In 1862, one year into the American Civil War, Alfred Tennyson attempted to take an incognito holiday around Yorkshire and Derbyshire. Ever wary of public attention, the Poet Laureate refused to tell strangers his name. At a hotel in Buxton, his enigmatic appearance led one of the guests to mistake him for a member of the Confederate States of America (Monkton Milnes, 81-2). It is apt that Tennyson was confused for a Secessionist, since the American Civil War had marked a turning point in his relationship with the United States, particularly with the South. Having previously considered America to be an undifferentiated mass of money-grubbing Yankees, the war highlighted to Tennyson that there were, in fact, Americans like him: that is, men sceptical about the expanding capitalist world of finance and speculation, who retained ‘Old World’ virtues of gentlemanly behaviour and a belief in traditional forms of authority.

This article will trace Tennyson’s changing relationship to the United States. As it will show, the poet first associated Americans with what he saw as the exploitative practices of the transatlantic literary marketplace, before the Civil War modified his opinion. After this conflict, he would maintain a personal preference for Southerners along with a distaste for ‘Yankees’. This discrimination paralleled an increased suspicion of the United States’ imperial ambitions, though his attitude to postbellum America was also mixed with admiration. As a result of what he understood as its superior federal system of political organisation, he came to see the United States as the likely successor to a declining British Empire. He would eventually adopt an ideology akin to Manifest Destiny in ‘Kapiolani’ (1892), a work that encapsulated his sense of a coming shift in global power.

Tennyson’s early views on America were driven by the issue of copyright. Due to the absence of an international copyright treaty, his work could be reprinted in the United States without the need to pay royalties. This benefited Tennyson’s reputation, but not his bank balance (see Ledbetter). At the start of his career he received a more favourable reception in the American than the British press,
and by mid-century he had become the most imitated poet in America. Yet like many British writers, Tennyson was aghast at what he saw as the theft of his work in newspapers and ‘pirate’ book editions.

More crucial still in forming his early attitude to the United States was the fact that he had felt bullied by the American editor Charles Wheeler into an early publication of his two-volume *Poems* (1842). Wheeler wrote to Tennyson to declare that if the poet did not allow *Poems* to come out, the firm Little & Brown would produce an unauthorised version based on previously-published works. He reluctantly agreed, correcting some of the earlier poems for the new volume, while adding and abandoning others. He expressed his anger in an 1841 letter to Edward Fitzgerald, pointing out the civil-yet-threatening tone of Wheeler’s letter (*Letters*, 188).¹ He would always associate Americans or, rather, the figure of the ‘Yankee’, with the commercially-driven maltreatment that he had experienced in the early 1840s.² Tennyson advocated for an International Copyright Treaty, and never lost his resentment towards those American publishers whom he felt had taken advantage of him.

Yet though it was no doubt significant, copyright was not the only factor influencing his feelings about the United States, especially as the century wore on. Of equal importance but much greater complexity, as I shall now discuss in detail, was the question of Empire. There has been a great deal of work on Tennyson and colonialism (see Bratlinger, Shatto, Rowlinson, Hughes, Shaw, O’Brien, Riede, Reynolds, Ebbatson), but little on his association with Britain’s most powerful former colony. The only book length-study of Tennyson’s American reception is John Eidson’s *Tennyson in America* (1943). When Tennyson has been read transatlantically, the focus has been on his influence upon American writers (see Joseph, England, Hood, Finnerty, Gravil). This has tended to obscure the fact that Tennyson was himself more popular in America than he was in Great Britain.³ Though his influence in the United States was, as the essayist Hamilton Wright Mabie wrote in 1892, ‘diffusive, pervasive, atmospheric’, the poet’s own relationship to America has been neglected (Mabie, 553). Scholars have often claimed that Tennyson was not interested in the United States, or even that he had an active aversion to it. The latter was an accusation that was put to Tennyson during his lifetime. The widely-reported idea ‘that I dislike Americans’, he wrote to Henry Van Dyke, ‘is wholly without
foundation’ (*Letters*, 403). As I shall show, while he did associate those from New England and surrounding states with financial acquisitiveness, he differentiated between Americans from the North and those from the South.

This article will chart the Laureate’s changing thoughts about the United States during the second half of the nineteenth century. Though I will deal largely with letters and ‘minor’ poems, the implications of my argument extend further. As we shall see, Britain’s national poet was deeply involved in transatlantic dialogue, debate, and exchange, both of a poetic and political nature. Tennyson’s representation of the British Empire cannot be seen in isolation from the threats that Empire faced, particularly from the growing power of the United States.

**Antebellum attitudes: Anglo-Saxonism and ‘Hands All Round’** (1852)

During the nineteenth century, according to Donald Scragg, the Anglo-Saxons achieved ‘a cultural significance higher than at any time before or since’ (21). This was felt strongly by Tennyson, whose interest in Anglo-Saxon affairs is clear from the content of many of his poems and plays, including ‘Lady Godiva’ (1842), *Harold* (1877) ‘The Battle of Brunanburh’ (1880), and *The Foresters* (1881). This interest affected his early attitude towards America, which, despite concerns about the transatlantic exploitation of his poetry, consisted of a fairly conventional Anglo-Saxonism. This was an ideology which, among other things, saw Britain and America as sharing a particularly close bond — as being two societies born out of shared principles: religion, cultural values, and law. Protestantism was seen as a purer and more democratic form of religion, having thrown off elaborate forms of worship and belief in the authority of Catholic popes and priests. Seeing the Anglo-Saxons as the most democratic group in history, Victorian Anglo-Saxonists produced historical studies that idealised the *Witengemót* as a forerunner of representative democracy. These scholars believed that the legal framework of the Anglo-Saxons had provided a guarantee against authoritarianism, at least until the invasion of England by William the Conqueror. The Anglo-Saxons were, according to this
view, guardians of liberty against more dictatorial cultures, such as the Catholic French or, worse still, the Islamic Turks.

From mid-century, a more racialised form of Anglo-Saxonism developed. Texts of scientific racism such as Joseph Arthur Comte de Gobineau’s *The Moral and Intellectual Diversity of Races* (English translation 1856), as well as anthropological studies such as Josiah Clark Nott and George Robins Gliddon’s *Indigenous Races of the Earth* (1857), suggested that the Anglo-Saxon or Aryan branch of the Caucasian race was inherently superior to other ethnic groups in terms of energy, morals, and intellect, a fact which explained the dominance of Great Britain and the United States in world politics. These two strands of Anglo-Saxonism, one cultural and the other racialist, co-existed throughout the rest of the century. They often appeared in overlapping forms, as in the work of the Orientalist Max Müller, active at the University of Oxford from 1850 until 1875, who believed that possession of a unified language equated to racial unity. By the end of the century, however, racialist arguments seemed to have overcome philological ones, as summed up by Isaac Taylor’s influential *The Origin of the Aryans* (1890), which argued that ‘Language…is mutable, race persistent’ and that the most reliable method to determine the latter was ‘The shape of the skull’ (45 & 63). The eventual victory of anthropometry and craniometry over language and law has overshadowed cultural Anglo-Saxonism in later scholarship, which has tended to concern itself with nineteenth-century anthropological explanations of racial difference.

Tennyson was influenced by both of these traditions. He had imbibed cultural Anglo-Saxonism from a young age, and was an avid reader of the racial philologists. His father’s library, which is housed in the Tennyson Research Centre (TRC), and which formed the basis of his home-schooling, contains several foundational Anglo-Saxonist texts. These include Tacitus’ *Germania* (circa 98) and Paul de Rapin-Thoyras’ *History of England* (2nd Edition, 1832-3, items 335 and 277). Tennyson’s own library holds Sharon Turner’s *The History of the Anglo-Saxons* (2nd Edition, 1807, item 2238), a traditional work of cultural Anglo-Saxonism, as well as later texts by racial philologists including Rasmus Christian Nielsen Rask’s *A Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue* (1830, item
1854), Samuel Laing’s *Modern Science and Modern Thought* (1855, item 1344), John Mitchell Kemble’s *The Saxons in England* (1849; revised ed. 1876, item 1307), and several historical works by Edward Augustus Freeman (items 955-959). Tennyson was personally familiar with Müller, as well as Kemble, who was a fellow Cambridge ‘Apostle’.

Damien Love argues that claims of ‘Anglo-Saxon origins…barely established a foothold’ in Britain, while ‘the Vikings have attained a much more potent hold on popular culture than the Anglo-Saxons have ever done’ (463). Love goes on to suggest that Tennyson’s acceptance of racial blending in ‘A Welcome to Alexandra’ (1863) is incompatible with Anglo-Saxonist thought. Although this poem does construct Britons as a mixture of ‘Saxon or Dane or Norman we,/Teuton or Celt, or whatever we be’, none of these sources, not even the ‘Celt’, is in fact outside of Anglo-Saxonism (*Poems* Vol II, 650-651, lines 31-32). This body of thought was broader and more complicated than Love’s conflation of it with ideas of racial purity suggests. Some strands, such as the one promoted by the mid-century magazine *The Anglo-Saxon*, included the Celts in a broad Caucasian family. Furthermore, Anglo-Saxonist ideology contained both polygenetic and monogenetic strands. Sharon Turner, for example, argued that the human race was one and attacked previous writers for denigrating and denying Britain’s Celtic origins (Turner, 3-4). Isaac Taylor, in an attempt to mend a schism between the racialists on this point, later argued that the Celts were the original Aryans (Taylor, 296). Even Josiah Strong, one of the most virulent proponents of the Anglo-Saxons’ providential duty to dominate the globe, claimed that ‘The marked superiority of this race is due, in large measure, to its highly mixed origin’ (Strong, 171). Furthermore, Tennyson’s views on race were more complex than the reading of a single poem will attest. ‘The Celtic race’, he once stated in justification of his opposition to William Gladstone’s policy of Home Rule, ‘does not easily amalgamate with other races, as those of Scandinavian origin do’ (see Hallam Tennyson, 338). Yet as Matthew Reynolds has convincingly shown, at other times terms like ‘Celt’ and ‘English’ represented to Tennyson cultural values related to character, behaviour and law, to the extent that to be English meant in part ‘the subjugation of the Celt within’ (Reynolds, 216). That Tennyson contradicts
himself at various points on the issue of race is unsurprising, given the length of his life and the confusions of racialist thinking during the Victorian period.

In his early to mid-century poetry, Tennyson wavers between cultural and racialist forms of Anglo-Saxonism. At times he advocates law and liberty as the binding qualities of the English nation. This is the case in ‘Hail Briton!’ (1832), which idealises feudal England as a land in which ‘The cords of order and of law’ were knitted around the ‘will’ of every peasant (*Poems*, Vol I, 523, line 28). Similarly, ‘You ask me, why, tho’ ill at ease’ (written 1833, published 1842), describes England as ‘The land, where girt with friends or foes/A man may speak the thing he will;/A land of settled government’ (*Poems* Vol I, 531, lines 7-9). At other times, he advocates a more essentialist view. In ‘The Palace of Art’ (1833-1842), for example, the speaker makes reference to ‘the supreme Caucasian mind’ while an unpublished draft of ‘To the Queen’ (1851) states that ‘The noblest men are born and bred/Among the Saxo-Norman race’ (*Selected Edition*, 59, line 126, & 986, lines 1-2). The latter reference to a ‘Saxo-Norman race’ aligns Tennyson with a British tradition of Anglo-Saxonism, overlooked by Love, which understood the Normans to share a common Viking ancestry with the Saxons, and which claimed that the events of 1066 had reunited ancient Germanic-Norse tribes.7 In *Harold*, Tennyson’s play about the Norman invasion, William the Conqueror states his belief that: ‘Of one self stock at first’, the Conquest will ‘Make them again one people—Norman, English;/And English, Norman’ (Act V Scene II, in *Works*, 692). However, Tennyson’s work is also inconsistent about the Normans. In *The Foresters*, the poet mixes the legend of Robin Hood with an Anglo-Saxonist interpretation of Magna Carta. Discussing King John, Robin prophesies: ‘For aught I know,/So that our Barons bring his baseness under./I think they will be mightier than the king’ (Act I, Scene II, in *Works*, 809). Robin’s prediction is that Saxonism, with its associated elements of freedom and liberty, will ultimately defeat John’s Norman tyranny through the signing of Magna Carta. Tennyson’s confusion around the status of the Normans — Vikings, English, French, or whatever they be — is a confusion at the heart of Anglo-Saxonism itself. This is significant, since fear of a French invasion played a crucial role in shaping his early attitude to the United States.
In 1851, Napoleon III came to power in France following a coup d’état. Tennyson was outraged, as is clear from his colourful reference to the President of the Second French Republic as a ‘French Dutch pseudo-Corsican-bastard-blackleg kite-eaglet’ (*Letters* Vol II, 47). He was convinced that France would soon attack Britain. He suffered literal nightmares over this prospect, which was still troubling him in 1859, when he hopefully asked the Duke of Argyll whether someone would put a ‘bullet into Louis Napoleon’s forehead before he gets to London?’ (*Letters* Vol II, 236) The Emperor had become something of an obsession. In his desperation Tennyson wrote a number of nationalistic works: ‘the most contemptuously depreciated poems of his career’, according to J. Timothy Lovelace (7). One of these, ‘Rifle Clubs!’ (1852), advocated for the formation of a domestic defence force and the arming of British citizens, perhaps on the model of the United States (*Poems* Vol II, 469-70). In another poem, ‘Hands All Round’, published in the *Examiner* on the 7th of February 1852 under the pseudonym ‘Merlin’, he overcame his annoyance at American publishers and called for aid from those whom he saw as Britain’s closest relations:

Gigantic daughter of the West,
We drink to thee across the flood!
We know thee and we love thee best;
For art thou not of British blood?
Should war’s mad blast again be blown,
Permit not thou the tyrant powers
To fight thy mother here alone,
But let thy broadsides roar with ours.
Hands all round!
God the tyrant’s cause confound!
To our great kinsman of the West, my friends,
And the great name of England, round and round.

Oh rise, our strong Atlantic sons,
When war against our freedom springs!
Oh, speak to Europe through your guns!
*They* can be understood by kings.
You must not mix our Queen with those
That wish to keep their people fools:
Our freedom’s foemen are her foes;
She comprehends the race she rules.
Hands all round!
God the tyrant’s cause confound!
To our great kinsman in the West, my friends,
And the great cause of Freedom, round and round.

(*Poems* Vol II, 475-477, lines 37-60)
The proposed American military intervention is represented as a ‘great cause’, part of the progress of a Hegelian notion of ‘Freedom’, the cause’s greatness being emphasised by the biblical ‘flood’ used to describe the Atlantic. Written in iambic tetrameter, the first eight lines of what are the poem’s final two stanzas maintain a pulsing regularity. This traditional meter emphasises a common poetic history between the two English-speaking nations. A triple-stressed refrain immediately follows, with the contrast between these lines emphasising a sense of urgency in the imperative ‘Hands all round!’

Indeed, the frequency of imperatives (‘Permit not’, ‘let thy broadsides roar’, ‘Oh rise’, ‘Oh, speak’, ‘You must not mix our Queen’) gives the poem a hectoring tone: though Tennyson is willing to ask for transatlantic assistance, the United States must nevertheless obey Britain’s commands. This presumed hierarchy stems from the respect owned to the older nation for its tradition of liberty, its long experience as an imperial power and, above all, its political system. The poem states that ‘You [Americans] must not, mix our Queen with those/That wish to keep their people fools’. This attempt to distinguish between the liberal British and despotic Continental Monarchies becomes muddled in the line ‘Our freedom’s foemen are her foes’, in which the terms ‘our’ and ‘her’ created a tangled sense of subject, a confusion that is not helped by the alliterative pace of the line. The justification for this distinction is that Victoria ‘comprehends the race she rules’ implying, presumably, that Napoleon III does not. In an earlier draft, Tennyson had written ‘comprehends the lands she rules’ (The Tennyson Archive, Volume VIII, 212). Though it was a term with a broad meaning in the mid-nineteenth century, this change to ‘race’ nevertheless enhances the sense of an essential ethnic difference between Britain and France.

Clearly Tennyson feels more aligned with Britain’s ‘strong Atlantic sons’ than he does with France. This is because Americans are, as the poem puts it, ‘of British blood’. The poem’s use of familial and sanguinary figures is significant. According to Ansgar Nunning, the family was the most commonly-applied metaphor used by imperialists to describe the British Empire. Kinship metaphors, as Nunning argues, naturalised and simplified complex political dynamics by implying ‘that the relationship between England and her colonies was based on unity, harmony, and, above all, love’.
(77). Tennyson’s use of mother-child metaphors to describe a former colony suggests the relationship of an experienced and responsible party to a youthful, perhaps naïve one. The United States may be fully independent (or fully grown) but, Tennyson implies, it should still learn its place in the imperial pecking order. As I will show later, his confidence in the relative position of the two nations would change radically by the time of his final poetic output. First, however, I will examine Tennyson’s reaction to the War of Secession, an event that was crucial in forming his distinction between the American North and South.

**War and Peace Pipes: Tennyson, Tobacco, and the American Civil War**

Stories of the American tourists who plagued Farringford were legendary. As a result of his frequent battles with transatlantic autograph hunters, scholars have tended to conclude that Tennyson disliked Americans (see Eidson, 124-125; Martin, 319, 469 & 565; Clark, 1). Yet during the American Civil War he came to find a fond preference for Southerners, while increasing his brusque attitude towards those from the North and East. Though often passed over by embarrassed Tennysonians, there is little doubt which side of the war the Laureate was on. He adopted a similar stance to that of the Southern General Robert E. Lee: while both men opposed slavery in principle, they felt that the rule of law and the right of (white) self-determination were more important. In an 1862 letter to the Duchess of Argyll, Tennyson asked whether the secession of the Southern States constituted treason against the Union:

> If I read rightly what has been truly written of the Constitution of those Southern States—No. Slavery there was recognised when each state was received—a sovereign state abdicating part of its sovereignty and laying it before the throne of the Union with a right to resume it at will. I love not slavery more than Charles Sumner does; but here a cool spectator—not an actor all on fire among these fiery scenes—small praise to me if I love justice more than he (*Letters* Vol II, 318).  

Like many British Confederate sympathisers, Tennyson believed that slavery would end sooner if the South became independent. A nation’s development, according to this conservative view, must occur
naturally, rather than being forced by the interference of well-meaning politicians. In 1864, as part of his increasingly-partisan involvement with Southerners, he met John Reuben Thompson, a Dixieland poet and propagandist, and Walker Fern, a diplomatic representative of the Confederacy. He liked both men, describing them as possessing ‘the finest gentlemenship, perfectly simple and noble-mannered’ (*Letters* Vol II, 385). The reference to Thompson and Fern as possessing the qualities of gentlemen encapsulates the distinction that he was beginning to make between North and South.

While Northerners were, he felt, largely responsible for robbing him of justly-deserved royalties through their pirate publishing activities, Southerners had a more old-fashioned, even Old World belief in simplicity, nobility and good manners. According to Thompson’s account of this meeting, Tennyson ‘talked much of the American war, which he deplored, and of the Yankees, whom he detested’ (Thompson, 1864 diary entry, cited in Wilson, 13). Though given from the perspective of a Confederate, this is nevertheless the first recorded instance of Tennyson distinguishing between North and South. Here he uses ‘Yankee’ to mean Northerner, whereas before the Civil War he had used the term ‘Yankeland’ to refer to the United States more generally (see *Letters* Vol I, 338). The word ‘detested’ parallels the strength of feeling that Tennyson displayed in his 1862 letter to the Duchess of Argyll, in which he went on to say that he was ‘disappointed nay disgusted with the Northerners ever yelling and mouthing against their old European mother’ (*Letters* Vol II, 318). His disgust related to the bad feeling that sprang up between the Union and Great Britain during the war, over what Northerners perceived as Britain’s friendly relationship with the South. The most infamous incident occurred when a Confederate warship, the *Alabama*, was built at Birkenhead in 1862. After leaving port, the ship went on to capture or sink 65 merchant ships working for the Union. This caused great bitterness in the American North and a decade-long period of ‘Anglophobia’. Highly sensitive to criticism, whether personal or political, Tennyson felt enormous resentment at Union censure of Great Britain.

Following the end of the conflict, Tennyson referred to the South’s failed war for independence as a ‘heroic struggle’ and expressed a desire to read the memoirs of the Confederate officer, Heros Von Borcke, which had been ghostwritten by John Thompson (*Letters* Vol II, 408).
Tennyson’s hostile attitude to Northerners crystallised upon the American publication of an unauthorised magazine account of his Farringford home. He declared on 3 June 1866, ‘I shall admit no more Yankees into my house until they learn to reverence the hearth’ (Letters Vol II, 438). This prohibition clearly did not apply to Southerners, though, since Thompson’s diary indicates that he was ‘cordially received by the poet’ later that same month (Thompson, 30). This prejudicial attitude continued for at least two decades, as indicated by the account of William Gordon McCabe, Headmaster at the University School in Petersburg, Virginia, and a former Confederate officer.

McCabe and Tennyson met in 1884 and got on extremely well, McCabe becoming a regular guest at Farringford and Aldworth, Tennyson’s home in Surrey. During their first meeting the pair, according to McCabe, ‘talked of the South’ and ‘of Negro franchise’ (McCabe, memorandum dated 12 September 1884, cited in Gordon, 349). McCabe did not record precisely what was said on these topics, but the attitude that both men took to ‘Negro franchise’ can be inferred from Tennyson’s infamous argument with Gladstone about the 1865 Eyre rebellion (‘Niggers are tigers, niggers are tigers’, Tennyson was heard to say) and McCabe’s description of Reconstruction as ‘dark days’ in which the North had sought to impose ‘humiliations’ upon the South (McCabe, 53).

Upon another visit by McCabe in 1885, he repeated the comment about disliking Yankees and confessed to his friend: ‘I can trust you because you are a Southerner and a gentleman’, terms which he seemed to conflate easily (352). Tennyson’s use of ‘Yankee’ to refer to Americans from the North was unusual among his countrymen. According to the OED, in Britain the term had referred to all Americans from the War of Independence onward. It did not acquire a more specific meaning, as in the United States, though even there the term began to lose its regional denotation in the 1880s and 1890s. Using ‘Yankee’ in its American, antebellum sense in the late nineteenth century, then, seems politically significant, not to say bloody-minded, on Tennyson’s part.

An enlightening example of the distinction that Tennyson drew between North and South is his reaction to receiving gifts of tobacco and smoking pipes. That the Laureate was a heavy smoker was well known, and as a result he was inundated with tobacco from admirers. His American donors included Henry Wadsworth Longfellow who, in 1866, perhaps as a gesture of goodwill during the
period of ‘Anglophobia’, sent Tennyson a Calumet, commonly (and inaccurately) referred to as a peace-pipe. Rather than being grateful for this gift, which remains in pristine, seemingly unused condition in the TRC, Tennyson complained: ‘It is odd that the Americans always send me pipes and tobacco, as if I cared for nothing else in the world; and their tobacco is not my tobacco, nor their pipes my pipes’ (*Letters* Vol II, 445). Later, he apologised to Longfellow for having neither acknowledged nor indeed used the pipe (*Letters* Vol II, 448). In contrast, he prized tobacco from Southerners highly. In 1884, for example, he thanked the Southern writer and editor Paul Hamilton Payne for his gift of ‘North Carolina tobacco’, which he called ‘very good’ (*Letters* Vol III, 307). He was similarly grateful to his good friend McCabe, who sent him Durham and Lone Jack tobacco on different occasions: ‘whenever the smoke of your Durham ascends to Heaven from my pipe, I shall remember the giver and wish him health and happiness’ (*Letters*, Volume III, 365). Tennyson not only received Southern tobacco, but he inhaled it as well. The image of the Laureate contentedly puffing away while his Durham tobacco ‘ascends to heaven’ is emblematic of his attitude to the South: a place where gentlemen remained gentlemen, and might enjoy the pleasures of life at their ease.

In 1871, the *New York Ledger* offered Tennyson £1000 for a three stanza poem. The subsequent work, ‘England and America in 1782’ (1872) has received little critical attention, partly because it is a rewritten version of a poem composed in the early 1830s. As I will now argue, the poem’s meaning in 1872 was different from its original unpublished incarnation, not because of textual amendments (of which there are relatively few) but because of the different political context for the later version. As far as I am aware, the fact that the poem was originally a poetic response to Edward Wakefield’s *England and America: a Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations* (1833) has escaped critical attention. Wakefield’s book, operating on the principle that ‘the Americans and the English have a common interest in understanding the art of colonization’, aimed to increase each nation’s understanding of the political conditions of the other (vi). The American War of Independence, Wakefield claimed, had demonstrated that ruling a colony over a great distance was impossible, and that local self-government was therefore inevitable for all Anglo-Saxon peoples. Britain could, however, be satisfied with its status as the originator of this lineage.
In a similar vein, Tennyson’s poem argues for the benefits of self-rule. It addresses a personified Britain, which the speaker refers to as the ‘strong mother of a lion-line’ (*Poems* Vol II, 42-3, line 3). It asks the nation to ‘Be proud of those strong sons of thine/Who wrench’d their rights from thee!’ and suggests that during the War of Independence, America had ‘Retaught the lesson thou had’st taught’ (lines 4-5). This renders the American Revolution British: another event in the progress of the freedom-loving Anglo-Saxons. Tennyson once again mixes racial and cultural forms of Anglo-Saxonism, on the one hand praising common traditions of law and on the other noting that Americans ‘sprang from English blood’. Ledbetter claims that Tennyson sent this poem to the *Ledger* because he ‘hoped for better relations between the two countries’ after the Civil War (Ledbetter, 190). This is, I suggest, only partly true, since it overlooks the gibe hidden in the final stanza:

Christopher Ricks notes that Tennyson was going to use this stanza for the ‘Ode on the Death of Wellington’ (1852, 1853, 1855) but that he removed it from that poem. Being in the ‘Ode’ would, he claims, have confused the sailor/soldier balance of that poem. John Hampden’s connection with ships is indeed a crucial connotation. Ricks argues that ‘Hampden’s honourable rebellion against royal tyranny is pertinent to the American rebellion’ (Ricks, 320). Yet by the time that ‘England and America’ was published, Hampden represented to Tennyson a figure of resistance not only to the tyranny of Charles I, but that of the United States as well.

Killed on the battlefield during the English Civil War, one of Hampden’s most significant contributions to history was his refusal to pay ‘ship-money’. This was the King’s right to raise ships from maritime towns and cities without Parliament’s consent. Since additional ships were frequently
unavailable, money was often paid instead – so that ‘ship money’ became a form of taxation without representation. Though there are obvious historical links with the American Revolution here, for Tennyson the contemporary resonance, or vibration, to use the poem’s own language, of ship money came during the ‘Alabama Claims’. From 1869 to 1872, the United States sought damages from Great Britain for losses suffered as a result of actions taken by the Alabama. Tennyson was incandescent at this legal action, which America eventually won through international arbitration. A month after the publication of ‘England and America’, he wrote to Gladstone who, as Prime Minister, was involved in the final negotiations. After first wishing him luck, Tennyson advised his friend: ‘if you let those Yankee sharpers get anything like their way of you in the Alabama Claims, I won’t pay my “shipmoney” any more than old Hampden’ (Letters Vol III, 24). As Matthew Bevis notes, Hampden was, for Tennyson, a law-abiding rebel, a man willing to stand up for the law even when great powers did not (154). Seen in this context, the reference to Hampden in ‘England and America’, rather than a call for transatlantic solidarity, is actually a critique of ‘Yankee sharpers’ who are attempting, once again, to enrich themselves. It positions the United States as a modern Charles I, seeking ship-money from Britons who have little power to resist. The reference is hidden from sight to most readers. This interpretation could explain why, in contrast to the traditional view that he was simply embarrassed by the amount of money offered, Tennyson hesitated before accepting the commission: he may have wondered whether the poem would prove controversial. If this was the case then he need not have worried, as no-one seems to have noticed.

The poem’s reference to ‘Whatever harmonies of law/the growing world assume/Thy work is thine’ is ironic, since Tennyson clearly felt that the 1871 Treaty of Washington and the 1872 international arbitration in Geneva were discordant rather than harmonious. ‘Thy work is thine’ suggests that Albion will maintain its tradition of resistance to tyranny no matter what the rest of the world, apparently now ganging up on the Empire in the arbitration process, might do. Hampden’s ‘deep chord’ now takes on a more ominous meaning, one which is enhanced by the change in pace that occurs with the line break after ‘smote’, as well as the elongated double vowel sound of ‘doom’, which enacts the vibration of the line’s beginning. Struck when Britain was the centre of the world,
the chord of freedom had vibrated outwards to the peripheral parts of the world, including the Americas. But now, as W. B. Yeats might put it, the centre could not hold. The phrase ‘to the doom’ implies the end of British dominance in the face of a ‘growing world’, particularly the rising power of ‘Yankee sharpers’.16

Tennyson, Federalism and the New American Empire

Tennyson was sensitive to the United States’ increasingly-important place in the future of international politics. For him, the rise of America, as well as Germany and Russia, was occurring in inverse proportion to the decline of the British Empire. He feared that the U.S would annex Canada, and that Britain had neither the sufficient military resources nor political will to defend its far-flung territories. He admitted these concerns to McCabe in 1884: ‘England, he thought, had reached her zenith, and was going down hill’ (McCabe, 350). This pessimism pervades much of his late poetry, including the Laureate Ode ‘On the Jubilee of Queen Victoria’ (1887).17 In Tennyson’s view, the only chance to prevent decline was to refashion the Empire into a federation: a unified state spanning several continents, with an Imperial Parliament in which all members had an equal voice. What was needed, in other words, was a United States of Great Britain.

A federal British Empire was, Tennyson wrote in 1879, ‘one of the dreams of my life’ (*Letters* Vol III, 173). In 1884, he and his son Hallam joined the Imperial Federation League, a group created with the aim of advancing the cause of ‘Greater Britain’.18 Robert Inglesfield, Marion Sherwood and Cornelia Pearsall have analysed Tennyson’s commitment to federation, though each has tended to underplay the importance of America in the poet’s vision of global unity. The United States, as Duncan Bell notes, was ‘the archetypal federal state’, and as such it served as ‘a constructive template for the future’ of the British Empire (100 & 208). For instance, in his popular *The Expansion of England* (1883), which Tennyson owned (item 1985), John Seeley comments that ‘The United States ‘is a great example of a system under which an indefinite number of provinces is firmly held together’ (160).19 Imperial federalism, the argument went, was flexible enough to
accommodate significant regional differences, and had been made practicable by the expansion of
technologies such as the telegraph. It could also survive internal strife. Notably, Tennyson’s views on
the benefits of federalism date from the end of the American Civil War. While some Britons saw the
war as evidence of disunity, federalists such as Tennyson understood it to demonstrate the strength of
America’s political system. The conflict had been a great test, or ‘fiery trial’ as Emily Tennyson put
it, which the United States – and particularly the principle of federation – had passed convincingly
(Letters Vol II, 405). In 1887, Tennyson spoke in glowing terms about the American Constitution,
which he had come to see as a bulwark against excessive democracy.

The poem ‘Opening of the Indian and Colonial Exhibition by the Queen’ (1886) shows
Tennyson’s anxiety for the future of Britain’s overseas domains if imperial federation (‘One life, one
flag, one fleet, one throne’) is not adopted (Poems Vol III, 147-148, line 39). As Sherwood notes, the
imagery of ‘Sons, be welded each and all/Into one imperial whole’ (lines 36-37) implies the violence
that may be necessary to bring about such a unified structure (Sherwood, 167). This is also an image
of modern industry, which can make use of the ‘Produce of your field and flood/Mount and mine, and
primal wood/Works of subtle brain and hand’ (lines 5-6) to create a new global polity. Technology, in
particular steamships and the telegraph, now made a state spanning several continents a practical
possibility. The poem’s call for unity is set against its anxious ‘Brothers, must we part at last?’ (line
32), a question that stems from the loss of the American colonies:

Britain fought her sons of yore –
Britain fail’d; and never more,
Careless of our growing kin,
Shall we sin our father’s sin,
Men that in a narrower day –
Unprophetic rulers they –
Drove from out the mother’s nest
That young eagle of the West
To forage for herself alone;
Britons, hold your own! (lines 21-30)
The eighteenth-century was a ‘narrower day’ not only because British rulers were complacent about American political demands, but also because of the material conditions of the era, as Wakefield had argued in 1833, meant that communication across a great divide was much more difficult. Now that barriers of time and space had been overcome by ‘Works of subtle brain and hand’, all that was needed was sufficient political will. Britain’s political leaders must therefore learn from the ‘Unprophetic’ rulers of the past, observe the direction in which history is moving, and help to bring about a new global order. The poem’s call for imperial unity may even include bringing the United States back home, since the language of ‘sons’ used to describe British colonial nations is the same as the ‘sons of yore’ used to describe the former colonists. Indeed, as in ‘Hands all Round’, the text’s confusing melange of subjects — ‘Britain’, ‘Sons and brothers’, ‘our’, ‘we’, ‘her sons’, ‘the mother’s nest’, ‘our father’s sin’ — points to an identity crisis of which the poem is aware but which it cannot resolve. Just who, or what, is Greater Britain? Is it a racial polity, or one that accommodates India, South Africa and the West Indies? And what of the United States, whose supposedly Anglo-Saxon heritage was often noted, but which remained a stubbornly-independent nation? The poem does not answer these questions. In order to see how Tennyson dealt with them, I turn to ‘Kapiolani’ (1892), one of his final and most politically-enigmatic works.

Posthumously published in 1892, ‘Kapiolani’ concerns the legendary actions of its eponymous heroine, a native Hawaiian chiefess who converted to Christianity in 1824. According to contemporary accounts, Kapi’olani braved the wrath of the native God Pele by daring to pray beside the crater of the active volcano Kīlauea, in which the spirit of Pele was believed to reside. Emerging unharmed from this journey, Kapi’olani scored a valuable propaganda victory for the islands’ protestant missionaries, who had arrived in Hawai’i only five years before. Tennyson portrays this as a victory of the Christian God over ‘a Spirit of Evil’: a ‘demon’ that had set itself up as a Deity (Works, 889-890, line 33). He constructs Kapi’olani’s actions as a necessary step towards Christianising the globe. The fact that Tennyson pays no attention to Hawaiian political reality, the politics of Kapi’olani’s own day, and Hawai’i’s contemporary status as a de-facto American outpost in this poem will seem unsurprising. Yet he does not overlook these issues out of ignorance, but rather
to avoid admitting the United States’ victory in a century-long imperial struggle. America’s awkward absence is, I contend, an implicit admission that the future of world imperialism belongs to that nation. While Sally Engle Merry argues that the poem portrays Kapi‘olani as a ‘model of British heroism’ who defines ‘the essence of Britain’, I claim that it in fact attempts to unite Britain with America in response to a perceived decline in the former’s global reach (56).

Given the name ‘The Sandwich islands’ by Captain James Cook, Hawai‘i was indeed sandwiched between a number of powers. It was a site of contention for rival imperialisms, including Britain, America, Japan, China, and even between the Hawaiian islands. ‘Discovered’ by Cook in 1788, in the course of a century the islands had been threatened with invasion by Russia and France, briefly annexed by Britain in 1843, abortively declared an American protectorate in 1851, subject to significant waves of Asian immigrants, and largely Christianised by American missionaries whose descendants would dominate Hawai‘i’s economy by mid-century. In the 1880s, fearing a growing American hegemony, King Kalākaua attempted to forge an alliance of Asian countries, to construct a submarine telegraph cable to Japan, and to annex the Micronesian states of New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands. He also considered bringing in Indian immigrants to work Hawaiian sugar plantations, thereby increasing British influence over the islands. These geopolitical moves led American businessmen to stage an armed revolt in 1887, during which Kalākaua was forced to sign a new Constitution, widely-known as the ‘Bayonet Constitution’. This turned him into a figurehead and reduced the voting rights of native Hawaiians and, especially, Asian immigrants.

Tennyson was reasonably knowledgeable about Hawai‘i’s internal and external politics, his knowledge coming from personal contacts and from his reading. In late 1865, he and Emily had hosted the Hawaiian Queen Emma and her entourage at Farringford for several days. They gave the Queen an Ilex wood throne to use for the duration of her visit, an artefact which remains at the TRC. Since the visit consisted mostly of tea and polite conversation, interspersed with the performance of Hawaiian songs and poetry, it has been dismissed by Tennyson biographer John Batchelor as ‘utterly pointless’ (279). This was not a view held by Emma, however. Partly English herself, she wanted
Hawai‘i to seek an alliance with Britain rather than America. In 1874, she would unsuccessfully contest the Hawaiian throne against Kalākaua, who at that time had been more supportive of American influence. Queen Emma’s visit to Britain was aimed at securing the Empire’s good will, and her visit to see the Poet Laureate should be seen in this context. The visit also had an impact on Emma’s British hosts. Through its use of the phonetic epistrophe ‘Hawa-i-ee’, for example, ‘Kapiolani’ indicates that Tennyson had paid attention to Hawaiian pronunciation during Queen Emma’s visit. The double vowel sound operates as a performative sign of Otherness, one which enacts Hawai‘i’s exotic strangeness in a similar way to Tennyson’s Lincolnshire dialect poems.

In 1871, Tennyson wrote to Manley Hopkins, British Consul General in Hawai‘i (and father of the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins), to accept a position on a Committee responsible for building a new church in Honolulu. Confirming his yearly subscription of £1 for the mission, Tennyson claimed that ‘neither my wife nor myself has lost the interest in Queen Emma and that which concerns her’ (Letters Vol III, 21). Tennyson had continued to read about the islands. His library contains numerous books on Hawai‘i, including Oceana; or, England and her colonies (1886; item 964), a popular work by the federalist James Anthony Froude. In this book, Froude notes that ‘The whole Sandwich group is under the protection of the Americans. Guarded by the stars and stripes, a phantom royalty maintains itself at Honolulu’ (300). Given his familiarity with Hawai‘i, Tennyson was unlikely to be ignorant about the islands’ tentative political position, perched as they were on the brink of full annexation.

References to political actors are absent from Tennyson’s poem. Instead, ‘Kapiolani’ presents the actions of its eponymous protagonist as part of a global Manifest Destiny, in which savage customs and religions are inevitably beaten back by the march of Christian progress. The poem also underplays the internal political changes that occurred in Hawai‘i just prior to the missionaries’ arrival, and which made their job of conversion significantly easier. Having been united as a single state under King Kamehameha I in 1810, the islands of Hawai‘i faced the prospect of falling back into separate nations upon his death in 1819. The arrival of the missionaries was fortuitous for the ali‘i, a
group to which Kapi’olani belonged, because Christianity provided a new ideology that could consolidate Kamehameha I’s recent conquests. Summarising this history, Tennyson’s poem asserts: ‘One from the Sunrise/Dawn’d on His people, and slowly before him/Vanis’d shadow-like/Gods and Goddesses/None but the terrible Peelè remaining’ (line 28). The imagery of pagan gods vanishing like shadows before the sun implies that the islander’s conversion was a natural, even automatic process, though this is contradicted by the reference to ‘One’, presumably Christ via his missionaries, arriving ‘from the sunrise’. The poem displays an internal tension, then, over the extent to which Hawai’i’s religious and social changes were driven by human or divine intervention.

‘Kapiolani’, with its varied line length, trochaic rhythm and sparing use of rhyme, demonstrates the development of Tennyson’s late style. It imitates, according to Charles Tennyson, the Hawaiian songs that the poet had heard during Queen Emma’s visit (Charles Tennyson, 523). Commenting on its flexible and irregular lines, Jason Nabi writes that ‘“Kapiolani” is one of the last poems Tennyson ever wrote, and it is as close to the poetic future, and as close to finished free verse, as he gets’ (195). In its looser structure, the poem edges towards a federalism of verse: a form in which the relationship of the parts to the whole is decentralised. This structure, which Nabi neatly characterises as Tennyson’s ‘freer’ verse, has consciously Whitmanian overtones. It represents an acknowledgment of Whitman’s increasing cultural power and, through him, that of the United States itself. Given the United States’ increasing influence in Hawaiian affairs, it is unsurprising that ‘Kapiolani’ is Tennyson’s most ‘American’ poem.

As a result of its unspoken transatlantic ideology, ‘Kapiolani’ marks a shift from the pessimism that is characteristic of Tennyson’s late imperial poetry. Its jubilant tone suggests that the removal of Hawai’i’s old Gods had laid the groundwork for a better future. This is an implicit justification of American intervention, given Hawai’i’s status as a de-facto protectorate of the United States at the time of writing. Though the poem alludes to the work of American missionaries, they are not identified by nationality. By suggesting that nationality is less important than race and religion, the poem side-steps the likely decline of the British Empire, uniting Britain and America under the
banner of Anglo-Saxonism. It compares Kapi‘olani’s defiance of Pele to ‘the Saxon who hurl’d at his Idol, a valorous weapon in olden England!’ (Line 4). This aligns Saxon England with pre-Christian Hawai‘i in order to suggest that divine providence was at play in Christianising both societies. The poem presents a global vision of Manifest Destiny in which the forces of Christian civilization spread inevitably Westward. In this, ‘Kapiolani’ anticipates America’s 1898 annexation of the islands, and their eventual absorption into the United States.

**Conclusion**

Tennyson’s relationship to the United States was complex and mutable. In his early career he was influenced by his anger at unauthorised American printings of his work, as well as by the call for racial solidarity implicit in Anglo-Saxonist ideology. These factors pulled him in opposite directions, leading to often contradictory statements and attitudes. Far from disliking Americans as a group, after the Civil War he came to be fond towards those from the Southern states. On the one hand, this allowed him to vent his spleen at ‘Yankee sharpers’ who were apparently willing to sacrifice everything to what Washington Irving called ‘the Almighty Dollar’. On the other hand, it led him to idealise the American South as a picturesque land of gentlemen, who were gradually being muscled out by the financial might of Northern capitalists. Utterly lost in this analysis, of course, was the fate of slaves and free black labourers. Though he feared that Yankee imperialism was a threat to the British Empire, Tennyson came to find a respect for the American political system, federation in particular. By the end of his life, the United States seemed to represent the future of the world. He felt that the British Empire would either adopt a more flexible, elastic system of government, or it would collapse as all previous empires had done. He encapsulated these tensions in one of his final poems, ‘Kapiolani’. America’s invisible presence in this poem is an indication of Tennyson’s fear that it would soon surpass Britain as the world’s dominant power. The poem’s solution is to present the gradual victory of Protestant Christianity as the driving force of history, but in doing so Tennyson, perhaps unknowingly, adopts the ideology of Manifest Destiny that had underpinned American imperialism in the first place.
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1 He was still angry in 1892 when, reflecting upon his treatment by Wheeler over half-a-century earlier, he wrote (but never published) the lines: ‘I weeded my garden for hours and hours/To make it a pleasure for women and men/But a Yankee planted the weeds again/Little he cared for the flowers’ (*Poems* Vol III, 244).
2 This is despite the fact that, as Jim Cheshire has shown, Tennyson was remarkably well treated by Ticknor and Fields, his Boston-based publishers, who paid him royalties during the 1850s and 60s according to what was known as the ‘courtesy of the trade’, even though they were under no legal obligation to do so (see Cheshire).
3 The tipping point was 1856, the year in which Tennyson’s new edition of *Poems* sold more copies in America than in Britain. My thanks to Jim Cheshire for this information.
4 From pencil marks made alongside the text, seemingly made by Alfred Tennyson or by his son Hallam (who often assisted his father) Volume 2 of Edward Augustus Freeman’s *History of the Norman Conquest* (item 596) appears to have been consulted for Tennyson’s research into *Harold*.
5 Strong argues that Tennyson’s ‘A Welcome to Alexandra’ is insufficiently inclusive, having apparently failed to spot the reference to Celts at the end of the poem.
6 In ‘Locksley Hall – Sixty Years After’ (1886), he describes the French Revolution as the result of ‘Celtic Demos’, which ‘rose a Demon, shriek’d and slaked the light with blood’ (*Poems* Vol III, 152, line 90).
8 So much so that they later found their way into Virginia Woolf’s drawing-room comedy *Freshwater* (1935), in which Tennyson states that ‘six American professors are in the summer house’ while ‘the bathroom is occupied by the Ladies drawing room Circle from Ohio’ (Act I, 8).
9 The legality of unilateral secession was much disputed. It was only explicitly outlawed by the United States Supreme Court in 1869 (*Texas v. White*), four years after the war’s conclusion. For more on the legal background to secession, see Kenneth M. Stampp, ‘The Concept of a Perpetual Union’ in The Journal of American History, 65:1 (1978), 5-33.
10 The most famous incident of this period was the Mayor of Chicago’s refusal, following the 1871 Chicago Fire, to accept a gift of books sent by Queen Victoria for a new city library.
11 Obsessed with militaristic poetry, McCabe had previously published Tennyson’s ‘The Revenge:’ a ballad of the Fleet’ in his collection *Ballads of Battle and Bravery*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1879.
12 As he had done with Thompson in 1864, Tennyson told McCabe that ‘He disliked the Yankees extremely, said he refused to see them’ (McCabe, 350). In 1887, McCabe became the Commander or ‘Colonel’ of the ‘A.
P. Hill Camp’ for Southern war veterans, which consisted of those who ‘refused to admit for one moment the unrighteousness’ of the ‘principle’ of Secession or their ‘patriotism’ towards the Confederate States of America (53). For more on Tennyson’s argument with Gladstone, see John Addington Symonds’ account (dated 8 December 1865) in Letters Vol II, 415-421.


14 Given that America’s original claim for damages was $2,000,000,000 and was centred upon a baseless suggestion that the Alabama by itself extended the war by two years, Tennyson’s outrage is understandable. The final settlement was $15,500,000. See Amanda Foreman, A World on Fire: an Epic History of Two Nations Divided. London: Allen Lane, 2010, 812.

15 Tennyson owned Consequential Damages (1872), attributed to the pseudonymous ‘Saxe Brit’, which stated its contempt for the legal process by which the Alabama Claims were decided. Denying the existence of a mandate for any form of International Law, Brit argued that the Alabama Claims were ‘a case, not of law, but of courtesy’, and that America was not being gentlemanly in its pursuit of reparations. Tennyson’s possession of this volume, along with his letter to Gladstone, indicates that he agreed with this assessment. Saxe Brit, Consequential Damages: three letters on the American doctrine. London: Smith, Elder, 1872, 9. See Tennyson’s copy at the TRC (item 609).

16 In 1880, Tennyson published ‘Columbus’, a poem that wrote back against Walt Whitman’s ‘Prayer of Columbus’ (1874), attempting to problematize the idealism of that earlier work. Tennyson objected to Whitman’s optimism, his favourable comparisons of the United States, in its ‘Yankee’ formulation, with Europe, and in particular to his assumption of a superior religious atmosphere in America. He had already stated as much in an 1872 letter to Whitman, which was written shortly after the United States was awarded damages over the Alabama dispute: ‘there is a chance that your country may turn out the most immoral the world has ever seen’ (Letters Vol III, 36).

17 Despite public exhortations from Gladstone to keep the poem upbeat, the Ode begins with the image of a rose blooming and dying fifty times, implying that all things undergo a Gibbonesque ‘Decline and Fall’. It ends with foreboding questions for the Empire: ‘Are there thunders moaning in the darkness? Are there spectres moving in the darkness?’ (Poems Vol III, 159-162, lines 66-67)

18 The term came from Charles Dilke’s popular Greater Britain: A Record of Travel of English Speaking Countries, During 1866 and 1867. London: Macmillan, 1890, which was later reused for his two-volume Problems of a Greater Britain. London: Macmillan, 1890. Tennyson’s library contains a copy of the later (item 861) but not the earlier work.

19 There are numerous pencil marks in Tennyson’s copy of this book, including alongside the lines just quoted. This suggests a thorough engagement with the text, but whether these marks are by Tennyson, Hallam, or someone else is unclear. Tennyson admired Expansion of England enough to send it to Gladstone, though the book did not change the latter’s anti-federalist principles (Hallam Tennyson, 301).

20 In 1865, he told William Allingham that ‘England ought to keep her colonies and draw them closer. She ought to have their representatives sitting in London, either in or in connection with the Imperial Parliament’. William Allingham’s diary, 29 July 1865, cited in Letters Vol II, 404. There are references to federation in ‘The Day Dream’ (1842) and, most famously, ‘Locksley’ Hall’ (1842), though neither of these poems indicate an explicit political agenda regarding federalism in Tennyson’s early career.

21 See his letter to Walt Whitman, 15 November 1887, in Letters Vol III, p.359. This letter was published in The Times on 22 November 1887, with Tennyson’s permission.

22 The TRC also holds William Ellis’s two volume Polynesian Researches during a residence of nearly six years in the South Sea Islands. London: Fisher, 1829 (item 904); James Jackson Jarves’ History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands. London: Moxon, 1843 (item 1252); Edward Clifford’s Father Damien: A Journey from Cashmere to His Home in Hawaii. London and New York: Macmillan & Co, 1889 (item 764); as well as Manley Hopkins’ Hawaii: the past, present and future of its island kingdom. London: Longman, 1862 (item 3226). The latter was given to Hallam and Lionel by their Aunt, Lady Franklin, to coincide with Queen Emma’s visit.

23 The breaking of aikapu (sacred eating) restrictions, the destruction of traditional religious idols and temples, and the adoption of a legal framework based on Christianity were pragmatic political moves on the part of Hawaii’s native ruling elite, the ali’i, in particular by Kamehameha I’s widow Ka‘ahumanu, who became an unofficial joint ruler with her son Liholiho (Kamehameha II). Ka‘ahumanu consolidated power by overthrowing the tradition of dividing a dead ruler’s lands among his chiefs. Her attempts, often resisted, to impose ‘Christian morality on the islands was’, as Kamanamaikalani Beamer notes, ‘a means of advancing her own political agenda’. Kamanamaikalani Beamer, No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation. Honolulu: Kamehameha Publishing, 2014, 114.

24 Tennyson’s remarks about Whitman’s poetry were at best ambiguous, and at worst derogatory. During the last few months of his life, Tennyson told Hallam that ‘Walt neglects form altogether, but there is a fine spirit
breathing through his writings. Some of them are quite unreadable from nakedness of expression’ (Hallam Tennyson, 424). This letter suggests that Whitman’s seemingly wild free verse style (his famous ‘barbaric yawp’) was on Tennyson’s mind during the period that he composed ‘Kapiolani’.