Abstract: McGrath’s purpose in staging the political play based on Scottish history was primarily to expose and de-falsify the destructive clearance pattern that had remorselessly been repeated in the last three centuries, but was officially depicted as progressive and developmental for the Scottish region. Although the “brutal” methods of the Highland clearances from the eighteenth and nineteenth century had definitely remained in the past, McGrath posed an important question of whether the phenomenon of clearances had actually been dispensed with in the twentieth century. The theoretical framework of the paper relies on the acutely relevant critical insights of Rich, Dawson, Farber, Brown, Innes, as well as McGrath himself.
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In Why I Refused National Medal for the Arts (1997) Adrienne Rich explains her personal reasons for declining this prestigious literary award, meant to be delivered by President Clinton, by claiming that “the very meaning of art … is incompatible with
the cynical politics of his administration.”¹ She further states that to a poet who believes in the social presence of art (as the sole voice for those whose voices are disregarded, as a potent breaker of official silences, and, after all, as a basic human birthright), the participation in this “hypocritical ritual” is definitely not an option. By refusing the legislation of her art by the system’s approval, and thus avoiding the possibility of becoming a hypocritical opportunist herself, Adrienne Rich emphasizes the primary function of art:

„Art is our human birthright, our most powerful means of access to our own and another’s experience and imaginative life. In continually rediscovering and recovering the humanity of human beings, art is crucial to the democratic vision. A government tending further and further away from the search for democracy will see less and less uses in encouraging artists, will see art as obscenity or hoax.”²

In general, Rich perceives art as a regenerative process that helps one recall the original desires, strivings and urges creatively expressed through a deeply instinctual and self-expressive language. Thus, the role of an artist in the modern society is of crucial importance: an artist should seek to establish a relationship with other members of the society who are beleaguered, suffering, disenfranchised and to connect them with the art they are nonetheless creating or searching for. In that way, art must not be separated from acute social crisis:

„In the long run, it needs to grow organically out of a social compost nourishing to everyone, a literate citizenry, a free, universal, public education complex with art as an integral element, a society without throwaway people, honoring both human individuality and the search for a decent, sustainable, common life. In such conditions, art would still be a voice of hunger, desire, discontent, passion, reminding us that the democratic process is never-ending.”³

In accord with her view on art, Rich cannot perceive an artist in a vacuum, completely detached from the current political, social and economic queries of the society, but insists on the idea of an artist as an active communal participant.

² Ibid, p. 2.
³ Ibid, p. 2.
Although it seems that Adrienne Rich, an American poetess creating her best poetry in the last decade of the twentieth century, and John McGrath, a Scottish playwright writing his most prominent plays during the 1970s, have nothing in common at first sight, the ideas of writing politically engaged works of art that would inspire ordinary people to look for different alternatives of life than the ones offered by the dominant ideology inseparably bind them. Bearing in mind the sincere belief in art as a human birthright, a creative way of challenging the “omnipotent” political and economic system of power, both McGrath and Rich regard their artistic perspectives as a potent tool preferably used to demystify and rectify the official state policies in their respective works. The mere fact that the works of these two authors have been related to spatially, temporally, politically and nationally different areas of experience testifies to the relevance of the artistic quest they bravely set on, thus distinctly showing that the creative attempt for de-falsification of established sets of values is not only never-ending, but indispensable for a genuine artist.

These are precisely the ideas that should be taken into consideration when discussing John McGrath’s play *The Cheviot, the Stag and the Black, Black Oil* (1973). Before focusing on the play itself, it has to be noted that McGrath regarded his creative vision as a necessary inquiry into the authentic historical truth of frequently marginalized and beleaguered Scottish Highlanders, constantly camouflaged (falsified!) by the UK official public policy allegedly tending towards equality and tolerance of all British political constituents, whereas the enormous privileges were given to the English, who had throughout the centuries occupied the main centers of financial, hence political power in the UK. Thus, McGrath’s role as an artist was to create a theatre in which the frequent maltreatment and subordination of this part of the UK population would be exposed in detail whereby the people would finally be empowered to find and raise their own voice against this severe practice.

Highly sensitive to the idea of an artist as an active communal participant, McGrath became a founder of 7:84 Theatre Group in the UK in 1971. The name of the group was derived from a statistics published in “The Economist” in 1966 that asserted that 7% of the population of Great Britain owned 84% of the capital wealth. Although the mere proportion of the economic structure of the British society had changed over the years, McGrath’s theatre company continued to use it in order to express their dissatisfaction with this unjust set-up and to indicate “socialist
alternatives to the capitalist system that dominates all our lives today.”  

McGrath conceived the plot of The Cheviot, the Stag and the Black, Black Oil (1973) in the form of the traditional Highland ceilidh. His idea of telling the story of the Highlands to the people of the Highlands seemed to be irretrievably linked to the popular and traditional form of public expression, the one that the people of the Highlands would have no problems to identify with. Although McGrath had been working on the historical background of the play for fifteen years, it is important to mention that the whole company was included in the process of the play’s creation. Each member of the company contributed with ideas, gags, musical suggestions, and with no constraints had the opportunity to question everything that was written. As a result, the play represents the talents, beliefs and skills of the whole McGrath’s company. This way of writing reflects McGrath’s idea of active involvement in the existing Scottish social queries and, basically, his perception of modern theatre. Although he personally believed that theatre cannot actually cause social change, unlike his American disciple Adrienne Rich, McGrath devoutly believed that art could help the marginalized articulate their own voice and thus become aware of resistance alternatives:

“The theatre can never cause social change. It can articulate the pressure towards one, help people to celebrate their strengths and maybe build their self-confidence. It can be a public emblem of inner, and outer, events and occasionally a reminder, an elbow-jogger, a perspective-bringer. Above all it can be the way people find their voice, their solidarity and their collective determination.”

With this idea in mind, McGrath purposefully created the play whose scope was rather voluminous, in the sense that it covered two hundred years of Scottish history from the infamous Clearances of the eighteenth and nineteenth century to the present day.

5 Highland ceilidh is a traditional Gaelic social gathering, which usually involves playing Gaelic folk music and dancing dating from the late Medieval period (See: Thurston, H. A. (1984) Scotland’s Dances, Kitchener, Ontario: Teachers’ Association (Canada) 1984, p. 5).
In the study on the Highland Clearances, Innes explains their prominent patterns:

„The Clearances fall into three distinct stages. The first stage began with the introduction of sheep farming to the Highlands from 1760 onwards and ended with the establishment of the large sheep runs in the interior of the country and the people on the coast. …The ‘clearances’ of the 1840s and early 1850s were intended to clear the land of those people who were so destitute that the landlords could not support them. It was thought that they would have a far better chance of surviving outside Scotland than by staying at home…The last wave of clearances was paid for by the landowners who found it cheaper to pay for the transport of their tenants across the Atlantic or even to the new favourite for émigrés, Australia. In many cases the tenants had no choice but to emigrate, their homes having been torn down to make way for sheep-walks. With nowhere left to go, the offer of passage to the colonies where they would be able to acquire land denied to them in Scotland was the only choice.”

Thus, the exploitation story of the Scottish Highlands in McGrath’s play is clearly divided into three parts, as the title suggests: the Cheviot, the stag and the oil. The first section of the play thus refers to the first wave of Scottish “forcible displacement” by the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century whereby the highland population got evicted from their land in order to clear space for the Cheviot sheep, a species that proved to be quite endurable in the unpredictable and infertile highland territory, offering fine wool to landowners as a prospective source of their profitable income. The second section of the play, the stag, is dedicated to different accounts of mythologizing the untamed nature of the Scottish Highlands during the Victorian era whereby the Scottish landscape and culture were forcibly appropriated and reshaped for hunting, shooting and fishing purposes of Queen Victoria and her wealthy aristocrats. Needless to say, a royal promotion and prominent interest in the cultural tourism of Scotland had as a consequence a further financial burden to the already depleted and displaced

highlanders, who were facing a bleak fortune of becoming the new world settlers and thus directly serving their country’s colonial and expansionist interests. The third part of the play brings into attention the American economic invasion of the oil fields discovered in the North Sea off Aberdeen in 1973, but still equally relevant nowadays due to its subsequent findings in the Scottish West. Whereas the first two sections in the play (the cheviot and the stag part) show the common pattern of displacement of the indigenous Scottish people throughout history, the third part of the play serves, as Nelson claims, as a contemporary reminder of the past abuses and frequent historical falsifications thus poignantly warning the Scottish Highlanders to learn the lessons of their (de)falsified history and simultaneously inviting them to resist the contemporary waves of invasion and displacement by American oil companies:

„7:84’s political stance is very evident in the structuring of the narrative and the selection of narrative material. For the company revisits history neither dispassionately nor to lament failures, but to learn its lessons and to disseminate them.”

The sole purpose of dissemination of various documentary accounts in the play is thus to uncover the forgotten lessons of history, to remove their falsified official explanations and to break out with “the lament syndrome” continuously haunting the Gaelic culture:

„In telling the story of the Highlands since 1745, there are many defeats, much sadness to relate. But I resolve that in the play, for every defeat, we would also celebrate a victory, for each sadness, we would wipe it out with the sheer energy and vitality of the people, for every oppression, a way to fight back. At the end, the audience left knowing they must choose, and that now, of all times, they must have confidence in their ability to unite and win. We wanted to go on saying that to the people. It couldn’t be said too often.”

Apart from reverting the audience’s attention from the lament syndrome, McGrath’s purpose in staging the political play based on Scottish history was primarily to make his audience aware


\[10\] McGrath, J. (1993) The Cheviot, the Stag and the Black, Black Oil, London: Methuen Drama, p. XXVII

\[11\] Ibid, p. XXVII - XXVIII
of the destructive clearance pattern that had remorselessly been repeated in the last three centuries, but was officially depicted as progressive and developmental for the region. Although the “brutal” methods of the clearances from the eighteenth and nineteenth century had definitely remained in the past, McGrath posed an important question of whether the phenomenon of clearances had actually been dispensed with in the twentieth century. According to Ray Burnett, McGrath’s close friend and a critic who was personally involved in the process of staging the play’s first performance in 1973, the sole answer to the issue of modern-day clearances logically imposes itself:

„It is all too clear that the method may have changed but the remorseless and insensitive logic of the “improper” remains very much with us. What was once called “improvement” is now called “development”, but the touchstone remains profitability, not the well being of the community…Greed and the profit motive have changed little over the years.”\(^{12}\)

This is precisely the message that McGrath was conveying to the people of the Scottish Highlands. The conflict between two different political policies, as well as life philosophies, is potently depicted through the main historical characters in the play. On the one hand there is infamous Patrick Sellar, an epitome of modern-day pleaders for economic growth and progress, trying to find proper euphemisms to justify the shameful exploitation of the Caledonian land, whereas, on the other hand, there is a vivid depiction of subordinate voices of the Gaelic elders that painfully expose the final product of Sellar’s noble mission – a systematic destruction of the Gaelic culture. Proud of his modernist tendencies, Sellar introduced the Cheviot sheep to the unwelcoming Scottish Highlands at the beginning of the nineteenth century, justifying his criminally enriching intentions by claiming that the Scottish Highlanders had “to be convinced that they must worship industry or starve” whereby all “the present enchantment” (with their land, tradition, culture) “which keeps them down must be broken.”\(^{13}\) Perhaps the most striking politically correct terms that Sellar employs in his speeches are those that depict him as an emotionless businessman, “not a cruel man as they say”\(^{14}\), and thus not having any personal queries with the people he practically sinned against, shamelessly imposing his utterly cynical and ultimately destructive patterns

\(^{12}\) Burnett, *Have the Clearances Stopped*, in: McGrath, op. cit., p. 75.

\(^{13}\) Ibid, p. 6.

\(^{14}\) Ibid, p. 10.
of domination: “To be happy, the people must be productive!”\textsuperscript{15} Furthermore, Sellar is quite pleased with himself because he has brought people “wonderfully forward” and feels perfectly satisfied that “no person has suffered hardship or injury as a result of these improvements.”\textsuperscript{16} However, in an attempt to de-falsify these official proclamations and in case that there still exist Highlanders who are lulled asleep into Sellar’s rhetoric of progress and development, McGrath coins a powerful song that Sellar sings for his amusement, rather revealing about the true nature of his exploitive tactics:

\begin{quote}
Your barbarous customs, though they may be old
To civilized people hold horrors untold –
What value a culture that cannot be sold?
The price of a culture is counted in gold. \textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

What Sellar did not expect was definitely a frequent series of resistance acts against this “thriving” practice. Although committed to the cause of “bettering”\textsuperscript{18} the Scottish Highlanders in spite of their own inclinations, McGrath enlists numerous accounts of lost battles against both literal and metaphorical forces of displacement, genuinely hoping that these lessons of history would never be forgotten. All these resistance acts are powerfully compacted in the outburst of an Old Highlander, a prophetic de-falsifying voice of wisdom, a conferrer of the authentic historical truth to the future generations of the Highlanders. In his account of “what was really going on”\textsuperscript{19} during the Highland clearances, the shrewd Highlander claims that there was no doubt that a change came to the Highlands: the population was growing too fast for the old, inefficient methods of agriculture to keep everyone fed. The English capital was growing powerful and needed to expand as a result of the Industrial Revolution and improved method of agriculture:

\begin{quote}
„This accumulated wealth had to be used, to make more profit – because this is the law of capitalism. It expanded all over the globe. And just as it saw in Africa, the West Indies, Canada, the Middle East and China, ways of increasing itself, so in the Highlands of Scotland it saw the same opportunity. The technological innovation was there: the Cheviot, a breed of sheep that would survive
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p. 14.
the Highland winter and produce fine wool. The money was there. Unfortunately, the people were there, too. But the law of capitalism had to be obeyed.”20

The law of capitalism that was obeyed despite the fervent acts of resistance on the part of the Scottish population has had far-reaching consequences. For instance, one of its most severe consequences has been the complete annihilation and devastation of the Gaelic culture. Its traditional means of expression – the Gaelic language – was ferociously stored underground. McGrath depicts this gruesome fact through the role of a Gaelic singer who wishes to sing classic Gaelic songs during a formal gathering of the Scottish Highlanders in the twentieth century; however, he is momentarily dissuaded from his singing plans, since, as he is told, “a lot of people will not understand a word of it.”21 Being puzzled with the current status of Gaelic, the singer simply asks “And why not?”22, and gets a poignant answer to his question in the form of an official historical proclamation. It goes without saying that this piece of documentary report has been de-falsified by McGrath’s company; in other words, this is the sort of history that is not taught in the publicly approved modern history books:

“In the 18th century speaking the Gaelic language was forbidden by law. In the 19th century children caught speaking Gaelic in the playground were flogged. In the 20th century the children were taught to deride their own language. Because English is the language of the ruling class. Because English is the language of the people who own the highlands and control the highlands and invest in the highlands - … Because English is the language of the Development Board, the Hydro Board, the Tourist Board, the Forestry Commission, the Country Council, and, I suppose, the Chicago Bridge Construction Company. The people who spoke Gaelic no longer owned their land. The people had to learn the language

20 Ibid. Again, a striking similarity between McGrath’s and Rich’s artistic expression can be spotted here. They refuse to use euphemisms in their depictions of the currently dominant system of power. In other words, they defiantly state that it is solely based on the law of capitalism, basically implying bare exploitation, although the banners nowadays floating above our economic system, “democracy, market economy, free enterprise” (Rich, What is Found There, 1993, p. XV) are commonly used in order to soften, conceal and, ultimately, de-falsify the general truth of modern Western civilization allegedly relying on the principles of equality and tolerance.

21 Ibid, p. 51.

22 Ibid.
of their new masters. A whole culture was economically destroyed – by economic power.”

The tragedy of the past, or to be precise, the devastation of culture and loss of solely meaningful means of expression represents the verifiable, gloomy fact the Highlanders are intensely aware of, as McGrath states. Although the genuine population of the Highlands has throughout history been rather insignificant to the political decision-making processes, it was extremely important to McGrath when staging his play to present the Highlands future not as predetermined or outside the control of the Highlanders. Modern Highlanders have to be increasingly aware of the current challenges, so that they should perceive alternative ways of creating their collective future. By de-falsifying the official history of Scotland, McGrath’s play shows why the tragedies of the past happened:

“...because the forces of capitalism were stronger than the organization of the people. The play tries to show that the future is not pre-determined, that there are alternatives, and it is the responsibility of everyone to fight and agitate for the alternative which is going to benefit the people of the Highlands, rather than multinational corporations, intent on profit. Passive acceptance now means losing control of the future. Socialism, and the planned exploitation of natural resources for the benefit of all humanity, is the alternative the play call for. Not the “socialism” that merely begs concessions from capitalism, but the kind that involves every individual in the creation of the future he or she wants, that measures progress by human happiness rather than by shareholders’ dividends, that liberates minds rather than enslaving them. Some will object that this kind of socialism has never been achieved: this is not true, but even if it were, it is no reason for not fighting for it.”

McGrath definitely refuses to satisfy himself with the position of a cog in the machine of the dominant system of power. Instead of the passive acceptance of the falsified official truths, he chooses to expose and de-falsify the real truth of his people in their own language. Thus, the Gaelic song at the end of the play envisions the idyllic return to tradition, only to be achieved when finally the Highlanders unite in the fight for their birth rights and the exploiter is finally driven out from their land:

23 Ibid, p. 52.
24 Ibid, p. 77.
As Brown and Innes rightly notice, “one can justifiably celebrate McGrath’s use of Gaelic at a time when activists were forced to fight with reluctant local authorities, the BBC and so on, to push through improvements through paltry or non-existent media, education, road sign provision for Gaelic.”26 For instance, prior to 1973, little more than one half of Gaelic television programming was broadcast in Scotland once a month.27 This is precisely the reason why the message of the play and use of Gaelic songs and some Gaelic dialogue, along with the encouragement to resist

exploitation, can be seen to form “a part in the beginnings of Scotland’s ‘Gaelic Renaissance.’”  

Once again it has to be emphasized that the political content of McGrath’s play is potently reflected through its popular, wide working-class masses highly appealing form. Though a scripted play, credited formally to McGrath in published versions, as Nelson concludes, it is frequently referenced as a piece of political theatre that exemplifies the author’s theory of “a political theatre praxis outside established, building-based theatres and beyond the confines of the literary playscript.” A stereotypical Scottish manner of direct address to the audience with specific local references through traditional folk songs, jokes, sketches, anecdotes and documentary material aims at breaking down the barrier between the actors on the stage and the audience, so that a sort of conversation or, better to say, a political discussion, “follows naturally from the engagement of the show.” It is precisely this “egalitarian forum for exchange of ideas” as Nelson termed it, that made The Cheviot, the Stag and the Black, Black Oil the great success on its rural Highland tour. From the perspective of the author’s quest to de-falsify Scottish history, the actors basically urged the audience into the political action “as if all present at a given performance were involved in an open conspiracy against authority.”

In conclusion, a striking parallel between Rich’s and McGrath’s insightful ideas of the political role of art should be reinforced. In her influential study, A Human Eye: Essays on Art in Society, 1997-2008 (2009), Adrienne Rich distinguishes between ‘protest’ and ‘dissident’ poetry (here to be understood as art in general):

„Protest poetry is ‘conceptually shallow’, ‘reactive’, predictable in its means, too often a hand-wringing from the sidelines. Dissident poetry, however, does not respect boundaries between private and public, self and other. In breaking boundaries, it breaks silences, speaking for, or at best, with the silenced; opening poetry up, putting it...
into the middle of life… It is a poetry art that talks back, that would act as part of the world, not simply as a mirror of it.”

Hence, in Rich’s opinion, the act of writing corresponds to a form of political activism, and the proper artist, a dissident, represents the voice of the silenced and depraved. This is exactly the idea that McGrath put into practice by creating his political theatre. Although writing solely about the Scottish experience, his play testifies to the significance of the revolt against the capitalist exploitation in Scotland that would then, hopefully, “break open locked chamber of possibility, restore numbed zones to feeling, recharge desire” and inspire a radical revolution in the rest of the world:

„The Highlands have so much that is good, rare, even unique in human experience. If the people there, and the working people of the rest of Scotland realize that there is a choice, that it must be made soon, and decisively, then not only can what is good be saved, but a future built in the Highlands, and in the whole of Scotland, that could inspire the rest of the world.”

The mere fact that the play witnessed its revival at Dundee Rep Theatre in 2015, under the guidance of Joe Douglas testifies to its timeless relevance. The world might have changed immeasurably since the play’s first performance in 1973, but the underlying issues of power, capital and the control of resources have not, “while Scotland’s current political landscape makes it a particularly apposite revival.”
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(ДЕ)ФАЛСИФИКОВАЊЕ ШКОТСКЕ ИСТОРИЈЕ У КОМАДУ ЏОНА МЕКГРАТА ОВЦА, ЈЕЛЕН И ЦРНА, ЦРНА НАФТА

Сажетак

Основни циљ Џона Мекграта приликом писања овог политичког комада са елементима шкотске историје из XVIII и XIX века био је да се разоткрије и дефалсификује деструктивни образац „рашишћавања” шкотских планинских предела. Мекгратова верзија описивања ове политичке праксе у потпуности се коси са званичним извештајима о наводном развоју региона након њене успешне примене. Иако су бруталне методе рашишћавања шкотских планинских предела дефинитивно остале у прошлости, Мекграт се у овом комаду бави питанјем да ли се основни поступати претходно поменутог феномена могу уочити и у XX веку. Теоријски оквир рада почива на акутно релевантним критичким увидима Ричове, Досона, Фарбера, Брауна, Иниса, као и самог Мекграта.

Кључне речи: (де)фалсификовање, рашишћавања, историја, политички театар, Шкотска