its drive to bring politics to the people ultimately create a passive space for audience reception rather than an enlivened, accessible space for civic participation?

In realizing the FoP, any potential socio-political and cultural advantages must confront technical and logistical regulations. Here the need for efficiency and smooth operational flow comprised within the organizational paradigm of performance chafed
against the call for innovation that could make politics a fun and creative collaborative
process. The danger in that collision is that concerns of scheduling, the technology used
for ticketing, the marketing strategies used to gain audiences and the technical savvy
required to archive the exchanges in the FoP sessions all begin to shape the environment
and the experience of the festival as well erect particular limits, for example, in the scope
of discussion topics. As the FoP developed, it utilized the communication infrastructures
already established by other August Festivals. FoP programmer and Parliament staff
member, Chris Berry, aware of the benefits of the extremely busy festival atmosphere,
addressed the ways in which the FoP organizes its ticketing through the venue that
handles the International Festival, shares speakers with the Book Festival (as a way to
offset costs and generate public interest), and advertizes in the massive Fringe Festival
program. By linking the FoP to these extant cultural arenas, the Parliament, with its
decisively smaller festival program, quickly entered the cultural milieu of the city during
an extremely busy tourist season.

Announcing its inaugural festival, the Parliament’s website proudly exclaimed:

The Edinburgh Festival calendar may be nearing its end, but the fun,
drama and excitement of the Scottish Parliament’s first Festival of Politics
is just beginning…the festival…will bring together the worlds of politics,
media and the arts in one of Europe’s most exciting buildings…[It] will
celebrate the role of the arts in developing a sense of self and
community.
Through this proclamation, the Parliament discursively constructed itself as a staging ground for fun and exciting events as it linked the drama of the Edinburgh Festivals with, arguably, the theatricality deployed in the realms of politics and the media. By connecting itself with the “excitement” of the Edinburgh festivals, and not with the growing cost of attending these festival events, the Parliament foregrounded a dynamic environment full of possibility. Additionally, many of the FoP events are free to the public, although some sessions cost up to £5 (or £3 for concessions). By deliberately positioning itself within Europe (as opposed to within the UK) in the above quotation, the Scottish Parliament proposed an architectural and political alliance with other European countries, available through an arts-centric agenda. It put the Parliament on equal footing with the autonomous states that comprise Europe and suggested an international dimension to this undertaking. The ambiguous “role of the arts” implied a wide swath of
cultural practices and events that would feed into the ongoing development of Scotland, a process reignited by devolution. The festival sought to mobilize a new culturally-informed, politically-motivated Scottish citizen within the house of government that could then circulate beyond the Parliament complex.

Sessions at the 2005 FoP primarily focused on Scottish politics and identity, laying to rest questions of whether or not this event would be Scottish enough. Operating as a forum to promote civic nationalism, the FoP program included sessions concentrated on democracy in Britain, gender and politics, and a five-part sequence of events called “People and the Land.” The inclusion of these latter sessions pointed to a sustained concern about the ownership, use, and stewardship of Scottish lands (made evident earlier during the first round of legislation and through the Parliament’s architecture). This forum, however, labored to target a much larger group of individuals to discuss and debate various facets of the relationship between Scots and the environments in which they lived and worked, to both inform the public and to hear from them. That year, the “role of the arts” was explicitly manifested through political song performances and workshops, a one-woman performance of late eighteenth-/early nineteenth-century poet, Lady Nairne, and an outdoor performance of Liz Lochhead’s play Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off by the Holyrood Amateur Theatrical Society. The artistic rendering of historical figures (Nairne, Mary) in this opening festival connected the Parliament to the Scottish past and, in the case of Mary Queen of Scots, linked the Parliament to its regal neighbor, visible to the spectators seated on the landscaped amphitheatre outside the Parliament’s doors.
In discussing the FoP’s first few years, Chris Berry recalled, “The events were themed to be interesting and political, but not necessarily party political and explore a diverse range of subjects.” I interpret Berry’s observation as a possible link between the FoP agenda and that of the Parliament complex’s design, which does not pit one party against another but, instead, offers a place for discussion, debate, and contemplative policy-making. While the Festival program team hoped to explore a diverse field of political topics, the fact that only a few people chose the events meant that certain perspectives would not be taken into consideration. This apparent lack may have been subsequently acknowledged by the team, however, since the Parliament has created a webpage that asks for suggestions for a particular theme, session topic, or speaker for the 2009 FoP, which will mark the fifth anniversary of the festival and the Parliament’s tenth year in session.

As I examine the degree of social efficacy of the cultural performance paradigm inaugurated by the Festival of Politics, I focus on two theatrical events: Lung Ha’s 2006 Legislative Theatre performance and Rowan Tree’s 2007 production of The Journey of Miss Jeannie Deans. These two different performances epitomize some of the desired intentions and creative designs of the FoP programming as well as shortfalls in terms of social efficacy, political engagement, and participatory citizenship. The first event created a (Augusto) Boalian forum theatre experience that asked audiences to play the role of *spect-actors* as we observed the unfolding of two different scenarios and offered suggestions to re-model discriminatory situations. This event questioned the very principles of the Parliament, namely accountability, participation, and power-sharing, as
the format questioned what constitutes citizenship. Lung Ha’s theatrical form pointed to the construction of social boundaries (real and imagined) and enabled spirited discussion and debate, appropriate for the Parliament building. Rowan Tree’s 2007 performance was an adaptation of Walter Scott’s 1818 novel, *The Heart of Midlothian*. This play, set in early eighteenth-century Edinburgh, primarily focused on the journey of Jeannie Deans from Edinburgh to London to plead for her the life of her sister, who had been found guilty of infanticide. In addition to staging this individual’s determination and courageous journey, the play briefly called attention to issues of legal justice and political intervention. In my readings of these two creative performances I ask if they promoted an ethos of active participation and what limits they expose to the different modes of performance produced by and through the Scottish Parliament.

In 2006, Festival organizers programmed an event with Lung Ha’s, a company comprised of actors with learning and physical disabilities that has been creating theatre production since 1984. Their performance examined issues of equality and
accessibility in everyday situations encountered by members of the disabled community in Scotland. Although identified as “Legislative Theatre,” the company’s piece diverged from Boal’s format in that it did not lead to a debate with politicians about the issues that it presented. Instead it used forum theatre to bring attention to these socio-political issues by creating an interactive site for spect-actors. This performance configuration encourages audience members to propose alternative movements, gestures, and dialogues to the given scenario, which either the performers or the viewers improvise into the scene in order to rehearse the suggestion and promote further discussion. By foregrounding the process of theatre-making and the construction of social relationships, Lung Ha’s work arguably enacted an embodied corollary to the systems built into the Parliament that suggest movement, adaptation, and process over a fixed political identity.

Situated on the first floor in a small room currently used as the Parliament’s crêche, the performance environment for this piece enabled all participants to focus on the bodies in the space. The event’s spect-actors were comprised of ten actors and approximately forty spectators. Non-Lung Ha’s participants, like me, sat close together on one side of the small room. The piece did not create a discernible theatrical setting (no backdrop, curtains, or props) and employed only a few basic furniture items (a table and a few chairs) suggested the different scenarios. The room itself and the collection of bodies within it became the materials of the theatrical event. After facilitators briefly introduced the session’s format, the company showed a short video about Independent Living, a community website providing information to disabled and elderly peoples in the UK.

Following, the video, Lung Ha’s company staged two different scenarios: one scrutinized
the lack of wheelchair access to a post office and the other portrayed a verbally abusive relationship between a caregiver and her client in a café. In each of these scenes, the convergence of public spaces and behavior intersected with private interests or lives. After presenting the first scenario, the facilitators paused the performance and sought input from audience members. They encouraged not only our suggestions about how we might remedy this situation, but they asked us to physically join in the scene in order to change the direction of it by rehearsing possible solutions.

As a “reflection on reality and a rehearsal for future action,” (how Boal described forum theatre), the piece presented by Lung Ha’s asked those in attendance to consider how they might re-think or re-play their own encounters in these settings as well as the steps that they could take to ensure the enforcement of existing laws regarding accessibility. This performance, in tandem with our location in the Parliament complex, created a dynamic, intimate space for discussion as we contemplated creative and effective solutions. Yet did this production do any more than purge its participants of frustrations over daily injustices? By being housed within the Parliament, as part of this FoP programming attempting to make policy-making a more personal activity, the session seemed to move beyond an idealistic gesture towards social change; instead, the room and interaction within it became an active rallying point once problems were identified and articulated via bodies and voices. Making visible the limitations imposed by physical boundaries generated within a particular physical environment (a post office or café), became the first step to tackling a complex problem, offering a way to engage with a participatory democratic system.
Through its use of forum theatre, this performance also labored to make visible the boundaries imposed through theatrical conventions that divide the space between performers and spectators. As it acknowledged this common practice of theatre-making, the performance simultaneously addressed the entrenched roles and hierarchies present, in this case, Scottish society. By continually shifting the visual and discursive focus of the scene (through the involvement of audience members and the piece’s dramaturgy of producing two different scenarios instead of one cohesive narrative), the session asked for collaborative engagement and a rethinking of creative means to address social inequality. “The piece was about political experiences,” argued Chris Berry, “And that was a great opportunity for people that quite often are not necessarily engaged directly to talk about how society and politics affects them, to get their message across.”

Berry reluctantly critiqued a political system that does not actively seek to democratize its constituencies by addressing the specific problems of a particular area or social group. This sentiment aligns with part of the thinking behind creating a Festival of Politics to address important issues and problems with Scots—and others—within the “big house of change in Scotland.”

Lung Ha’s contribution to the FoP complicated a single understanding of citizenship and (dis)ability as it literally re-played moments of denied access and unfair working conditions experienced by Scots across Scotland. The performance structure encouraged interventions into the socio-political transactions that occurred, attempting, in the wheelchair scenario for example, to develop support systems and more physical access for bodies circulating throughout Scotland’s towns and cities. Although not every spectator leapt at the opportunity to join the action taking place “on
stage,” I observed concentration on the faces of my fellow *spect-actors* whose verbal contributions repeatedly shifted the tenor of the scenario. Several kinds of transactions occurred in this politically potent space: bodies, gestures, thoughts, and personal experiences moved across the small room as the stakes of these scenarios became more visible. As one woman seated in the “audience” section reluctantly volunteered to take the place of one of the actors, the energy shifted again as she sought to try out new approaches to the scene. While not fully successful in terms of reaching a positive solution (no easy answer was attained, no piece of legislation was proposed) the event emphasized the necessary ongoing interaction and collective problem-solving needed to democratize.

The event staged difficult questions concerning active citizenship in contemporary Scotland. What are the boundaries or limits of social policies? Do citizenship rights actually include *all* Scots? What kind of social movements can and does the Parliament promote and implement? This event opened up a format for recognizing a social problem, questioning the conditions that made this problem possible, and encouraging all of us present to seek alternate solutions to a given situation. By informing audiences about a social encounter that may normally remain in our peripheral vision, if it appears in our visual field at all, Lung Ha’s performed a pedagogic function that asked us to carry these ideas and scenarios beyond the walls of the Parliament. Through a more informed perspective, we can act to promote more equitable social relationships. The performance also showcased an arguably peripheral room of the Parliament complex that was used because of loose beams in the Debating Chamber that
meant no FoP events could take place in it during the 2006 sessions. Lung Ha’s intended
goal with this theatre event was to create a space for “empowering the audience to make change and work in solidarity with the performers.” By emphasizing that we are each social actors within the networks of Scotland, they anticipated an active mode of citizenship both within and beyond the walls of the Parliament complex.

Another theatrical event staged by the FoP the following year in 2007, was The Journey of Jeannie Deans, written by Judy Steel and directed by Catriona Taylor. The dramaturgical arrangement of this performance retold a familiar Scottish event in a locale in close proximity to the play’s setting. Two main narratives comprise Walter Scott’s The Heart of Midlothian, from which Steel drew her dramaturgical material. One plotline involves the lynching of Captain John Porteous following his firing into an Edinburgh crowd that had begun rioting because of Porteous’s cruel treatment of a condemned man who had aided his accomplice in escape. Known as the Porteous Riots, this 1736 incident still lingered in the minds of many Scots and, physically, in the remaining pieces of the gallows in the Grass Markets. The central narrative of Scott’s tale, however, concerned Jeannie Deans who walked from Edinburgh to London to plead on behalf of her sister, Effie, who had been condemned for infanticide when she was unable to produce her baby in court. The tale of personal struggle framed within a larger socio-political issue of national import (the quelling of Jacobite antipathy, the loss of the Scottish Parliament) is a narrative structure familiar to Scott’s readers. This favored formula was, of course, deployed in Rob Roy Macgregor, written just a few months prior to Midlothian. The particular retelling of the story staged by Rowan Tree at the FoP pared the lengthy text to
an hour’s performance by focusing almost exclusively on the individual strife within this family and the heroism of Jeannie. Although the dialogue included a few lines concerning events in Edinburgh and the state of Scottish politics in the years following the Act of Union, the performance relegated the socio-political dimension of this moment of intense conflict in order to foreground Jeannie’s journey south.

This tale proved complementary to Scott’s political leanings, since he was, after all, a determined Unionist. The performance used the courageous, successful actions of its protagonist to counter Scotland’s lost political autonomy. Jeannie’s rise from these political ashes disclosed the strength of an individual on a difficult pilgrimage, seeking the benevolence of sovereignty performed in London. While the play had the potential to align itself with the questions raised in Lung Ha’s Legislative Theatre in extremely salient ways by calling attention to the impact of Scotland’s policies on individual citizens, the geo-political constitution of Scotland, or the kinds of physical and social movements necessary to enact social change. This dramaturgical composition might have also induced audiences to find a renewed interest in and enthusiasm for investigating the Parliament’s historic roots. The production, as far as I could tell however, did not encourage debate or discussion, which was particularly ironic given its performance venue: the Debating Chamber. (The ceiling was restored to working order in 2007.)

As I previously mentioned, the Debating Chamber is a large, open room with seats for nearly 400 spectators. Aisles delineate areas of the MSPs’ seating transformed into the audience’s seating, and the viewing galleries became mezzanines and balconies overhead. Rowan Tree’s production, in adapting the space for their purposes, used the
central platform, where the Presiding Officer usually conducts business, as their main staging area. Two large topographical maps depicting Holyrood hung over black curtains, which covered the elevated seating and podium. These maps not only provided visual clues to the audience about the specific location of the play’s narrative, essentially just outside the Parliament’s doors, but they also formed an impromptu backstage area where the three actors and solo fiddler changed costumes and concealed props. Apart from the maps, with which the actors never directly engaged, other performance props existed in the form of small objects: a kettle, a bucket, etc. While most of the action centered on this focal point of the room, at times characters traversed the aisles, particularly during Jeannie’s journey to London to plead before Queen Caroline, wife and regent to King George II. In addition to these movements breaking up our visual focus, the actors each portrayed several characters. These maneuvers displayed the dexterity of the actors while introducing additional characters, such as the Duke of Argyll and Queen Caroline, who embodied the political conditions of this historical moment. By reiterating the
concentration of sovereignty in London (the only site that brings a happy conclusion to the tale), the performance seemed to re-valorize a political inequality between Scotland and Britain by not questioning what was at stake in this encounter or in Jeannie’s plead at the feet of Queen Caroline.

Since the performance so clearly focused on Jeannie, audience members received lines such as “Holyrood wasnae built in a day” and “Do you think the time will come when we’ll have air ain Parliament again?” with a bit of laughter, possibly resulting from the irony of those lines being written nearly 200 years before devolution or because of the inflated budget and protracted deadline resulting from this Parliament’s actual construction. The narrative immediately disregarded these lines, however, as it returned to the personal situation at hand. The serious anxiety, frustration, and loss felt in this early eighteenth-century moment in Edinburgh, amplified through the Porteous Riots, was transformed into clever, satirical side comments, rather than complex investigations into what fueled such observations. Like the discrepancies made visible between the architectural design and aspects of sustainable performance in the Parliament, this production exposed another kind of incongruity through its use of theatrical convention and performance space. While the play might have created the opportunity to portray a local account of how politics, law, and justice intersected, producing a complicated network of relationships between personal and public rights, for example, or to encourage debate around issues of social justice and imprisonment, the play returned to its tidy dramaturgical arrangement and its laudable heroine. By doing so, the production, and the FoP, exposed a measure of underperformance in terms of the Parliament’s mission to
bring politics to its people. While Rowan Tree made no overtures about being a politically-engaged theatre that sought to point out the stakes in the social encounters depicted in their production (in the way that Lung Ha’s operates) as an actor within the network of the FoP, it exposed a missed opportunity to impact its viewers. While the theatrical conventions and dramatic material deployed by Lung Ha’s troupe interrogated issues of social justice, political mobility, and collective action, the dramaturgical structure used by Rowan Tree did not urge its audience to include themselves in the participatory arena ostensibly established by the Parliament. The play’s re-presentation articulated a national narrative in a familiar mode that maintains the status quo. Jeannie Deans played the quintessential hero, embodying reason and fortitude on a quest for familial justice. This image of national subjecthood (not particularly distinct from Francis Osbaldistone), differs from the under-construction and active mode of Scottish subjectivity promoted by Lung Ha’s. Here, the subject, although physically mobile (able to traverse the same places as Osbaldistone in a reverse route), has no ability to effect change beyond her immediate family.

What made this discrepancy between the two theatrical presentations more noticeable was the use of the Debating Chamber as the venue for *Jeannie Deans*. Prior to the play’s commencement, I was struck by this crowd’s resemblance to a typical audience at a mainstream theatre venue. Basing my assessment solely on my visual perception and not direct communication with them, the audience looked predominantly white, middle-class, and middle-aged. The Lung Ha’s audience, in contrast, included a much wider range of ages and ethnicities. Unlike the performance venue of Lung Ha’s room, the
Debating Chamber’s space felt remarkably unenthusiastic. The room being half-full, with its audience spread across such a large area, likely attributed to my impression. Also, unlike Lung Ha’s forum theatre event that constructed and deconstructed its performance conventions in order to elicit participation from spectators, Rowan Tree operated primarily within a proscenium frame-based arrangement. Movements within the aisles or moments of direct-address to spectators (and we were clearly framed as spectators and not spect-actors here) felt more supplemental or tongue-and-cheek than integral to the embodied storytelling. The performers’ movements and interactions, then, actually emphasized the silence of the Debating Chamber and the lack of multiple perspectives. Even the displayed Mace, a symbol of Scottish governance presented in a glass case just beside the main performance area, stood mute and explicitly unnoticed. A theatrical performance in this space might have created a provocative opportunity to examine a nostalgia that Doreen Massey identified as a “meeting-up (again),” an acknowledgement of the ways in which “home” (in this case, Scotland) has changed.\textsuperscript{330} The necessary back-and-forth movement of Massey’s configuration might have materialized in a performance’s consideration of the socio-political and cultural conditions of 1736 and 2007 in Edinburgh to tease out the implications of political governance and Scottish identity-in-process. In \textit{Jeannie Deans}, though, neither moment received adequate time or space within the FoP venue of the Debating Chamber. The show offered an opportunity to sit quietly within the Parliament and not a provocative exploration of citizenship and political efficacy.
If the FoP intends to match the Parliament’s aims as a forum of participation and power sharing, then it needs to seek out a variety of pathways. One future direction, according to Berry, might occur through the creation of satellite events that take place beyond Edinburgh’s borders at different times of the year. This decision would align with devolution’s decentering of political authority and generate something akin to the NTS’s HOME projects. Additionally, according to a report produced by the Scottish Parliament regarding its 2008 FoP, participant surveys indicated that the festival has drawn a slightly more diverse group of spectators than its 2007 program did: the number of disabled spectators rose from 2% to 11% and the percentage of non-white spectators increased from 2% to 5%. Clearly the Parliament has a long way to go to ensure that it creates a more inclusive, democratizing, and accessible environment, but these figures suggest a positive start. Also, interestingly, in its four years the FoP format has been exported to other nations looking to explore creative ways to engage their citizens and to acknowledge the connections between artistic and political practices. In 2008 a Festival of Politics was launched at the Houses of Oireachtas Parliament in Ireland (October) and the Flemish Parliament (November). Whereas Catalonia became a model for Scotland in 1999, nearly a decade later, Scotland has become an innovative example for other small nations hoping to promote their local and national resources while forwarding their own political agendas.

Through this cultural mode of performance the Scottish Parliament presents and produces a nation that relies on its artistic modes of production to engage its citizens and to disseminate information. Through theatrical and musical performances, panels on the
nature and financial support of arts programming, and the use of artistic media to contend with social and environmental problems, the Parliament showcases its reliance on creativity and innovation. Evident in the two productions that I investigated here, though, tension exists concerning how to effectively utilize the arts to promote the foundational principles of the Parliament: openness, accountability, the sharing of power, and equal opportunities. By finding relevant ways to utilize the technological and organizational aspects of the Parliament (in the design of rooms, inclusion of MSPs, or deployment of electronic media, for example), the Parliament can promote an active interrogation of Scotland’s political past while finding ways to collaborate toward creating a more just future.

**Final Thoughts**

In its creative efforts to implement more engaging methods for citizens to interact with their elected representatives and legislative processes, the Scottish Parliament attempts to connect two distinct modes of artistic practice in their FoP: a socialist, civic approach to the arts, as demonstrated by Lung Ha’s, and an instructive, consumer-oriented style manifested by Rowan Tree. While these different approaches to storytelling and theatre-making fit comfortably within the organizational paradigm of performance (each required minimal technology, involved few bodies, took place within an hour’s time slot), they prove less compatible when viewed from a cultural paradigm of performance that takes as its aim a degree of social efficacy. From this angle, the pieces work against each other producing, on the one hand, citizens as active agents within the political process, willing to speak up and take risks, and, on the other hand, passive
consumers hearing a re-told tale of personal triumph that does not take into account 200 years of social, economic, and cultural change. By trying to reconcile these decidedly different approaches within their arts-centric agenda, the Festival of Politics points out ambivalences within the Scottish Parliament. As it proposes an experimental, ecological, and organic rethinking of national politics as mutually local and global, it simultaneously runs the risk of re-articulating nineteenth-century modes of thought regarding sovereignty, re-inscribing socio-political hierarchies, borders, and limitations to its citizens, and promoting culture as a commodifiable good.

When looking at the development of the Scottish Parliament, from Miralles’s sketches (that incorporated natural geographies and the stories embedded within them) to the concretization of the buildings (choice of site and materials, engineering decisions regarding energy flow and pipe systems), I notice a limiting of its scope from an exciting, nearly limitless possibility to the execution of particular tasks (agendas, meetings, debates, debriefs, interviews, bill-writing). The continued maintenance of the building draws attention not only to the initial costs of the site but to its needing to be frequently evaluated, measured, and rated. These acts of preservation echo the need to maintain public interest in this political institution as it maps out future agendas for Scotland (either retaining its current devolved state or making a bid for independence). The Festival of Politics is one way to proactively repair public doubt over or the perceived and actual distance from the legislative process in a representational parliamentary democracy. One cannot assess the FoP through solely the technological, organizational, or cultural paradigms, however, given that this site (building, institution, location) exists
as a node between several material and embodied networks. The incompatibilities
between these different paradigms of performance make visible Scotland’s own
ambivalent position within the UK—as a nation with limited political governance, a
substate. Scotland must continually negotiate within multiple (local, regional, national,
European, global) networks to keep adapting to meet changing domestic and international
needs.
Conclusion

Scotland is a fascinating site to explore the dynamics of political and theatrical labor that shape the contours of socio-cultural developments in the early nineteenth, late twentieth, and early twenty-first centuries. Having been placed under the constraints of the Treaty of Union in 1707 and, in the last decade, devolution, Scotland does not fit within an established model of an autonomous nation-state. Its non-compliance with a traditional mode of nation-state formation (and the scholarship that attempts to explain the nation’s creation) requires an examination of Scotland that echoes its complex, multi-layered dimensions. In my attempt to tease out such social, political, geographical, and cultural dimensions, I have tried to attend to the conflicting, paradoxical, and multivalent opinions and processes of Scotland present(ed) in these historical moments. The optics of theatre and performance enable me to scrutinize the embodied modes of articulation in past and present “national” performances in Scotland. Here I can think through particular elements of the Scottish nation in terms of dramaturgical arrangements, modes of theatricality, collective participation, the construction of stages, and the positioning of citizens as participant-spectators. Scrutinizing ideas and enactments of Scottish nationhood through theatre and performance also allows me to highlight the kinds of proposals for and rehearsals of governance and policy that individuals and institutions have organized over time, in part, through the deployment of explicit theatre productions and large-scale performances.

In my chapters I have endeavored to provide connections between different sites, events, objects, institutions, individuals, and organizations to ask (in Chapters Two and
Three) what is at stake in the politics of theatre production and (in Chapters Four and Five) what are the implications of a political institution utilizing theatrical means to call attention to and gather support for specific policies and ideologies. In each of these instances objects are not simply static artifacts and bodies are not simply passive receptors of ideas. Instead, the exchanges between these materials actually point to an active generation of networks shaped by processes of rootedness and circulation. The forms of rootedness or locality take shape in the use of local building materials in the Scottish Parliament, the staging of embodied narratives in several distinct performance venues in HOME, the political potential embedded in the city streets of the capital, and the specific ideas articulated by urban architectures. These embedded aspects of Scottishness find a mobile counterpart in the interconnected buildings and walkways of the Parliament; the global touring of Black Watch (the regiment and theatre production); the mobilization of Scottish, English, and colonial bodies in the 1822 pageant; and the movement of scenic backdrops and a retold story in Rob Roy.

By using methodologies from theatre and performance studies as well as critical materialist approaches from cultural geography, anthropology, and sociology that investigate the relationships formed by the circulation of these materials, I attend to different dimensions (intellectual, physical, affective) of an embodied event and aim to break down binaries between, for example, nature/culture, subject/object, local/global. Upon teasing apart these dualisms, I can see how different materials (texts, bodies, buildings, geographies, legislation, mission statements) perform in relation to one another and shape the social practices whose repetition constitutes political realities. Identifying
intriguing nodes along these networks enables me to temporarily pause these dynamic engagements in order to delve into the constitution of a specific activity, event, or production. I have done this in order to scrutinize particularly dense relationships, but I do not mean to suggest that these formations indefinitely hold the shapes that I have highlighted at each site. For example, in my second chapter, I attempt to parse elements and qualities of a particular performance that has been labeled and categorized and, I argue, limited under the rubric of “national drama.” By taking apart a production’s different components and then reordering them, at multiple performance venues, I have tried to enliven the possibilities for how these productions of *Rob Roy* were in dialogue with specific sites (venues, cities) and how the differences made visible (or made invisible) at each site means that they could not have produced the same meaning in each city for each audience. After breaking apart the notion of “national drama,” I turn to a national theatre’s conscious decision to generate various portable relationships between the diverse elements of Scottish theatre communities. The NTS has invested financial and cultural capital into the places that comprise the diverse environments, individuals, and practices that they see at the forefront of Scottish theatre today. Their first season, with its located stories in Shetland and Stornoway, and its stories of Black Watch soldiers set adrift at transnational performance venues exemplifies the generative tension between rootedness and circulation that is the broad framing of this dissertation.

I re-imagine another network of relationships, one in which novelist and stage-manager Walter Scott operated as one piece of a complex puzzle of narrators, urban locales, and mobile texts and images. In the 1822 pageant I point to disciplining
maneuvers (Scott’s *Hints* and George’s audience) and embodied storytelling (marching Highlanders and *Rob Roy* production) that did not ultimately yield their intended results. The pageant’s use of theatricality, a framing of particular movements and viewpoints and/or participation within them, actually produced a doubleness, exposing the overt inauthenticities that appeared hand-in-hand with the production of Scottishness (Omai’s account, the circulating satires). The recent development of the Scottish Parliament and its Festival of Politics steps away from the pro-Union stance articulated through so much of the 1822 pageant’s dramaturgy. Attempting to devise a flexible and participatory Scottish political system that can meet changing socio-economic and political needs (which may include “devolution max,” if not actual independence) of the twenty-first century, the Scottish Parliament offers a collaborative and inclusive model for a democratic parliamentary system. Its having been shaped by current neoliberal conditions, however, means that its operating procedures—its multiple paradigms of performances—conflict, at times, with the Parliament’s founding principles. The programming of the Festival of Politics makes visible the tensions between its attempt to animate an inclusive, processural-based notion of citizenship and its reuse of earlier modes of citizenship, characterized by passive recipients of national narratives and unquestioned governmental rule. How each contemporary institution, the NTS and the Scottish Parliament, contends with issues of social inequality, human rights, environmental crises, and poverty may prove its relevance to Scottish society and to other institutions across its borders.
In many ways Scotland’s current exports of cultural products and practices (the visual and performing arts, for example) parallels the labor of other nations in the changing socio-political terrain of Europe. As increased information, communication, and transportation technologies appear to shrink and/or homogenize the supranational territory of Europe, its constituent countries seek to distinguish themselves through local heritage production (museums, galleries, performance venues, local products, and festivals) that attempt to take advantage of ever-increasing tourist numbers and apparently diminishing borders. Scotland, like other small European nations, ostensibly lacking the resources of its larger neighbors, must find innovative ways to market and to promote itself as a tourist destination and its peoples as innovative thinkers and producers. This process requires flexibility, adaptability, and creativity from the politicians, artists, organizations, and cultural institutions spread across Scotland. What events like the NTS and the Festival of Politics make apparent is a desire (and perhaps necessity) to draw from the resources that provide Scotland with its unique sense of place, community, and environment, its particular geological and geographical makeup, its complicated relationship as part of the UK, its social and political histories, and its performing arts (music, theatre, dance, opera). A danger lies, however, in this rich, complex landscape of places, stories, and practices becoming circulating commodities that displace the material conditions of their development and translate into tourist kitsch like the ubiquitous tartan that spills out of shops across the capital and, indeed, the country.
As I move forward with this research, one area that I would like to consider in more depth is Scotland’s recent cultural policy decisions. Here I want to dig into the *Homecoming Scotland 2009* programming and reception to see the kinds of relationships and narratives produced and sponsored by this tourism initiative and how specific events within its agenda explored, articulated, or questioned geocultural aspects of Scottishness. I am also interested in researching the development of Creative Scotland, planned to begin operation in 2010 through the convergence of the Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Screen. Undoubtedly the decision to design and implement Creative Scotland draws, at least in part, from the rampant development of the “creative industries” in the UK, which promote, develop, and export artistic practices (crafts, film and video, performing arts, architecture, fashion) that the state feels contribute to its economy. I am curious about the labor relations involved in this kind of postindustrial, neoliberal marketing scheme and the role of artists and artisans in developing the policy and distributing the funding. I am also interested in how Scottish history becomes reactivated and, perhaps, revalued in this process as Scotland attempts to carve out and capitalize on its creativity and innovation.
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The Design Panel included architects Joan O’Connor, John Gibbons, and Andy McMillan as well as journalist Kirsty Wark and Robert Gordon of the Scottish Office Constitution Group.

The design proposals of the five finalists appeared in seven cities across Scotland, and nearly 5000 viewers commented on their design preference. The popular vote rested with Rafael Vinoly (New York) and Reiach & Hall (Edinburgh). The other finalists included: Michael Wilford (London); Richard Meier (New York) with Keppie Design (Glasgow); and Glass Murray (Glasgow) with Denton Corker Marshall International (Sydney). For more information on the winning architecture firms, please see their individual websites: “EMBT” Enric Miralles-Benedetta Tagliabue 15 April 2009 <http://www.mirallestagliabue.com/> and “RMJM” 15 January 2009 <http://www.rmjm.com >.


Ibid.
These modes of e-participation in Scotland further exemplify the Scottish Parliament’s contrast to Westminster. As far as I can tell, although the British Parliament also maintains an updated website that includes live broadcasts and email updates, it has not taken as many steps to encourage its citizens—who, of course, live within a much broader geographical area than the citizens governed by the Scottish Parliament—to assume a more active role in the proceedings.

Jencks 35.

Lefebvre 209.

Jencks 48.


The two areas designated through these measures are the Cairngorms National Park (northeast Scotland) and the Loch Lomond and Trossachs National Park (west central Scotland). For more information, please see: “History and Background to the Creation of National parks in Scotland,” Scottish Natural Heritage 9 February 2009 <http://www.snh.org.uk/strategy/natparks/sr-np0h.asp>.


The building houses the offices of the Presiding Officer, Deputy Presiding Officers, and the Chief Executive and other staff of the Scottish Parliament.

Most quotations are written in English, although some appear in Gaelic and Scots, an effort to physically reflect the multi-lingual dimension of Scottish culture at the time of the Parliament’s (re)construction.

Jencks 13.


A “brownfield” is a site that has been previously built upon. A “greenfield” indicates a site that formerly stood as a field, meadow, or park that has been newly built on.

This area was likely settled from the early twelfth century, and it was a popular and increasingly populated area through the sixteenth century when King James IV began to build what would become the Palace of Holyroodhouse. The growing affluence of the seventeenth century changed drastically with the 1707 Treaty of the Union and the shifting of resources and individuals to what would become the New Town built in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In 1781, William Younger bought the area upon which the Parliament currently stands and opened a brewery. As business increased, he began purchasing the surrounding areas of land. With business booming in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it is alleged that at one time the beer produced in this area accounted for 25% of Scotland’s entire beer brewing. Although beer production on the site ceased in 1950, Scottish & Newcastle plc continued to use the buildings as their headquarters until the site was purchased in September 1998. For more information please see: “Site Selected,” Scottish Parliament 18 January 2009 <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/vli/holyrood/projHistory/HolyroodSiteSelected.htm>.

McKenzie 99.

BREEAM stands for: Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method.

The overall rating was calculated by the percentage of credits received in these areas multiplied by the Environmental Weighing Factors. You can download each of the BREEAM reports from: “Sustainability,” Scottish Parliament 15 April 2009 <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/vli/holyrood/building/Sustainability.htm>.

The following buildings were assessed with these scores of “Excellent”: Queensberry House (84%), the MSP Building (82%), and the Assembly Building (77.5%). The Assembly Building was assessed in 2002 and so its rating was a result of the new guidelines imposed by BREEAM that year.


Here I am thinking of the 2006 scandal involving former Scottish Socialist Party Leader and MSP Tommy Sheridan, who was allegedly caught on film admitting to having visited a swinger’s club and then was written about in the tabloid, News of the World. Sheridan won a libel case against the tabloid and later sold his story to another tabloid. During the midst of this weeks-long scandal, Sheridan withdrew from the Scottish Socialist Party and created the Solidarity Party.


“Corporate Events,” Our Dynamic Earth 16 April 2009 <http://www.dynamicearth.co.uk/events/whatisodevents>.


Chris Berry, Personal Interview, 26 August 2007.


Augusto Boal is a Brazilian theatre practitioner who has developed methods of performance that examine power relationships between socio-political, economic, or cultural “oppressors” and those “oppressed” by them. For more information on Boal’s methods of using theatre to engage with the political dimensions of community formation and individual social responsibility, please see: Augusto Boal, Theatre

324 For more information on Lung Ha’s Theatre Company, including previous and current productions, please see: “Lung Ha’s Theatre Company,” 16 April 2009 <http://www.lunghas.co.uk/home.asp>.


326 Ibid.

327 This phrase was used by Lung Ha’s as they introduced their legislative theatre piece.


329 This narrative is allegedly based on an account of a Dumfriesshire woman, Helen Walker, who had walked to London from Scotland to ask pardon for her sister’s alleged crime of infanticide. Walter Scott mentions Walker in the introduction to the 1830 edition of *The Heart of Midlothian*. To view a copy of this introduction, please see: “The Heart of Midlothian by Sir Walter Scott, Bart.” Software for Teaching English Language and Literature and its Assessment (STELLA) 6 February 2009 <http://www2.arts.gla.ac.uk/SESLL/STELLA/STARN/prose/WSCOTT/HEARTMID/intro.htm>.

330 Massey 124-125.

331 These figures were calculated through the return of 500 surveys during the 2008 Festival. For more information on this latest Festival of Politics, please see: “Paper 102 Summary: Festival of Politics 2008,” *Scottish Parliament Corporate Body* 11 February 2009 <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/corporate/spcb/minutes/papers-08/1126_Paper_102.pdf>.
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