

THE APPROPRIATION OF A COMMERCIAL TRADEMARK: THE GOLLIWOG AS A CULTURAL MARKER

ROBERT MACGREGOR

Peebles is an ancient small rural town in the border region of Southern Scotland. It was granted a Royal Burgh Charter in 1140 by King David I of Scotland. A major claim to fame is that it is the home of and a key breeding center for the world-famous Border collie.

Infamy surrounded the town in June 1991, when what should have been a joyous annual children's parade turned into a national incident over a small number of children who were "blackened" up in a minstrel/Samboesque mode of dress. Critics of the costumes and "blacken-faced" young people saw them as golliwogs, a highly criticized doll-like figure from Enid Blyton's "Noddy Series" of children's books. Others saw them as a golliwog, the international trade character, of a major British jam manufacturer, James Robertson and Sons. Numerous dimensions that surrounded this incident and many other related points of view will be critically analyzed.

The Golliwog, a Brief History

Historically, in Britain, Florence K. Upton (1873-1922) used a golliwog figure in a series of children's books. Soon after the publication of the first book in 1895 it became a commercially used symbol to sell a large array of products, such as toys, games, dolls, postcards, novelties, dishes, packaging, and, in the 1920s, food products. From the late 1920s until 2001, the golly was used by Robertson's, the jam manufacturer (Nicholson 1981; Hartlap 1984, Fisher 1975).

Throughout the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, controversy has ranged from the local grassroots to public debates, discussions of the golliwog in the House of Commons, letters to her Majesty the Queen, and many other avenues of discourse. All of these discussions have basically focused on whether or not the golliwog was a cherished doll, a cultural icon, an integral toy/doll that many British children had played with and loved; or was it a racist image, a play object that could instill racist values in children and psychologically harm minority, non-white British children?

January of 1987 marked a watershed point in this ongoing heated debate. British book publisher Macdonald Purnell decided to delete the Golliwogs from Enid Blyton's "Noddy Series." The director of children's publishing at Macdonald Purnell said:

We have produced a completely new Noddy library and the decision was taken to revise the text, the illustrations and characters. A decision was taken to take the golliwogs out. A lot of people feel uncomfortable about gollies either because they are felt to be racist or because they always seem to be villains (Bates 1987, 2).

The new Noddy books of 1987 were welcomed by the Commission for Racial Equality (C.R.E.). A spokesperson said, "We had a number of complaints from people who felt that the depiction of the Noddy characters was insensitive."

Writers and critics of children's literature Dixon (1978) and Mullan (1987) discussed at length the serious, damaging implications that these grotesque, malevolent characters may perhaps have conveyed to young minds. Dixon believed that the golliwog was a part of most children's fictional nursery. He suggested focusing upon two considerations. Firstly, the golliwog was a standardized racial caricature, the Sambo, the minstrel, a creation of whites. Secondly, the names of the characters were widely used as racial epithets.

Seemingly, this grotesque doll, Dixon believed, was meant to confirm the connection and association of fear with black faces in particular. These naughty, mean, evil and menacing roles allowed Blyton to portray blackness a la golliwogs a sufficient cause for their dislike by young readers. Her "The Three Golliwogs," published in the early 1940s, had three golliwogs called Golly, Wollie, and Nigger who were disliked by Angelae, their mistress, because of "the blackness of their faces." The names, as stated previously, did not change until 1973, and the "Three Golliwogs" book was sold into the early 1990s. As early as 1964 some libraries phased out the Blyton books.

Mullan reinforced the outlook that it was extremely important not to perpetuate racism by drawing misleading stereotypes of cultures and races in literature, especially those focused on children, where the images tended to work on a symbolic and unconscious level.

As Elaine Moss (1986) has argued, the 1970s were years in which "Britain was coming to terms with its post-Imperial role as a multicultural nation" and this had its effect on the content of the content of children's books. The editors of Children's Books for a Multi-Cultural Society (1985) argued that unless:

we want our children to develop an inward-looking, insular perspective, educating them for the future must imply educating them to live and play a positive role in a society where cultural diversity is recognised and respect (Mullan 1987, 124).

Wilkinson (1984, 1987) discussed the psycho-cultural analysis and impact of black dolls and role stereotypes. She believed the vivid symbolic artifact called the golliwog was a most grotesque example of frightening images. Ironically, she stated, psychologists continued to criticize children's play with golliwogs "on the grounds that the black face, the pop eyes and the red mouth are the unconscious source of many childish nightmares" (Wilkinson 1987, 21).

Forster (1989) condemned Blyton's *The Little Black Doll* (1937, 1964) because of its character 'Sambo' and Oliver Tinkle's *The Golliwog* (1982). Forster stated the golliwog had rapidly established itself among the characters of the English nursery, but by way of its longstanding use as a commercial trademark, it had entered the repertoire of contemporary racist abuse (73) ; more on this point later.

Opposition to Macdonald Purnell's decision was immediate. Critics of the changes saw it as a process of degollification, a bowdlerisation of the 1940s

classic. Newspaper columnists called opponents of the golliwog 'barmy', 'the loony left', left-wingers, labour councillors, left-wing councils dividing the right from the left with political labels such as those forementioned. Newspapers that carried articles on the Macdonald Purnell decision would include the *News of the World*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Star*, the *Guardian*, the *Sun*, the *Daily Mirror*, and the *Daily Telegraph*; see works cited for more complete details.

As previously stated, many other forms of protest against the golliwog gained national momentum in the 1980s. Although protestations against the trademark had begun approximately 30 years previous to the Blyton affair, historically, Robertson's golliwog appears to have been used by the firm since about 1910. It was in 1928, however, that the lapel badge began to be used as a three-token redemption item. Children and mothers were encouraged to buy a jar of jam, cutting from the label a small stamp-like token, collect three, mail them to the company, and receive an enamel badge of the golliwog. To date, well over twenty million badges of the golliwog have been distributed. The golliwog also appeared on cups, towels, pens, pencils, writing pads, erasers, cutlery, ties, and other items, all purchasable from Robertsons (see examples).

One major campaigner against the perceived racist promotional items was the National Council Against Racism in Children's Books; other institutions would include The Commission for Racial Equality, the Greater London Council, the Camden Council for Community Relation, *Searchlight* magazine, *Dragon's Teeth*, the North Lewisham Project, the George Jackson Media Collective, the Merseyside Labour Council, and many, many individuals from various walks of life. All protesting discourses intersected on the complex, multidimensional, widely circulated stereotype. The 'grotesque' golliwogs, whether portrayed in books, commercial trademarks, or numerous and varied commercial items, all had a wide, simple grin, large, bulbous, round eyes, a shock of fuzzy/wool-like hair, and thick lips. The clothes are always in bright, basic colours: usually red blue, green and yellow. The trousers frequently have blue and white stripes; the brightly colored jacket is short, and the golliwog usually wears a bow tie. This image clearly indicated the historical associations, the southern Sambo, the Minstrels of 'burnt cork', vaudeville, theatrical fame and infamy. One must also remember that until the 1973 Pan edition, when golliwogs' names change, the three Blyton characters were called 'Nigger', 'Wollie', and 'Golly'. These racial and racist epithets were changed to 'Wiggie', 'Waggie', and 'Wollie'.

Examination of racial labels and their conventional meanings, as in Blyton's golliwog trio, reveals some insights into Britain's racial outlook towards such names; that is, they were acceptable. MacGregor (1993) highlighted examples where the word 'golly' and golliwog epithets were used in numerous social settings. Salman Rushdie, in Hamilton's New Yorker article (1996), recalled the school life of the well-known author in England. In 1961, at the age of 13, Rushdie was sent to Rugby Public School in England. His time there was one of taunts and anti-Indian jokes. He described catching a studymate crayoning "wogs go home" on a wall. The slogan, he thought, was clearly aimed at him. He said, "I went insane ... I banged him as hard as I could against the wall he was writing on" (94). Rushdie has called this a determining moment in his school career; indeed,

his whole attitude toward life in England. It was the moment when he learned how to strike back. Later, in an end-of-term satirical revenue during his final year, he heard himself lampooned: "What is this shape 'midst the nebulous fog?' Merely the resident Bradley House wog" (95).

Rushdie, in his book of essays, *Imaginary Homelands* (1991), openly discussed racism in Britain; he believed that the English language historically coined many terms of racial abuse such as 'nigger' and 'wog' and posed the question, "Can there be another language with so wide-ranging a vocabulary of racist denigration" (130). He went on to say, "Yes, the golliwog, too; at football grounds, black players are taunted with the cry, "Get back on your jam jar" (146). This last example was widely used as one of many racist slogans that football hooligans hurled at black soccer players in the 1980s.

Describing in some detail numerous examples of racial labeling and role stereotypes from various written sources, we now turn our attention to the 1991 Golly Parade at the Peebles Beltane Festival.

The Golliwog Controversy: Beltane Festival

On February 15, 1991, *The Peebleshire News* reported that the wearing of golliwogs costumes had been banned from the 1991 Beltane Festival Parade in Peebles. It was found that the costume contravened the spirit of the Regional Guidelines on Multicultural Education. The costumes owned by the Beltane Committee and stored at the town's Kingsland Primary School were not to be used in the Children's Parade. In 1990, a Mrs. Margaret Macintosh, a retired schoolteacher living in Edinburgh expressed her concern about the costumes. She was shocked when she saw ten children riding on the back of a truck dressed as golliwogs and in blackface. She thought that the costumes and blackface were racist and she offered fifty pounds to help replace the gowns. The Festival Committee met with the local school board and the "no" golliwog decision was reached, reluctantly.

It is worthwhile to note that the Regional Guidelines on Multi-cultural Education were established in 1986 by a special working group under the title "Multi-Cultural Education in Primary Schools." It was up to the head teachers to



Figure 1. Marchers in the Beltane parade in Peebles, 1991.

decide on the implementation of the Guidelines and until Mrs. Macintosh's protest no one locally had thought about or given their opinions on the Beltane costumes. The document stated: "Everyone involved in education must instill in children a respect for themselves and other human beings regardless of race, color, or creed." It was not clear why it took five years for the guidelines to be applied to the Beltane costumes and why other stereotypical costumes — Arabs, Chinese — were also not affected and eliminated.

Once the banning decision was made public, there arose much local protest against that outcome. The first major player to enter the fray was the former principal and teacher of history at Peebles High School. Ted Smith "begged" the committee to reconsider its decision. Part of the text of his letters follows:

Two of the highlights of the Beltane Festival are the Children's procession and the parade of floats containing numerous characters, some of which represent real-life people but not all. The rest may be mythical creatures, animals, or even toys such as soldiers and golliwogs. The latter simply depict dolls or inanimate objects which like teddy bears are usually to be seen on a child's pillow. To pretend that they are racially offensive is so ludicrous that one is inclined to retort 'You cannot be serious' (Keddie 1991, 1).

Mr. Turnbull, the chairperson, of the annual general meeting for the Festival, went on to read a second letter that had been sent to a national newspaper. Scott Kerr believed that Mrs. Macintosh's offer of fifty pounds was offensively patronizing. He believed that she evidently failed to understand that education was about establishing children's community identity and had nothing to do with indoctrinating socialist shibboleths. This is an interesting last comment, particularly since it invokes the word 'socialist,' which has somewhat specific politically ideological overtones. This reference to socialism and the political left reappeared in numerous ways throughout the Golliwog debate.

During the week of March 15, 1991, the Beltane Festival Committee announced that it had reached a compromise with the head teachers of the three local primary schools. The members felt that under the Education Guidelines covering Multi-Cultural Education in Schools the following changes would be made:

As far as the Beltane Committee is concerned these costumes were never intended to be seen as any form of racial jibe, but were meant to represent a Golliwog doll, as they have done for many years. However, we agree that perhaps the term 'Golliwog' was now outdated and could, in some eyes, cause offence.

The Golliwog costumes will be used within new characters to be created, called Rag Dolls. They will be placed in the Beltane Programme under 'Toyland.'

It is hoped that this clarification of the much loved character will end this controversy (Golliwogs 1991, 1, 2).

The statement did not specify if the new characters would be “blacked up,” but one committee member believed that the black make-up would cover the entire face and not leave white rings around the eyes and the mouth, as had been the case with the previous golliwogs. He believed that the woolly wigs would continue to be used.

The golliwog compromise did not succeed and one week later, it was announced by Ian Thorburn that although there had been initial agreement, the staff of Kingsland Primary School, who had to handle the costumes, refused to accept the compromise. On March 22, the school staff gave Mr. Thorburn the following statement:

Although it was felt after a meeting between Beltane Committee office-bearers and the head teachers of Peebles Primary schools that a compromise could be reached as to how the golliwog’s costumes may be used in future years, this has proved not to be the case.

The staff of Kingsland feel that to use the costumes with accompanying blackface and hair is unacceptable.

It is with regret, therefore, that we have decided that the costumes be returned to the Beltane Committee (It’s Goodbye Gollies 1991, 1).

Head teacher of Kingsland Mrs. Marlene Galashan, who had agreed to the compromise solution of renaming the dolls, said that her staff believed that the costumes were still “golliwogs with another name” and felt unable to administer them (Golliwogs Renamed 1991). Reaction to the banning of the golliwogs was quick and, at times, demeaning. Ex-Provost Alex Walker told the Peebleshire News:

I can contain myself no longer. As far as I can see there are a few jackaroos who are posing a threat to our way of life and creating problems where none existed.

Howard Purdie, the local self-styled bard of Traquair, had the following satirical article published in the local newspaper. He called Mrs. Macintosh a Mrs. Mary MacIntrouble who, at 91, objected to the Peebles police wearing black uniforms: “Your policemen, I see a black-and-white minstrel. That is a racial stereotype and should not be tolerated.” When she was asked what sort of uniform would fit the situation in Peebles:

“Oh, I envisage something really colourful,” trilled the excitable lady who used to teach Mixamotosis at the Golliwog’s Primary School. “Something like funny-worded t” shirts, tartan boxer shorts and American baseball caps.”

“After all, our friendly bobbies should keep up with fashionable trends” (1991).

In the satire, Mrs. MacIntrouble sent the fifty pounds to the desk sergeant for new-style uniforms. The bard asked the policeman, Al Jolson, aged 113, if he was concerned about the lady in question.

“Mammy!” sang the policeman, frantically waving his white-gloved hands. “I’d walk a million miles for one of your smiles, Mammy!”

Eyes bulging enormously, our friendly bobby tap-danced on the pavement outside the police station, causing acute embarrassment to a person from Edinburgh (Keddie 1991).

By May 31, the controversy had reached a national audience and more and more attention was focused on the parade and the town. Sides in the issue were chosen, and it was rumored that the National Front would be at the Festival to defend the pro-golliwog side and that anti-racists groups would give their support to the ban the golliwog position. The situation was getting out of hand. There was also a proposed mass “black-up” by Peebleans protesting Mrs. Macintosh’s ‘outside interference’ in seeking to have the golliwogs banned.

A Mr. White, a local businessman, put up a prize of fifty pounds for the ‘Best Beltane Golly.’ Mr. Edge, a local hotel owner, announced that he would change the name of his hotel, The Green Tree, to The Golliwog’s Rest, for June 21 and 22. Doug Mann, the Peebles singer-songwriter, saw his protest song “I Wanna Be a Golly in the Beltane Parade” become a local cult hit and eventually sell almost 2,000 copies (Mann 1991). A well-known black dancer and television personality, Clive Donaldson, would support the pro-golliwog group. Ironically, his stage name is Wiggi, which is one of the golliwogs in the Enid Blyton series *The Three Golliwogs*. He read some of the newspaper reports, and he was not offended at all by the golliwog costumes.

Two weeks before the six days of festivities, some of the local officials started to worry about the “untold damage” to the event and to the future well-being of the event. An editorial of June 7, 1991, tried in an objective manner to clearly outline the two positions in the golliwog controversy. The writer went on to say that in fact the picture of the pros and cons of the golliwog were more complicated than they seemed and the nuances might be lost in some of the stories that were published in the tabloid press. A golliwog parade might be portrayed as some kind of Ku Klux Klan rally in a red-neck backwater of Scotland. Throughout the newspaper articles, there appeared to be a growing acceptance that there would be a golly protest parade. Seeing this protest as an inevitability, the local authorities pleaded with the would-be marchers to take to the street on Friday night and not to interfere with the Saturday’s Red Letter Day Parade for the local children.

Throughout the major protest time frame, the *Peebleshire News* started a “Golliwog Forum” to allow people to voice their opinions with letters to the newspaper. From February 22 to June 28, 1991, 37 letters were printed in the paper. From February 22 to June 28, 1991, 37 letters were printed in the paper. There were twenty-eight letters for keeping the golliwog costumes, eight against keeping the costumes, and one neutral reply; approximately seventy-five percent

of the respondents wanted to keep the golliwog costumes and the woolly hair and the blacked face.

Trying to discover just how long the golliwog imagery had been part of the children's parade was difficult. Some of the age estimates say that the golliwogs had been in the festivities since 1901 (ninety years), one said seventy years or sixty years. Whatever date was the real one was not that important; what was more germane was that the tradition of the golliwog was old and firmly fixed and accepted by the majority of the respondents. Initially, Mrs. Macintosh was the lone dissident, with some slowly growing support.

The major theme that repeatedly appeared in the golliwog support letters was basically that the costume and the blackface were traditional images that were part and parcel of Britain's heritage. The image was simply that of a harmless doll and only that, with no possible racist connotations.

Numerous people also strongly indicated that Mrs. Macintosh was a limousine liberal from Edinburgh, a sociologist, and not a true native Peeblean (a Gutterbluid). In fact, Mrs. Macintosh was born in Peebles and had worked in the community before moving to Edinburgh. This idea of an outsider causing trouble in a local community was echoed time and time again, as my on-site interviews and correspondence will show.

As a Storie Foot (someone who had left the community), Mrs. Macintosh defended her opinions and her six-month campaign to get rid of the golliwogs in the following manner:

1. She firmly believed that this was not the most important issue but it is an issue. She believed that to many people the golliwog was an offensive image.
2. The abusive term 'wog' which black people have to endure daily comes from this innocent source.
3. Britain in general was becoming more racist and there were many ways of combating it. This protest was her way. She believed that schools should be promoting positive images of all ethnic and racial groups. She believed that golliwogs were unhelpful and were an impediment to good teaching.
4. Her offer of a cash donation for the cost of the replacement costumes was neither generous nor patronizing. She felt if change occurred because of her action she should contribute to that change (Macintosh 1991, 7).

For the persons who saw the costumes as unacceptable, their basic point was that the United Kingdom was becoming a multi-racial society where greater tolerance and humanity to others were a necessity. Peebles was seen as a town that was parochial, insular and unsympathetic to the needs and feelings of ethnic minorities.

What I have tried to convey in the previous pages about the golliwog is that the image and name, in many different forums, have been controversial for many years. Considering the length of the controversy and the widely debated, widely reported nature of the various incidents, it is difficult to believe that some people of Peebles were not aware of the incidents; more and more the image of the golliwog was being seen as racist by a substantial segment of the population in Britain.

Within the town itself, a number of local “poets” and a well known folk singer had their works published and recorded which in themselves are revealing. The three verses of George Lewis clearly showed his sentiment and the frequent tie-in to the Robertson’s jam product:

“THE BIRTH OF A RAG DOLL”

Sin-How nice to learn my Golliwog wasn’t just a jolly wog, but sad his smiling black friendly face, not longer will my table grace.

The golden shreds, and orange jelly too, hot buttered toast, and tea to brew, there’s something missing, this I know, I don’t want my Golliwog to go.

But nothing now can bring him back, you see his face was much too black for two-bob-bits afraid to see, he’s just another chap, like thee and me (1991).

Part of the wording in “The Birth of a Rag Doll” clearly echoed the long held outlook by the traditionalists that the golliwog image is nothing more than a doll, a cultural artifact, of folkloric and commercial Britain; note the references to jams.

Perhaps the artistic endeavor with the greatest longevity was Doug Mann’s recording of “I Wanna Be A Golly in the Beltane Parade” (Golly Song Released 1991, 2). The words suggest the importance of rules, the interference by outside forces, yet acknowledge the golly problem did exist. Doug eventually became so identified with the song that he was called “The Golly Man.” All the sales, the attention, and the controversy apparently delighted the artist. These words were recorded from the tape of the song sent to the author by the writer Doug Mann:

I WANNA BE A GOLLY IN THE BELTANE PARADE

I’d just one ambition when I was but a boy, Just one ambition tae fill my heart with job,

No to enter a profession or tae tak a trade
But just to be a golly in the Beltane Parade.

Chorus:

In the Beltane parade, in the Beltane parade,
I wanna be a golly in the Beltane parade.

A wifie up in Edinburgh frustrated aw' my plans, Declaring golly's racial and said they should be banned, She read it in some guidelines and guidelines must be right, And who would are tae argue when it's Doon in black and white

Tae dress as an Egyptian I hear wid be just fine,
A geisha or a gaucho frae distant Argentine,
A songie Hielan laddie or ev'n an Injun brave,
So what's so wrong with gollied in the Beltane Parade?

Peebles golly problem is important there's nae doubt, Ye'd think from a' bickering, sae bitter is the rage, Small wonder they're a symbol on a jar o'marmalade.

The Parade and The Gollied's Protest

The first evidence of a "golly" protest took place on Wednesday, when two gollied waded across the River Tweed. Some say there were fifty; some counted seventy-six, and other observers say over one hundred gollied protesters marched in the parade. The actual figure was not all that important, but the fact did remain that despite the national media attention given to the event a sizeable section of the community dressed as gollied and blackened their faces, all to protest the withdrawal of the ten children's golly costumes. Some of the titles and images that I researched include the following: Kingsland Escapees (Primary School "home" of the costumes), Gollie Busters (Ghost Busters film), Golly For Us, I am no Golly, Robertsons, Oily and his gollied, Persil washes gollied whiter, Jollie Gollied, Rev. I. M. Golly, A Funeral Cortege, A Golly Detector Van, and Mrs. MacIntrouble. For some of the actual costumes that were used in the parade, see figure 1.

Rumors had circulated throughout the town on Friday that contingents of the National Front and the Anti-Racist League would be making an appearance, but they did not prevail. Nevertheless the media was out in force, and a BBC television crew did record the parade. Their interviewer and spokesperson was the black actor Craig Charles. Charles told the viewers of the eventual program "Them and Us" that he found the gollied costumes "a hideous caricature of black people and offensive." After interviewing the owner of the Green Tree Hotel who had changed its name to The Golly Rest for two days, he turned to the still running camera and said: "I think the people of Peebles need a good kick up the backside."

Some other media personnel believed that the golly protesters showed "a good humored gesture of defiance." Mrs. Galashan, of Kingsland Primary School, closed off the school's involvement by saying:

As an educational establishment we are concerned with the academic and social education of our pupils in preparing them for life in the modern world. We must not be seen to promote anything that might be taken as racially offensive.

Sadly, however, the staff of Kingsland Primary believed they had been let down by the Border's area School administration. Mrs. Galashan took a swipe at the educationalists by saying:

We have not actually had any official backing from any official body even among professionals, the whole of the Region. I don't know what that says, but I find it rather sad (It's Goodbye Golliw 1991, 1).

As one writer from the region wrote: "If golliwog costumes in a children's parade are an anachronism they are not alone. Why it happened this year, and not during the Jam Jar row of the '70s, is still a mystery."

Cultural Markers and the Appropriation of Names and Images

Said (1993) believed that self-definition is one of the activities practiced by all cultures. It has a rhetoric, a set of occasions, such as festival, and a local and regional acceptance and familiarity all its own. Peebles had its Beltane Festival and parade for close to one hundred years.

This festival and parade were part of the local cultural traditions. In 1991 an 'outsider' threatened the longevity and continuation of a black-face' tradition. The 'insiders,' the locals, took to the walls and defended this cultural icon atavistically. According to Said, people were mobilized, throwing their outlooks and discourses back to an earlier imperial, colonialistic time (1993, 37). He also believed that culture comes to be associated, often aggressively, with a nation that differentiates 'US' from 'THEM.'

Rehin (1975, 1981) discussed the long history of the Harlequin character, Jim Crow, to blackface minstrels in Victorian London and its seaside resorts. Hern (1967) discussed blackfaced minstrelsy in England's seaside resorts and theatres. Pickering (1986) was interested in how minstrelsy symbolically worked out questions about the status of white Victorians posed within a framework of social and biological and class orders and distinctions. He went on to say that minstrelsy in Britain was responsible for crystallizing and establishing certain stereotypes of blacks and black 'racial' characteristics in Britain. In helping to shape a symbolic lexicon that people carried away in their minds after leaving minstrel shows, the presentations contributed to the development of racial prejudice. Later, when scapegoating took place towards blacks and other visible minorities, they had a ready-made lexicon of derogatory ideas, images, and names at hand: 'Sambo', 'Wog', 'Golliwog', and 'Nigger'.

As of November 2000, this lexicon, this ideological legacy in Britain had still to be overcome (Pickering 87). Lively (1999) briefly mentioned the successful television show in Britain 'The Black and White Minstrel Show,' which, in the 1960s, attracted an audience of over twenty million viewers on approximately fifty percent of Britain at that time. It ran until 1978. Even today, a continuing debate appears in the media concerning Al Jolson impersonators who appear in British benevolent venues and local halls (Kuttner et al. 1987).

Britain has a long tradition of differentiating blacks as 'THEM' from its white population as 'US,' the insiders; this ideological outlook almost always is discussed with some degree of xenophobia. Culture and its racial markers provide a source of identity. The numerous arguments that have been presented in this paper against changing the cultural icon known as the golliwog were linked to the 'loony left' a liberal discourse and philosophy associated with hybridity and multiculturalism. Culture conceived in this way can become a protective boundary, an enclosure supported in some instances by manufactured commercial constructions such as the golliwog stereotype.

Ziff and Rao (1997) have defined cultural appropriation as 'the taking' from a culture that is not one's own of intellectual property or cultural expressions. Expressions include artifacts, history and knowledge (1). Cultural appropriation is a multidimensional phenomenon. In the case of the golliwog, the 'black-faced' minstrel-like figure, where and when and how did the act of cultural blackening one's face begin? Lively and Rehlins both discussed the very origins of the practice of 'blacking up.' In the context of English Morris dancing, Lively traces its origins to Africa and especially Morocco. The French Harlequin, or Italian Arlecchino, may have had its origins in the late Middle Ages. Rehlins discussed the early English example of 1377, when the Lord Mayor of London visited King Richard II at Kensington. Then and there mummers disguised as African princes, for example, danced and entertained the audience. In 1510, at the court of Henry VII, foreign ambassadors were entertained by Henry in a 'blackface' disguise, dressed as a Turk accompanied by twelve torchbearers "like Moreskoes, their faces blacke" (Rehlins 1975, 686). The humorous Negro made his appearance on the English stage in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Throughout most of the nineteenth century Negro minstrelsy was popular as vaudeville, theatrical entertainment. The idea, the process of taking, appears to have a long, long tradition: maybe first African, then European, with other appropriations of the Jim Crow representational format from America. The doll-like images, the representations of a minstrel-like, Samboesque figure, however were already widely seen and accepted by large sections of the British public. The stereotype of the dandified, brightly clothed persona of the black comic figure had already been somewhat fixed with British theatrical and other venues of popular culture, parades, dances, children's puppet shows, jokes, cartoons, and vernacular expressions, for example. What seems to have happened is a chronological serialization of cultural appropriation taking place over many centuries.

The pro-golliwog protesters in 1991 were a fleeting continuation of this adaptational process. They basically converted a 'black-faced' brightly costumed child into a somewhat parallel, similar image, the Robertson's golliwog. Much of the discourse and protestations for and against the golliwog clearly used the commercial trademark as the anchor, the cornerstone for all discussions.

In 1991 the golliwog, as a cultural icon, was part of the symbolically constructed social order of Britain. However, as we have previously discussed in this work, there has been a growing demand from 1950 to the present, for a recognition and re-allocation, of social status by visible minorities in British society. The historically collective identity was fragmenting, due mainly by the

large influx of non-whites, and images such as the golliwog were oriented and constructed with the view of a white Britain.

With the growing awareness of their own collective identity and power, black Britons and their supporters began to express their displeasure with numerous institutions (publishing houses and football teams and manufacturers, for example) and demanded change. There was a victory in 1991. The Beltane Festival stopped the 'black-faced' dolls. Robertson's and Sons, in 2000, continued to use the golliwog trade character. The pressure for change in the symbolic cultural capital in Britain is changing, but resistance to change also presently continues into the new millennium.

WORKS CITED

- Akass, John. 1987. I Can't Bear It. *Daily Express* (5 January): 9.
 Barny 87! *The Sun* (2 January): 17.
 Bates, Stephen. 1987. Golliwogs Lose their Place in Noddy's Tales. *Daily Telegraph* (2 January): 17.
 Bell, Colin. 1987. Al Jolson Lookalike Is Blacked. *Daily Express* (28 March): 25.
 Black And White Set? 1986. *The Standard*. (23 October): 14.
 Blyton, Enid. 1951. *Here Comes Noddy Again*. London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co., Ltd.
 Breton, Raymond. 1984. The Production and Allocation of Symbolic Resources: An Analysis Of The Linguistic And Ethnocultural Fields In Canada. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 21 (2): 123-44.
 Camden CCR Campaign. 1980. *Dragon's Teeth* 2 (September): 6.
 Clark, Beverly Lyon. 1992. American Children's Literature; Background and Bibliography. *American Studies International* 30:1 (April): 4-40.
 Cockrill, Pauline. 1997. *Teddy Bears and Soft Toys*. Buckinghamshire, England: Shire Publications Ltd.
 Deleting Golliwogs. 1987. *The Daily Telegraph* (2 January): 16.
 Dixon, Bob. 1978. *Catching Them Young* 1. London: Pluto Press.
 Dixon, Bob. 1980. Money For Jam. *Dragon's Teeth* 2:3 (September): 15.
 Ezard, John. 1987. Outlook Not All Black For Golly. *The Guardian* (2 January): 3.
 Fisher, Marjery. 1975. *Who's Who In Children's Books: A Treasury of the Familiar Characters of Childhood*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
 Forster, Imogen. 1985. I Love My Golly but ... *Dragon's Teeth* 21 (Spring).
 _____. 1989. Nature's Outcast Child: Black People In Children's Books. *Race and Class* 31 (1): 59-77.
 Fraser, Pamela. 1991. Boycott. *Peebleshire News* (12 July): 6.
 Golliwogs Renamed. 1991. *Peebleshire News* (22 March): 1, 2.
 Golly Gets the Sack. 1987. *The Sun* (1 January): 9.
 Golly Song Released. 1991. *Peebleshire News* (10 May): 2.
 Golly What A Silly Row. 1987. *Daily Star* (5 January): 18.
 Good Golly! 1987. *Daily Mirror* (12 January): 4.
 Hamilton, Ian. 1996. The First Life of Salman Rushdie. *The New Yorker* (25 December): 90-97, 100-102, 104-108, 110-113.

- Hartlap, Diane. 1984. Florence Upton and the Golliwogg Doll. *The Black Memorabilia Collector's Monthly Newsletter*. Mt. Arlington, New Jersey: Jacquie Greenwood, 1-5.
- Hern, Anthony. 1967. *The Seaside Holiday*. London: Cresset Press.
- It's Goodbye Golliies. 1991. *Peebleshire News* (29 March): 1.
- Keddie, Andrew. 1991. Gollywogs Miss Out on Beltane Parade. *Peebleshire News* (15 February): 1.
- _____. 1991. Golly Cash Arrives. *Peebleshire News* (22 February): 1, 6.
- Kuttner, Julia. 1987. Jolson Blacked Out As Irene Sees Red. *The Standard* (27 March): 3.
- Lewis, George. 1991. The Birth of a Rag Doll. *Peebleshire News* (29 March): 6.
- Lively, Adam. 1999. *Masks*. London: Vintage.
- MacGregor, Robert M. 1993. The Beltane Festival Golliwog Controversy: Moral Entrepreneurs and Symbolic Restructuring of Social Order in British Society. Paper presented at the conference "Studying Human Lived Experience: Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research," 1993, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, May 14-22.
- Macintosh, Margaret M. 1991. Defending My Beliefs on Golliwogs. *Peebleshire News* (8 March): 7.
- Mann, Doug. 1991. Golliwog. *Peebleshire News* (26 April): 6.
- Mullan, Bob. 1987. *The Enid Blyton Story*. London: Boxtree Ltd.
- Newman, David. 1987. Noddy Blacks Golly! *Daily Star* (1 January): 7.
- Newton, Neil Jessup. 1997. Memory and Misrepresentation; Representing Crazy Horse in Tribal Court. *Borrowed Power*, ed. Bruce Ziff and Pratima V. Rao. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 195-224.
- Nicholson, Susan. 1981. The Golliwog. *Collectibles. Spinning Wheel* (January/February): 12-14.
- Pickering, Michael. 1986. White Skin, Black Masks: 'Nigger' Minstrelsy in Victorian England. *Music Hall: Performance and Style*, ed. J.S. Bratton. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 70-91.
- Purdie, Howard. 1991. Racism in Peebles, the Latest. *Peebleshire News* (12 April): 16.
- Rehin, George F. 1975. Harlequin Jim Crow: Continuity and Convergence in Blackface Clowning. *Journal of Popular Culture* 9: 682-701.
- _____. 1981. Blackface Street Minstrels in Victorian London and its Resorts: Popular Culture and its Racial Connotations as Revealed in Polite Opinion. *Journal of Popular Culture* 15 (1): 19-38.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- The Naughty Gnomes Oust Those Robber Golliwogs in the Alternative Noddy. 1987. *The Daily Mail* (1 January): 3.
- The Press, the Jam Jar, and the Gollywog. 1984. *Searchlight* (September): 16, 17.
- Trew, Winston. 1985. Campaign Report. *Dragon's Teeth* 21 (Spring): 5.
- Waterhouse, Keith. 1987. Golly Gumdrops. *Daily Mail* (5 January): 5.
- Welcome to Toytown: No Golliwogs! 1987. *Daily Mail* (2 January): 15.
- Wilkinson, Doris Y. 1987. The Doll Exhibit": A Psycho-Cultural Analysis Of Black Female Role Stereotypes. *Journal of Popular Culture* 21 (2): 19-29.

- _____. 1988. The Toy Menagerie: Early Images of Blacks in Toys, Games and Dolls. *Images of Blacks in American Culture*, ed. Jessie Carney Smith. New York, Greenwood Press, 273-287.
- Wyatt, Woodrow. 1987. Golly! What a Load of Noddy Nonsense. *News of the World* (4 January): 8.
- Young, Sydney. 1987. Toyland Kicks Out Noddy's Gollies. *Daily Mirror* (2 January): 3.
- Ziff, Bruce and Pratima V. Rao. 1997. Introduction to Cultural Appropriation: A Framework For Analysis. *Borrowed Power*, ed. Bruce Ziff and Pratima V. Rao. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1-27.