



*Visiting the Family and
Introducing the Royals: British
Royal Tours of the Dominions in
the Twentieth Century and
Beyond*

Robert Aldrich

Visiting the Family and Introducing the Royals:
British Royal Tours of the Dominions in the Twentieth Century and Beyond

Robert Aldrich

Abstract: Until the early twentieth century, colonial tours by British royals were rare, and the 1911 Delhi Durbar, where George V and Mary were crowned Emperor and Empress of India, marked the first time a reigning monarch had visited his overseas realms. As the century progressed, such imperial visits become increasingly frequent, and Elizabeth II is the most widely travelled monarch in history. Royal tours of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa were different from those to other outposts because of the ‘Dominion’ status of the four countries (until South Africa became a republic in 1961), and because of the kinship felt to bind the monarch to settler populations. Such tours provided opportunities for the sovereign and family members to manifest the monarchy in the flesh to distant ‘relations’, wave the flag of Empire (and the Commonwealth), and express appreciation for the sacrifices of Dominion soldiers in the South African War and the World Wars. Tours, however, evolved in response to changing conditions in the Dominions, the Empire and the wider world, as well as the particular personalities of royal visitors and the political intentions of their hosts. There were also great differences in ways in which various groups—such as men and women—figured in and responded to tours. Furthermore, the changing place in the tours of Māori in New Zealand and Indigenous people in Australia reveals much about the position of native populations in the Dominions and their special relationship with the monarchy.

Keywords: British Empire, colonialism, Commonwealth, Queen Elizabeth II

ince ancient times, travel has been an important aspect in the life of monarchs. Royals left their palaces to inspect near and remote parts of their realms, and to fight wars and negotiate treaties; they went on pilgrimages and crusades, and they sometimes fled into exile. Women royals left home for dynastic marriages, often in distant courts. In the early modern age, the royal progresses of Queen Elizabeth I, the visits to their far-flung domains by the Habsburg emperors, and the landmark trip to Western Europe by Tsar Peter the Great were some of the signal peregrinations of sovereigns.¹ Touring increased in later times, partly because of greater ease of travel, but also as monarchs and their family members tried to secure the throne against currents of revolution and republicanism.

¹ There is a considerable literature on early modern royal tours. Among representative scholarly works are: Teofilo F. Ruiz, *A King Travels: Festive Traditions in Late Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 146-192; Arthur MacGregor, “The Tsar in England: Peter the Great’s Visit to London in 1698,” *The Seventeenth Century* 19, no. 1 (2004): 116-147; and Krisztina Kulcsár, “The Travels of Joseph II in Hungary, Transylvania, Slavonia and the Banat of Temesvar, 1768-1773,” *Collegium* 16 (2014): 34-57.

The acquisition of overseas empires provided a further mandate for more far-reaching tours.

In two earlier collections edited by Cindy McCreery and myself, authors have explored the connections between the ‘crowns and colonies’ in the age of empire, and the particular importance that royal tours held from the late 1800s onwards in strengthening imperial bonds.² Though the rulers of Spain’s vast overseas empire never visited the Americas, nor did Queen Victoria ever venture to any of her many colonies outside Europe, other royals did so. Queen Victoria dispatched her son Alfred on a world tour in the 1860s and 1870s, and sent the Prince of Wales (later Edward VII) on a tour of India and the Middle East; subsequent royal progeny followed suit.³ As Charles Reed has shown, the royal tours of the late 1800s and early 1900s were highly significant in welding Britain’s disparate colonies into an empire, affirming the rule of the imperial sovereign, and developing a sense of belonging among the ruler’s subjects.⁴ In 1901, the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York—the future King George V and Queen Mary—embarked on an imperial and world tour, and ten years later, they set sail for the durbar in Delhi where they were proclaimed Emperor and Empress of India. The Prince of Wales, the future Edward VIII, undertook imperial tours in 1919-1925, and various other members of the royal family journeyed overseas to show the Crown and wave the flag.

The most recent scholarly work to look specifically at royal tours of the Dominions is Frank Mort’s 2017 study of the Prince of Wales’s tours of 1919-1920. Mort credits these visits to the Dominions with creating a more democratic and accessible image of the royals, helped by the prince’s popularity and approachability, despite the stress and tedium that he experienced on his travels. Returned soldiers and women (as is also suggested by several contributions to this issue of the *Royal Studies Journal*) were among the most important groups in the prince’s audiences. Mort speaks of the ‘royal populism’ that the tours helped to introduce, suggesting a more horizontal, rather than simply vertical, relationship between royals and subjects. A modernist prince symbolised a modern monarchy for the post-war world.⁵

With the reign of Elizabeth II, royal tours by the monarch, her consort, and her children would become yet more frequent and even more extensive; indeed, the scale of their

² See Robert Aldrich and Cindy McCreery, eds., *Crowns and Colonies: European Monarchies and Overseas Empires* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016); and *Royals on Tour: Politics, Pageantry and Colonialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018).

³ See Michael Nelson, *Queen Victoria and the Discovery of the Riviera* (London: I. B. Tauris and Co., 2007); Matthew Glencross, *The State Visits of Edward VII: Reinventing Royal Diplomacy for the Twentieth Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). Among studies of pre-1900 royal visits to colonies, see, for example: H. Hazel Hahn, “Indian Princes, Dancing Girls and Tigers: The Prince of Wales’s Tour of India and Ceylon, 1875-1876,” *Postcolonial Studies* 12, no. 2 (2009): 173-192; on a later Prince of Wales’s travels, see: Hilary Sapire, “Ambiguities of Loyalism: The Prince of Wales in India and Africa, 1921-2 and 25,” *History Workshop Journal* 73, no. 1 (2012): 37-65.

⁴ Charles V. Reed, *Royal Tourists, Colonial Subjects and the Making of a British World, 1860-1911* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

⁵ Frank Mort, “On Tour with the Prince: Monarchy, Imperial Politics and Publicity in the Prince of Wales’s Dominion Tours 1919-20,” *Twentieth Century British History* (2017): doi: 10.1093/tcbh/hwx037. Pioneering works on British royal tours of the Dominions include Judith Bassett, “‘A Thousand Miles of Loyalty’: The Royal Tour of 1901,” *New Zealand Journal of History* 21, no. 1 (1987): 125-138; Phillip A. Buckner, “The Royal Tour of 1901 and the Construction of an Imperial Identity in South Africa,” *South African Historical Journal* 41, no. 1 (1999): 324-348; and Phillip A. Buckner, “Casting Daylight upon Magic: Deconstructing the Royal Tour of 1901 to Canada,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 31, no. 2 (2003): 158-189.

travel is extraordinary. The twentieth-century British royals, of course, were not the only ones to journey to the colonies, though some fellow monarchs of empire—like the long-ruling Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands—never did so. Our collection *Royals on Tour* explores a number of visits by Europeans to their own colonies, and to those of other countries, as well as to places that some dreamed might become colonies. Kaiser Wilhelm II and his spouse went to the Ottoman Empire in 1898, a trip that some hoped (in vain) would lead to German colonial expansion in the Levant. The Portuguese Crown Prince Luís Filipe went on a lengthy tour of his country's colonies in Africa in 1907 (just a year before he and his father, the king, were assassinated in Lisbon). Belgian royals visited the Congo from 1909 until its independence in 1960, and continued to do so after independence. The Japanese Crown Prince went to colonised Taiwan in the 1920s. King Vittorio Emanuele III visited Italy's African colonies in the 1930s.⁶ Likewise, the Spanish king Alfonso XIII undertook several tours of Spain's residual enclaves in North Africa in the early years of the twentieth century.⁷ Meanwhile, non-European royals were more and more likely to move around their own domains, to set out on foreign tours, and to go abroad for education or military training.⁸

In the case of the present-day British royals, when Prince Philip completed his last official engagement in mid-2017, before taking retirement, journalists noted that he had completed 637 solo overseas tours since Elizabeth II acceded to the throne in 1952. Elizabeth herself, by the age of ninety, had officially visited 128 countries a total of 271 times, and she is undoubtedly the most travelled monarch in history. The Queen has journeyed to lands all around the globe, including most of those that were at one time British colonies. The foreign country she has most often visited (27 times) is Canada, followed by Australia (18 times), and it is no coincidence that Elizabeth remains officially Queen of Canada and Queen of Australia, the head of state of fully independent nations.⁹ Her tours are important in understanding the evolving relationship between the British monarchy and the Commonwealth since the mid-twentieth century.¹⁰ From the 1950s onwards, the attendance of a royal representing the

⁶ See Aldrich and McCreery, *Royals on Tour*.

⁷ Alfonso Iglesias Amorin, "Alfonso el Africano: la monarquía in Marruecos," in *Alfonso XIII visita España: monarquía y nación*, ed. Margarita Barral Martínez (Granada: Comares Historia, 2016), 221-244.

⁸ King Chulalongkorn (Rama V) of Siam was notable in this regard. See Kannikar Sartraproong, *A True Hero: King Chulalongkorn of Siam's Visit to Singapore and Java in 1871* (Bangkok: Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 2008); P. Lim Pui Huen, *Through the Eyes of the King: The Travels of King Chulalongkorn to Malaya* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2009); and Robert Aldrich, "France and the King of Siam: An Asian King's Visits to the Republican Capital," *French History and Civilization* 6 (2015): 225-239. Several sons of Rama V were educated in Britain, Germany, Denmark, and Russia; on Prince Chula Chakrabongse's years of residence in Russia, see the letters he and his father wrote to each other: Narisa Chakrabongse, ed., *Letters from St Petersburg: A Siamese Prince at the Court of the Last Tsar* (Bangkok: River Books, 2017).

⁹ See *The Royal Tour: A Souvenir Album* (London: Royal Collection Publications, 2009), which provides an overview of Queen Elizabeth II's tours of the Commonwealth. The articles in the present issue provide references to studies of her visits to Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa. There are various studies of other tours as well. See, for example: Klaus Dodds, David Lambert, and Bridget Robin, "Loyalty and Royalty: Gibraltar, the 1953-54 Royal Tour and the Geopolitics of the Iberian Peninsula," *Twentieth Century British History* 18, no. 3 (2007): 365-390; and Ruth Craggs and Harshan Kumarasingham, "Losing an Empire and Building a Role: The Queen, Geopolitics and the Construction of the Commonwealth Headship at the Lusaka Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, 1979," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 43:1 (2014): 80-98.

¹⁰ See Philip Murphy, *Monarchy and the End of Empire: The House of Windsor, the British Government and the Postwar Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Queen—though never the Queen in person—also was a key presence at independence ceremonies of British colonies,¹¹ and the Queen herself, until the last few years, continued to take pride in attending meetings of the Commonwealth Heads of Government and the Commonwealth Games.

Among the royals' tours around the Empire and Commonwealth, those to the Dominions have a special valence. The Dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and, in the early twentieth century, South Africa, after all, were linked to the United Kingdom by the 'crimson thread' of British settlement and kinship, a majority of their population (except in South Africa) tracing their ancestry to the British isles.¹² The descendants of the English, Scottish, Welsh, and Irish—soldiers, convicts, free settlers, later migrants—traditionally prided themselves on their British heritage, including a Westminster system of government, codes of law, educational institutions, and English language and culture, even if they increasingly also saw themselves as 'Australians' or 'Canadians.' Though the Catholic Irish and some of the Scottish often viewed Britain with mixed feelings, they nevertheless carried with them to the new worlds a sense of Britishness and a kinship with those in the 'British world.'¹³ French Canadians and Afrikaners in South Africa had a different ancestry and often an awkward relationship with both their compatriots of British origin and the Crown, but many of them, too, eventually became attached to the imported traditions of the United Kingdom, including the monarchy.

In the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, those of British 'stock' also gloried in a 'race patriotism' that formed an integral part of allegiance to the mother-country and the 'white' British Empire, and that was seen to differentiate British settlers both from Continental Europeans and, above all, from non-European 'natives'. Notions of race, and the superiority of the European (and foremost the British) race over others, became entrenched in colonial ideology, and were enacted in such legislation as the 'white Australia' policy concerning migration, which was not fully revoked until the 1970s.¹⁴ Although apartheid was adopted as official policy by an autonomous Nationalist (Afrikaner-dominated) government in South Africa only in 1948, it built on a long history of racialism and segregation under British rule. Race patriotism buttressed a sense of solidarity across the empire, and not just in the Dominions, as it extended to other 'white' settlers in Africa, Asia, and elsewhere, and was used to discriminate against Indigenous populations, and to favour inward migration by 'Anglo-Saxons' seen to share British 'values.' Racialised versions of national belonging continue to resurface in the context of contemporary debates, though the Crown and monarch are now seen, in principle, to embrace all of the diverse peoples, cultures, and religions of the countries over which the Queen reigns.

Despite the granting of responsible government to the white-settler Dominions in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the federation of different colonies into the united provinces of Canada (1867) (with Newfoundland joining in 1948), the Commonwealth

¹¹ Philip Murphy, "Independence Day and the Crown," in *The Iconography of Independence: "Freedoms at Midnight,"* ed. Robert Holland, Susan Williams, and Terry Barringer (London: Routledge, 2010), 19-28.

¹² At various points, other British territories—notably Ireland, Newfoundland, India, and Ceylon—were also termed "Dominions," but the word more commonly refers to Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa.

¹³ See James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Anglo-World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

¹⁴ See Deryck M. Schreuder, and Stuart Ward, eds., *Australia's Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

of Australia (1901), and South Africa (1910), it is difficult to date the independence of these countries or of New Zealand (which was from 1841 a unitary colony). The Balfour Declaration of 1926 recognised the Dominions of Australia, Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, and South Africa, as well as the Irish Free State, as “autonomous Communities within the British Empire,” but their legislatures gained full independence from the British Parliament only with the Statute of Westminster in 1931. South Africa became a republic in 1961 (in large measure, in defence of apartheid), but Australia, Canada, and New Zealand still recognise the British sovereign as head of state, represented locally by a governor-general (and governors in the Australian states, and lieutenant-governors in the Canadian provinces). Other formal ties—appeals to the Privy Council in London as the law court of last resort, the granting of imperial honours including knighthoods—endured to differing degrees, though institutional connections between Britain and the Dominions have considerably loosened in recent decades.¹⁵

Republican movements have existed in the Dominions since the nineteenth century, though their influence ebbs and flows. For many English-speaking Canadians, the monarchy and the Westminster system comfortably separate them from the presidential system (and overbearing presence) of the neighbouring United States.¹⁶ In New Zealand, republicanism has not, until recently, gained a great deal of traction. Australia, with its strong syndicalist tradition, large non-‘Anglo’ population, and political aspirations in the Asia-Pacific, however, has seen a more sustained republican movement.¹⁷ In 1999, the country held a referendum on becoming a republic, but diehard monarchists (a decided minority) joined with republicans who objected to an unpopular proposed model for the election of a head of state by a two-thirds majority of the federal parliament in order to defeat the initiative.¹⁸ In the late 2010s, the heads of both major Australian political parties are avowed republicans, and the majority of the population is quite likely inclined to be so; the current New Zealand prime minister is also a republican. Though the proposal for a change in constitutional status never disappears from the agenda, a move to a republic is not imminent, certainly not during the reign of the incumbent monarch.

With the ancestral, institutional, and emotional ties between Britain and the Dominions, the visits of monarchs and other British royals, therefore, took on the character of family visits as well as the tour of a sovereign. While on tour, Queen Elizabeth has presided at the opening of parliaments, occasionally, if rarely, has assented to legislation with her own signature (a duty generally delegated to the governor-general) and held investitures. However, it is probably as much on an affective register as on a legal one that the monarch, and her forebears and family members, were welcomed with such enthusiasm in the Dominions. The Queen’s visit to Australia in 1954, one of the first by the young monarch and the first by a sovereign ‘Down Under,’ was greeted with rapture, and as much as a third of Australia’s population turned out to see the Queen in person. On a later visit by the Queen, the conservative prime minister, Sir Robert Menzies, memorably (if rather embarrassingly for

¹⁵ Peter Boyce, *The Queen’s Other Realms: The Crown and its Legacy in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

¹⁶ David E. Smith, *The Republican Option in Canada, Past and Present* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999).

¹⁷ See Mark McKenna, *The Captive Republic: A History of Republicanism in Australia, 1788-1996* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

¹⁸ David Hill, *Australia and the Monarchy* (North Sydney: Random House Australia, 2015).

some) recited words from a poem by Thomas Ford, “I did but see her passing by, and yet I love her till I die,” to express his and, he assumed, Australia’s, monarchist sentiments.¹⁹

The stature of royals has diminished since the mid-1950s, and royal tours have not been immune to political controversy: not just rising republicanism in Australia, but also moves for secession in Quebec, and issues surrounding Indigenous people throughout the former Dominions. The Queen and her kin, nevertheless, have usually still been greeted with respect and affection wherever they travel. Visits by Diana, Princess of Wales, were met with near hysterical interest by press and public, such was the reputation of the ‘people’s princess.’ More recent tours by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge, and Prince Harry, have revived the royal family and royal tours, though youth, celebrity, and the lingering prestige of royalty, rather than their formal status as representatives of the Crown, undoubtedly explain that popularity. ‘The Palace’ and monarchists are no doubted buoyed, however, by the reception that the young royals have received, probably hoping for a further boost from tours that include Prince Harry’s new bride.²⁰

Royal tours to the Dominions during the twentieth century, in some ways, were less fraught than those to (other) former British possessions, precisely because of the community of interest represented by race patriotism, imperial loyalty and bonds of kinship, and the relatively muted activism of anti-colonial, Indigenous, and republican movements until recent decades. But, of course, complex considerations of security, choice of itinerary, protocol, and domestic politics surround any royal tour. The tours mobilise the staff of the royal household and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (and, earlier, the colonial bureaucracy in London), as well as national and local governments in the countries visited. Great attention is always given to programmes, speeches, and audiences, with the visitors’ movements carefully choreographed and timetables meticulously calibrated. In the earlier years, the press was deferential and newspaper reports often official, but later journalists showed less reserve. With *paparazzi* eager for scoops for newspapers and television (and, more recently, with words and images streamed live on the internet), each action, word, or gesture is scanned. Not surprisingly, the frocks and hats of the monarch and female royals command almost obsessive coverage, but journalists (and presumably readers) are also intrigued by walkabouts, off-hand comments, informal encounters, gaffes, and other human interest details, proof of the continuing aura that surrounds those bearing royal titles. The fascination that monarchy continues to command in the public, and the reasons behind royal mania, merit further study.

The objectives of royal tours to the Dominions were multiple. “I must be seen to be believed,” the Queen once supposedly remarked, and royal tours are intended first and foremost to show off the sovereign or other members of the royal family. Visits provide opportunities to testify to their benevolent interest in countries over which they reign. Until well into the twentieth century, they symbolised residual aspects of British suzerainty over the Dominions, local governments, military forces, and other areas of the public sphere. A world tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901 served to thank the Dominions for support in the South African War. Tours following the World Wars, notably those of the Prince of Wales (the future Edward VIII) in the 1920s, expressed appreciation for the

¹⁹ Jane Connors, *Royal Visits to Australia* (Canberra: NLA [National Library of Australia] Publishing, 2015).

²⁰ Cele C. Otnes and Pauline Maclaran, *Royal Fever: The British Monarchy in Consumer Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015).

Dominion efforts in the Great War, paid tribute to their soldiers fallen in battle, and honoured returned soldiers. Special occasions, such as the opening of the Sydney Opera House in 1973, coincided with tours, and thus allowed the monarch to play the starring role. As time passed, and tours became more frequent, travel was organised so that regions not previously visited could be included, permitting yet more people to behold the queen or other royal. The ‘ocular’ relationship between sovereign and (nominal) subjects thus remained significant, and ‘colonials’ jostled to glimpse a royal visitor.²¹ Seeing a royal, especially a monarch, in person not just through the lens of a television camera, remains for many an indelible memory.

In Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (and in other countries over which she has continued to reign), the Queen in a sense had, and has, a dual role as monarch of the United Kingdom and of the individual countries she visits. Constitutional experts differ with regards to the ‘divisibility’ of the crown, and the multiple ‘personalities’ of the monarch are revealed when some spectators wave British flags, others the flag of Australia, Canada, or New Zealand. On at least one occasion, the queen officially visited the United States, during a tour of North America, as Queen of Canada and not Queen of the United Kingdom. In a strict sense in the Dominions, the arrival of the monarch has been that of a ruler alighting in her own realm, not a tour by a foreign sovereign.

For monarchists, such visits re-affirmed the constitutional position of the Crown in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand and, they hoped, proved the benefits of monarchical government. Indeed, regular visits afforded signal opportunities to celebrate monarchy and contest republicanism (especially in Australia). As the place of the monarchy in national life was nevertheless attenuated, such tours gave unique occasions for monarchists to attempt to galvanise public support for the throne; republicans, meanwhile, used tours to restate demands for abolition of the monarchy. But even for government leaders and ordinary people deeply ambivalent about the Crown, the visit of a royal bestowed honour, and a chance to bask in the regal limelight. If played well, a tour returned benefits for a political leader in the electorate and wider public opinion, both at home and abroad. Even ardent republican ministers were careful to show due respect for royals, though some drew the line at bowing or curtsying to the visitors; the Australian prime minister Paul Keating was damned as a discourteous ‘lizard of Oz’ in the British sensationalistic newspapers when he dared to touch the Queen.

Local reactions to visits, in the Dominions as elsewhere, varied substantially. The great popularity of such tours in the first half of the twentieth century seemed to decline in later years, though it might be reinvigorated when a particularly photogenic royal, such as Princess Diana, came to visit. Older people, with perhaps more traditionalist attachments to ‘queen and country,’ usually showed greater enthusiasm for the royals than their youthful compatriots, though the outpouring of young people for Diana, and later William and Kate, or Harry, was sometimes surprising. Women, as Carolyn Harris discusses in this collection, were considered to be more interested in royals than men. People with British ancestry, unsurprisingly, might feel more identification with visiting royals than those from different ethnic backgrounds. Radicals sometimes shunned royal visits altogether, voicing criticism of the hoopla, the expenses incurred, and the anachronism of a ‘foreign’ monarchy. Opponents of monarchy and

²¹ Milinda Bannerjee, “Ocular Sovereignty, Acclamatory Rulership and Political Communication: Visits of the Princes of Wales to Bengal,” in *Royal Heirs and the Uses of Soft Power in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Frank Lorenz Müller and Heidi Mehrkens (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 81-100.

other dissidents made their disapproval felt by boycotting royal tours, ostentatiously turning their back to royal visitors (as occurred when the Prince of Wales visited South Africa in the 1920s), or organising demonstrations. Most Dominion residents nevertheless observed the goings-on with lively curiosity, though fascination with royal figures, and flag-waving at public events, did not necessarily translate into deep and abiding allegiance to the institution of the monarchy. Royal visits, at the very least, were a good show. In remote towns and small communities, a royal visit was a notable event that punctuated quotidian provincial life.

For Indigenous peoples, a royal visit—like the whole relationship of the Crown to ‘First Nations’—took on complex meaning.²² For some, as the articles in this issue demonstrate, a royal on tour symbolised a colonial regime under which their homelands had been conquered, their people disenfranchised, their culture denigrated, their lands taken, and their resources exploited. Yet for others, the monarchy represented an institution above and beyond settler populations, the governments they dominated, and their commercial interests. The monarch was a figure to whom to present grievances, and to call upon for justice and recognition of ‘First Nations’. In New Zealand, where the British had signed the Treaty of Waitangi in the name of Queen Victoria with Māori in 1840, there was an even more enshrined link between the Indigenous population and the British monarchy. Meetings between a visiting royal, especially the sovereign, thus assumed enhanced significance, though encounters were not without controversy about which ‘native’ groups would meet the visitor, where, in what circumstances and to what ends. Meetings between royals and Indigenous leaders were nevertheless always newsworthy, both ceremonially and politically, and symbolism was strong: from the moment that the future Edward VIII briefly put on a Māori fur cloak in the 1920s, to the time that Prince Charles was inducted into a Native American tribe and donned a feather headdress in Canada in the 1970s.

Royal tours to the Dominions shed light on many aspects of the histories of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa—and Britain itself. They point to the constantly evolving nature of the monarchy, the transformation of the British Empire into a Commonwealth, and the place of Britain in the world. They provide insight into the construction (and sometimes destruction) of imperial, national, and racial identities. They show how the cultural and geopolitical positioning of each Dominion altered over time. They illustrate different registers of monarchical rule: constitutionalism, hierarchy, affect, and celebrity. Studies of royal tours, such as the ones presented in this issue of the *Royal Studies Journal*, thus afford opportunities for historians to reflect on broad issues of colonial and post-colonial governance, the legacy of empire, relations between various communities in multicultural states, and the place of monarchies in the modern world. By examining royal tours to the British Dominions in the twentieth century, the articles suggest further themes for research, including royal tours to other destinations, travels by monarchs of different countries (including non-European ones), the ‘spectacular’ and emotional pull of royalty, contemporary issues surrounding the Crown and the Commonwealth, and tensions between Indigenous people and fellow citizens.

The articles, by focusing on particular tours, underscore the significantly different experiences of royal tours in various Dominions. Those variations relate, as the authors emphasise, to particular characteristics of each Dominion, and each royal tourist, and to the

²² See Sarah Carter and Maria Nugent eds., *Mistress of Everything: Queen Victoria in Indigenous Worlds* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

timing of visits. Though united into a great ‘imperial family’ under the Crown, the Dominions displayed marked dissimilarities in history. Carolyn Harris points out that the first royal visit to Canada, by the future William IV (as captain of a Royal Navy ship) in 1786 occurred two years before a British colony had even been established in Australia. In New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi, as Jock Phillips argues, was an abiding issue in royal visits, but it had no equivalent in Australia. Early royal visits to Australia gave approbation to efforts to show a burgeoning and energetic society of firmly British Antipodeans redeemed from the convict past, while white South Africans portrayed their country as an exemplar of civilisation on the ‘dark continent.’ Within each Dominion, regional differences also appeared. Rivalries between cities and states (or provinces) meant that regional authorities competed to host royal visits and used them as platforms to vaunt the merits of their respective communities.

Context, as Barbara Messamore underlines in her article, is vital to understanding royal tours. Prince Alfred’s tours in the 1860s and 1870s occurred during a period of relative Victorian imperial and industrial self-confidence. The Prince of Wales, in the 1920s, toured in the wake of wartime destruction and sacrifice. By the 1930s, the ‘readjustment’ of imperial relations through post-war conferences and the Statute of Westminster, as well as Edward VIII’s abdication, provided an entirely new constitutional context. Elizabeth II’s first Commonwealth tour as sovereign in the 1950s was situated in the glowing early days of her reign, and pride in Britain and the Empire’s hard-won victory in World War II. It also occurred as the Empire had begun to fall apart. Countries that represented a massive share of Britain’s colonial portfolio—India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon—had already gained independence (and all eventually became republics). Ironically, the number of tours of the British ‘empire’ expanded rapidly just at the time that the empire was shrinking. With the British military withdrawal from east of Suez in 1971, and the entry of Britain into the then European Economic Community two years later, Britain reoriented itself away from the old imperial outposts. Yet, royal visits may have been one of the significant strategies in retaining and reinforcing links between the Crown (and the British) and the colonies of the old empire fashioned into a new Commonwealth in a post-colonial world.

The times were changing in the Dominions as well. When the Queen first went to Australia in the 1950s, many and possibly most Australians still clung to their British roots. By the time of her 1970 tour, as Hugh Chilton suggests in this issue, Australia was re-defining its relationship with Britain. Developments in the following years, in particular, the controversial dismissal of Prime Minister Gough Whitlam by the monarch’s representative, Governor-General Sir John Kerr, in 1975, would further distance Australia from Britain, and likewise kindle republican ardour. ‘Royalty and loyalty,’ in Messamore’s felicitous conjugation, which remained key to successful visits, to Australia and elsewhere, were increasingly separated, if not antiquated. In geography as well as in chronology, close attention to the particular and varying traits of Dominion tours is necessary. Royal tours, though following practiced scripts, were not all the same in each country, precisely because Britain and each of the Dominions was undergoing rapid and profound political, social and cultural metamorphosis. Each tour displayed its own character.

The contributions to this issue also show the benefits of disaggregating royal tours and moving away from composite perspectives about, say, ‘Australian’ or ‘Canadian’ sentiment. Carolyn Harris shows how women’s involvement in, experience and memories of royal tours of Canada were in some ways different from those of men—and how the role of Canadian

women in royal tours has often been marginalised in the scholarship. She demonstrates how women were often confined in stereotypical roles as participants, and were reported as being primarily interested in royal fashion. Yet, their participation nonetheless illustrated the widening presence of women in public life: in earlier years, several royal women came to Canada as spouses of British-born governors-general, but by the 1980s, a visiting royal was welcomed by Canada's first female governor-general. Barabara Messamore quotes one newspaper account that described the Prince of Wales in the 1920s as "a paragon of all manly virtues," proof that gender issues are not solely a question of the place of women, but are of a deep-seated inflection of public and private life, and of expectations and representations of royal visitors and their hosts. Several other articles underline the important gender angles of royal tours by considering the presence or absence of women, the predicted or unexpected roles men and women played, and the masculinist ethos that (as Christopher McDonald writes here) dominated the martial displays that loomed large in each royal appearance.

Race is always a crux in colonial history and was never invisible in royal tours. Looking at issues of race, and the responses of different ethnic groups to royal visits, offers another way of disaggregating public reaction. Jock Phillips's discussion of Māori and royal tours points to the crucial issue—evoked in other articles as well—of relations between the monarchy, Dominion governments, and 'native' populations. Māori, black and Indian South Africans, First Nations peoples in Canada, and Indigenous Australians had different perspectives on royals than did British settlers (and their descendants) and diasporic migrants from other parts of the world. The way that native peoples and cultures were or were not incorporated into royal visits was a central consideration of tour organisers, and is now a key theme of investigation for scholars. As Phillips shows with his comments on various Māori *imi* (tribes), it is revealing to zoom in to avoid 'essentialising' Indigenous populations marked by great diversity.

Mark McKenna similarly finds diversity of opinion among Indigenous Australians and ambiguity in their relationship with the Crown. The British occupied Australia and dispossessed its original inhabitants under the aegis of the Crown, but Indigenous people have sometimes viewed the monarch as benefactor, and have appealed to the sovereign for redress of their grievances. The Australian government, however, did not deem Indigenous Australians fit to join the delegation sent to London for Elizabeth II's coronation in 1953, and only gradually were Indigenous people given more than a tokenistic and folkloric presence during her early visits to Australia. From the 1970s, however, she was aware of Indigenous protests at the time of her visits, and by the last years of the twentieth century, the monarch's speeches made mention, often sympathetically and explicitly so, of their plight. In 1999, just before Australians voted on a republic, the Queen received a group of Indigenous Australians at Buckingham Palace (for the first time), and many others have met the Queen and other royals on their visits to Australia. McKenna asks a pertinent question about whether the Crown holds any "any substantial political utility for Indigenous Australians."

Settler populations, like Indigenous ones, included many different social and cultural groups. Hilary Sapire's article on the visit to South Africa by the Prince of Wales (later Edward VIII) in 1925 provides yet another example of the benefits of deconstructing royal tours, but in a way different from focusing on Indigenous versus settler populations, or considering gendered receptions of peripatetic royals. The Prince went to South Africa less than a

generation after the Anglo-Boer War, which had pitted two white settler communities against each other. The British emerged victorious, but with great recriminations on the part of the Boers at loss of independent territories, confinement of Boer prisoners to British concentration camps, and the exile of captured Boer soldiers. By the mid-1920s, some, but not all, of the Boers were reconciled to British rule, but there were also strong and mounting strains of Afrikaner nationalism and republicanism (which later extended to diehard defence of apartheid). The visiting Prince faced a daunting task in winning over the Afrikaners, but he seems to have acquitted himself well of the mission; his efforts to say a few words of Afrikaans in a speech and his meetings with Afrikaners provided good strategies for *rapprochement*. Thus, the travels of the Prince of Wales in South Africa not only showed off the dashing young heir to the throne and provided an apprenticeship for his future (though ephemeral) rule, but they also underlined the value of royal tours in the domestic life of the Dominion, even though the popularity of the royals could not prevent South Africa, under the leadership of the Afrikaner-dominated National Party, from later becoming a republic.

Christopher McDonald's wide-ranging article on three royals tours of New Zealand—in 1901, 1920, and 1927—focuses on military aspects of the pageantry and politics. The first tour, as already mentioned, took place just after the South African War, and the second after World War I; military parades and reviews played essential parts in the ceremonies. In 1927, even as Britons and New Zealanders hoped for definitive peace, military pomp remained present, but more in the form of the spectacle than an exhibition of readiness to serve on the battlefield. In each case, military demonstrations were meant to affirm the vigour and virility of the young men, and the old soldiers, of New Zealand. There was, too, an implicit, and sometimes explicit, comparison between the robust physique and healthy mien of the colonial men and the perceived 'weediness' of British troopers, even if the Kiwis, commentators conceded, could seldom match the spit and polish of the British forces. McDonald's article also highlights the place of children in royal tours. New Zealand had a remarkable system of 'cadet corps' for adolescents, and youths regimented into formation for visiting royals, further evidence, it was hoped, of the muscle and might that the Dominion contributed to the empire. Boy Scouts and Girl Guides were similarly mustered in quasi-military ranks to welcome the three visiting princes, whose own military attributes—especially the wartime service of the 'Digger Prince,' the future Edward VIII—were also put on show.

In addition to gender, regionalism, ethnicity, age, and other variations in the reception of royals, there is a very personalised dimension to royal tours. Several of the contributions speak, for instance, about the relations between the monarch and the eccentric Canadian prime minister William Mackenzie King. This is a reminder that relations between Crown and colony, or monarch and Dominion subjects, were ones mediated by elected governments, and in particular by heads of government. These leaders could range from staunch monarchists such as Mackenzie King or the Australian Robert Menzies, to those with far less fervour for the throne or even (as in the case of several recent Australian prime ministers) ones with declared republican sentiments. Royal tours were moments for aspirational leaders to strut the stage in the company of a queen or a prince. In Canada in 1939, both Prime Minister King and George VI ardently hoped to derive benefits from the royal tour, and the situation was comparable at other times and places.

Personality involves the royal as well as Dominion figures. Indeed, during Elizabeth's long reign, despite the constancy of her persona, her image has changed dramatically. In her

landmark 1954 tour, she was a lovely twenty-something, wife of a debonair naval officer, and mother of a six-year old; she was pictured as the embodiment of a new Elizabethan age and the model of British elegance. A decade later, to the backdrop of the Beatles, Carnaby Street, and swinging London, she appeared far less 'with it,' and still later she was cuttingly portrayed as a handbag-toting middled-aged frump. More recently, the Queen, with her immaculate silver coiffure, brightly coloured wardrobe, ready smile, and old-world poise, has become the kindly grandmother and senior stateswoman. Prince Charles, for his part, has variously appeared in Australia in the guise of a gawky adolescent sent to school in the outback, a very eligible bachelor, the husband of the wildly popular fairytale princess, a less-than-gay divorcé, and now increasingly as an aging if earnest heir, himself a grandfather. Monarchists place great hopes in the star attraction of the young Duke and Duchess of Cambridge to create a rejuvenated image of the dynasty, though time will tell how their personas and reception develop.

Yet another dimension of royal tours that that these articles suggest, especially in Hugh Chilton's contribution on the 1970 tours of Australia by Elizabeth II and Pope Paul VI, is how royal tours both provided a template for and paralleled those of other distinguished visitors. Chilton contends that the queen's tour was, in a measure, 'religious'—evident in the worship services that she attended, her professed Christian faith, and her position as head of the Church of England—and that the Pope's tour was 'royal' in the pomp with which the welcome of the pontiff (who is, according to international law, also the head of state of the Vatican City) took place. This is an interesting comparative perspective that demonstrates how tours by British royals provided models for travel by royals from other countries, presidents and prime ministers, and popes. The 'royal' aspects of the other tours are manifest: gun salutes, red carpets, state dinners, wreath-laying, municipal receptions, walkabouts, and other formulaic events. Tours by republican heads of state and government, the pope and senior international dignitaries follow the same choreography as those of crowned sovereigns, even though few of the 'commoners' exude the mystique of a royal. Studies of 'royal' tours, somewhat paradoxically, need not be restricted to 'royals'.

If most of the authors in this collection consider particular parts of the tours as they played out in the countries visited, such as military or gender aspects, Cindy McCreery argues that the whole is more than the sum of the parts. At least before the days of air travel, royals and those accompanying them spent more time at sea than on land in reaching distant domains. The royal vessel was a floating court, complete with senior officials, junior aides-de-camp, officers and sailors, civilians and military personnel. The royal played the lead role, but there was necessarily a large supporting cast. Using complementary accounts of the round-the-world voyage of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York in 1901, including a near unique one written by an ordinary seaman, McCreery is able to see into the royal tour upstairs and downstairs. She emphasises the role of the ships and their crews that conveyed the royals to their destination and home again, and she underlines the different ways the voyages were experienced by toffs and tars.

The contributions to this issue thus present a number of unexpected themes that can be discerned within royal tours, from issues relating to women in Canada, to youth in New Zealand; from the place of Afrikaners in South Africa to Aboriginal people in Australia; from the experiences of sailors, to those of princes. As Chris Holdridge points out in his afterword, they reveal the fact of conquest, and also allowed for overtures of conciliation between Indigenous, settler, diasporic, and other communities. Behind the ceremonial, he suggests,

using some further examples from South Africa, lay very real questions about historical claims and political stakes. While trying to promote the unity within each Dominion, royal tours inevitably displaced some of the fractures in these societies.

Taken together, these articles show the transformation of the British and imperial monarchy, the Empire, and Commonwealth over the course of the twentieth century and beyond, and the ways in which each tour—despite patterns that repeated in format, rituals, receptions, and responses—had its own objectives, successes, and failures. The contributions to this issue bear testimony, too, to the transformations in travel (from steamships to jet planes), in the technology of the media (from cables and newspaper articles, to television and internet streaming), and in the performance of public duties (from staid official gatherings, to more leisured and relaxed presentations of royals as near ‘ordinary’ people).

The articles demonstrate the curious, and even anomalous, position of the British monarchs, no more evident than during such tours, as sovereigns of the United Kingdom, rulers of an empire, and monarchs of particular realms around the globe. Even when Elizabeth II goes on tour, she is queen of the United Kingdom “and of her other realms and territories,” but also “Head of the Commonwealth” and “Defender of the Faith.” When she is in Wellington, she is “Queen of New Zealand”; in Adelaide, she is “Queen of Australia,” and in Vancouver, “Queen of Canada.” The royal tours underline the personal and institutional ties between the Crown (and other royals) and overseas countries: ties that endure, though they have been considerably loosened during the long decades of the present Queen’s reign. (How long will they last?) They point to constitutional and political debates about bonds between Crowns and the (ex-)colonies. Tours brought to the Dominions the monarchs in person, but they placed in high relief the situation of those Dominions having ‘absentee’ monarchs. They provide lenses through which to view the way inhabitants of countries as diverse as Canada and South Africa perceive themselves, construct their identity, and locate their place in the world. Despite the abiding affection and respect for the Queen, and the enduring fascination with members of her family, they show up the widening cultural differences between the British and the inhabitants of old British settler societies. The Queen may speak the same language as those she visits in the former Dominions, but she does not speak in a Canadian, Aussie, or Kiwi accent.

Royal tours of the Dominions were all about the formal presence of the monarch and the constitutional verities such apparitions revealed, but they were also about the emotional ties binding subjects with sovereign, and citizens of distant countries with the monarch and with Britain. In much of daily life in Australia, Canada, or New Zealand, the reigning monarch is regularly visible only through her image engraved on coins and printed on bank notes. Each of those countries sings its own national anthem rather than the canonical “God Save the Queen,” and the Queen is invoked only in the most formal and arcane language of the state (and among fervent monarchists). It would be rash to predict when the residual formal connections between the Crown and the former Dominions will be broken, as they have been in South Africa and in many other parts of the Victorian empire. Yet even were they severed, the celebrity of the British royals would probably mean that they would continue to receive a warm welcome from politicians, press, and public in Canberra, Ottawa, and Wellington (just as they do in Pretoria). Indeed, pro-republican politicians never fail to proclaim that this would be so even if Australia, Canada, or New Zealand became a republic. As laws and traditions change, and as one monarch eventually succeeds another on the throne, that relationship will

inevitably evolve, but royal tours—whether or not still of a monarch to her or his ‘subjects’—will no doubt continue as a feature of the historical links between Britain and its old settler societies, just as they have been an important part of royal and national life since the age of the first Queen Elizabeth.

Royal tours are exercises in public relations, in various senses of that expression. They include elements of propaganda, advertising, and marketing. They bring the figure of a royal into the public arena, carefully mixing and mingling with the elite and ‘ordinary’ citizens, and they emphasise the affective relationship between monarch and people, ‘mother country’ and Dominion. They intended to show not only the permanency of the institution of the monarchy, but also the way in which it adapted to changing circumstances. The objective of tours has been to show off the visiting royal to the regions, cities, and various sections of the communities through which he or she passes to best advantage, to put on a successful show, leave good memories, and stimulate the desire for encore performances in subsequent royal visits.

As the essays in this collection suggest, there is a wealth of material on which to base analyses of royal tours. There are the plans and programmes of the tours, official accounts and those of other observers (and, in diaries and published accounts, those of royals themselves); there are photographs, lithographs and, in a later age, radio and television broadcasts. There is the material culture of royal tours—from plaques and banners to tea towels and commemorative mugs. Questions of gender, race, and class, but also of finance, security, and health can be explored. Politics and diplomacy are never absent from the pomp and circumstance, even if royals are meant to be above politics, and these political nexuses deserve analysis. The reception of the royals tells us much about the emergence of regional and national identities, about ‘belonging’ to larger polities, or the rejection of centralised rule. They lay bare some of the cleavage lines in societies between different communities and ideologies. They enhance portraits of the royal tourists themselves, those who accompanied them on their journeys, and those who observed and took part in their tours. The study of national, colonial, and international tours by monarchs and other royal figures give great insight into the history of monarchy—just as scholarly work on peregrinations by ancient, medieval, and early modern monarchs have advanced our understanding of monarchy in a prior age. Both modern monarchies and even modern ‘subjects’ of hereditary sovereigns, including those ‘beyond the seas,’ are heirs of much older traditions, including those of royal progresses and royal entries, the powers and privileges of the Crown, the spectacle of royalty, and the mystique of a royal visitor come from afar.