

# ALFRED MOSELY\*

by Ian Bruce

Few St Helenians have ever heard of Alfred Ezekiel Mosely, yet had his efforts to help the island succeeded, his name might have joined that of Dr Arnold on the James Square obelisk as “the greatest friend St Helena ever had”. It might even have been placed by islanders on a monument erected at a place that was far from Jamestown.

Born in Bristol in 1856, Mosely was a friend and contemporary of Cecil Rhodes, both staking an early claim at the Kimberley diamond mines in the 1870s and making a fortune.<sup>1</sup> In Britain, these days he is best known for erecting a controversial plaque of Rhodes at Oriel College, Oxford.<sup>2</sup> A prominent member of South Africa’s Jewish population<sup>3</sup> Mosely gained a reputation as one of the foremost philanthropists of the early 20th century. For example, he funded and gave land in Natal for a 100-bed hospital that treated wounded soldiers during the Boer War, shipping equipment from Britain at his own expense.<sup>4</sup> This was probably why he was knighted in 1901<sup>5</sup>, but he was modest about the title, most newspapers simply referring to him as “Mr Mosely”. This modesty may have extended to his own appearance, the following being the only image found of him.<sup>6</sup>



**Alfred Mosely**

---

\* This is a modified version of a published article - Ian Bruce, ‘Alfred Mosely’, *Wirebird: The Journal of the Friends of St Helena* 46 (2017): 13–27.

In British census returns, Mosely described himself as a merchant of diamonds and precious stones. He travelled widely on business and believed Britain had much to learn from American industry and education. In 1903, he founded the Mosely Industrial and Education Commission enabling 31 scientific, educational and civic British leaders to study methods in America and Canada.<sup>7</sup> Three years later, he arranged for 600 teachers to travel to these countries to study their teaching systems and then made similar arrangements for a thousand US teachers to cross the Atlantic to observe British methods.<sup>8</sup> Mosely probably gave away a large part of his fortune, leaving a gross estate of £309K (net £151K) when he died in 1917.<sup>9</sup>

Having regularly visited St Helena on his voyages to South Africa, Mosely was familiar with the island's lack of opportunities and was galvanised into action when the island's garrison closed in 1906 leaving it without an industry. With the backing of the Colonial Office, governor Gallwey examined several new export opportunities, including New Zealand flax, agriculture, and fish.<sup>10</sup> He had also taken over Bishop Holbech's initiative to develop lacemaking. Mosely was not only convinced that the island had several untapped resources but also that its population would develop entrepreneurial skills if exposed to the world of international trade. In collaboration with Gallwey, Mosely funded a wide range of initiatives to help the island. For example, he trialled the export of bullock carcasses to Britain but this was uncompetitive in price. He sent a two-year-old pedigree stallion to the island so that farmers could freely breed from it and improve the stock of their horses.<sup>11</sup> In 1910, he sent over pedigree Berkshire pigs, enabling farmers to produce home-produced bacon and ham.<sup>12</sup> This followed a plea from Gallwey who claimed that the "pigs at present in St Helena have deteriorated to almost a useless standard". Mosely even sent bats to the island, it is assumed to reduce the mosquito population, but only three survived the journey. There are no bats on the island today so they may all have been the same sex.<sup>13</sup> Mosely was also a staunch supporter of the lacemaking industry, presenting the school with all its furniture and window sunblinds. In 1910, he also paid the cost of daily lace-making classes in country schools.

These activities aside, Mosely's main idea at the start was to set up a fish, fruit and vegetable canning factory in Jamestown. It seems that during a visit to the USA in 1908 he tried to persuade companies to set up an operation at St Helena. In so doing he was putting the cart in front of the horse because at that time he did not know precisely what produce would go into the cans. A newspaper report shows the startling errors that can arise when reporters forget to bring their notebook to an interview:

Alfred Mosely of London, England, who accumulated a large fortune in South African mining, was in Freehold [New Jersey] last week. While in South Africa he had noticed that large quantities of American canned goods were consumed there. He came to this country for the purpose of getting some Americans well acquainted with the canning industry to go to an island he owns in the South Pacific to aid in establishing the business on the island. The climate is equable and the soil is well adapted to the raising of vegetables. The South African market is only five days sailing away. [...] If Mr Mosely cannot find an American willing to go to St Helena he will send a man from England.<sup>14</sup>

In his 1908 annual report to the Colonial Office, Governor Gallwey mentioned that Mosely was thinking about canning fish on the island but gave greater emphasis to the possibilities of exporting cured fish. This would certainly have been easier and cheaper to set up. In February 1909, Mosely arrived with a team of experts commissioned and funded by the Colonial Office to find the best food export opportunities. The prospects of fruit and vegetables were examined by Edgar E. Stokes, a graduate of Reading College<sup>15</sup> who was pessimistic, concluding that production would only be practical if canned on the same line as the fish. Specifically, he recommended the canning of pears. An experimental shipment of fresh pears to London in 1909 was unsuccessful, not even paying Mosely's freight costs. Stokes was cautious about the prospects of exporting new potatoes to Britain. With two growing seasons, he thought crop lifted around the end of December had very good prospects, but the March harvest would face competition from the Channel Islands and the Canaries. In trials, Mosely supplied both seed potatoes and boxes for packing the crop, paid the freight of the outward and homeward shipments and arranged for their sale in London.<sup>16</sup>

At the same time, Joseph T. Cunningham reviewed the island's fish species.<sup>17</sup> He worked from vacant Government stores on Jamestown's wharf, converting this to a temporary laboratory and curing shed.<sup>18</sup> In addition to naming local fish species, he examined ways to increase catches and trialled mackerel driftnets, trammel nets, a seine and an otter trawl. All were new to St Helena, but he eventually concluded that mackerel avoided the nets and that the islanders' traditional hook and line was indeed the most effective method. He noted that few boats were seaworthy so fishing was limited to the calmer seas on the leeward side of the island.

Mosely supplied barrels and curing salt to make sample barrels of cured mackerel<sup>19</sup> and albacore<sup>20</sup> for shipment to New York, the quality of which was good, albeit prices were low because of a glut of fish. These and later actions show that Mosely had by now dropped his original plan to set up a canning plant, instead deciding to export cured fish. In 1909 Mosely travelled to Norway and arranged for an expert fish salter and packer, Captain Skaflestad, to travel to St Helena and supervise the mackerel curing operation. Mosely also discovered that canned albacore was more acceptable than the cured product. He decided to trial the idea of curing albacore and then shipping this to an overseas processor who could retort and can this fish in oil. He therefore arranged for a Mr H. Dunn, a partner in a company of English fish merchants and curers, to visit St Helena and prepare sample cans of cured albacore in oil. To increase supplies of mackerel, Mosely also agreed to lease two boats to island fishermen on easy terms.<sup>21</sup>

Governor Gallwey's enthusiasm and optimistic support of the various new island industries had one major fault - he tended to close his eyes to serious issues that stood in the way of their success. In the case of fish exports, there were two major difficulties. Mosely well understood and guided Gallwey on the first of these, that to offset the high shipping costs, it was critically important to control the cost of the supplied fish. A confidential Colonial Office report written in 1906 had already drawn attention to the problem of shipping costs:

In 1905 an ex-prisoner of war attempted to run a fish-curing establishment, but it proved a failure; there was little or no sale for the fish locally, and the freight charges would not allow a reasonable profit being made on the article in the Cape market.<sup>22</sup>

The second problem was that the fishermen had long run a cartel, maximising their prices by limiting the size of their catches, a practice that may even date back to 1816 when John Barnes listed the price of most essential foods, but excluded fish with the comment: "There is no regular market for fish at present – the prices of them are enormously enhanced".<sup>23</sup> It seems to have taken many years before the reason for this was fully understood, the general assumption being that the fishermen were work-shy. In his 1875 description of St Helena, John Melliss cynically described them as follows:

[...] although there are some few exceptions, they are for the most part satisfied to bring in just sufficient fish as will afford food and obtain a supply of Cape wine for a few days, when, after indulging in excess in the latter, and recovering from their half-stupefied state, they proceed out again for the same purpose.<sup>24</sup>

Before his appointment as governor, Robert Sterndale wrote a booklet in 1894 that argued the case for developing St Helena's fish industry. He also leapt to the conclusion that the fishermen were lazy:

The fisheries have languished, like everything else on this island, from lack of energy. The fish are there, probably in greater numbers than before, but the St Helenian is content to leave them in the sea, judging from the lamentable picture drawn by Mr Melliss [...].<sup>25</sup>

Only after his appointment as governor did Sterndale fully understand the reason the fish catches were so small: "The fishermen do not see the force of working longer hours to keep the price of fish down; it is to their advantage to have short hours and high prices".<sup>26</sup> A 1903 commission on the fishing industry came to the same conclusion and, like Cunningham, noted the unseaworthiness of the boats:

All the fishermen who have been examined state that the fish is scarce and they would catch more if they could. The reason is they go to leeward and constantly over the same ground because the sea is calm there. It is plain that more fish could be taken if they were not so idle. They very seldom go to the windward part of the Island, where private parties go for amusement and return with plenty of fish. Yet, by the high price they obtain, they can afford to make it appear they make a very poor living, and so they minimise the amount of money received. The facts, however, are different to their statements, and we can only come to one conclusion, that a “ring” has been formed to bring in just sufficient fish as will give a big day’s wages to each boat.<sup>27</sup>

All these facts all were available to Gallwey, but he ignored them. There is a sense of unreality in the description Gallwey portrayed of his meeting with the fishermen. He reported:

[That Mosely had] therefore decided to see the matter through, looking for the good seasons to recoup losses incurred in the bad ones. He offered to pay 3d. a dozen all the year round for mackerel delivered at the proposed factory in Jamestown, irrespective of the local or market price of the article. In August I called a meeting of the fishermen and others interested in the matter and put Mr Mosely’s proposals before them. The price offered (a very generous one) was unanimously accepted, and the men assured me of their readiness and intention to fish regularly and keep the factory supplied to the best of their ability. I, accordingly, was able to send a reassuring telegram to Mr Mosely which enabled him to proceed with his arrangements.<sup>28</sup>

Gallwey may indeed have thought the price offered was very generous but the commission report on fishing showed that in 1903 mackerel was being sold at two shillings a dozen, eight times more than was now being offered.<sup>29</sup> With their long and canny tradition of controlling price and supplies, the acquiescence by the fishermen to Gallwey’s words suggests they were either too browbeaten or polite to explain the reality: they were no different from any other trader and would continue to sell their product wherever they could get the best price. If the new enterprise only paid a fraction of the market price, it would be at the back of the queue in receiving supplies.

Captain Skaflestad and Mr Dunn arrived at the island in February 1910, respectively to supervise the curing of mackerel and to investigate the prospects of canning cured albacore. Cured mackerel production began on 26 February.<sup>30</sup> Mosely had sent £100 to pay the wages and a Mr Bagley managed the operation – his identity within St Helena’s extended Bagley family is uncertain. The following image is the only photograph known to exist of the operation and shows a team of women cutting mackerel at a table on the wharf. It is presumed that the term “factory” used by Gallwey in his reports referred to this production team working out in the open, not to workers inside a conventional workshop. A man at the end of the tables can be seen hosing water into a low tank, to either wash the gutted fish or dissolve the curing salts. The operation falls some way short of modern-day hygiene standards.<sup>31</sup>



#### Processing Mackerel on the Wharf

It did not take long for Gallwey to realise that the “factory” was short of supplies because the fishermen were selling their mackerel elsewhere at a better price. Five private letters written by Gallwey to Mosely between 25 January and 21 April 1910 held at the Bodleian Library reveal details that were never admitted in the official records. Gallwey wrote to Mosely on 31 March and for the first time admitted there was a price problem, the only solution to which was to legislate:

The regular fishermen consist of a small coterie who control the price of fish. Lately, for the last 3 weeks, they have been charging the public 1/- [twelve pence] a dozen for mackerel! It is therefore only natural that an unduly large proportion of the “catch” has gone to the market. I have addressed a despatch to Lord Crewe asking him to allow me to enact an Ordinance fixing the price of mackerel, i.e. laying down a maximum price at which it may be sold. I have suggested 3d a dozen as fair and reasonable.<sup>32</sup>

No ordinance was issued, so the fishermen were neither offered the carrot of attractive prices nor the stick of maximum price controls and the “factory” remained undersupplied. That Mosely’s idea to increase catch sizes by offering two boats never came to anything is shown in one of Gallwey’s letters: “Your intention not to send out boats until you are satisfied that the fishermen intend acting up to their promises is based on sound reasoning”. By now, Gallwey well knew that that the real problem lay in the low price he was offering to the fishermen but in his frustration, reverted to all the old accusations of laziness, railing in a letter to Mosely at the “criminal apathy of the islanders”. Nevertheless, the catches were large enough to feed the population and enable the export of some 98 barrels of cured mackerel, much of it to New York. This sold at a loss of seven shillings a barrel. Mosely was decisive in his decision and closed the “factory” in January 1911.<sup>33</sup>

Gallwey now needed to explain the failure of the fish enterprise to his masters at the Colonial Office. Avoiding all mention of the price problem, which he should have foreseen, he decided to use the same

bad luck excuse given in the past by the fishermen - that the fish were hard to find. In his report for 1910, written in early 1911, he claimed there was:

[..] an extraordinary shortage. [...] There is no doubt that the year 1910 was an abnormally bad year for fish of every description. The fishermen seem totally ignorant of why this should have been, while the superstitious put all such happenings down to the comet.<sup>34</sup> [...] The total number of mackerel landed in Jamestown during the year was 11,449½ dozen. Looking at the records of about 100 years ago, we find that 12,597 dozen mackerel were caught in one month alone - September, 1813.<sup>35</sup>

There is a sense of smoke and mirrors here. Gallwey would normally be expected to compare the 1910 figure with 1909, but instead contrasted it with a figure of 12,597 dozen for September 1813 that is so far out of line with other months recorded that particular year (an average of 1,967 dozen per month) that it might even be a misprint in the records.<sup>36</sup> In fact, 6,130 dozen mackerel were caught in the nine months April-December 1909 compared with 11,449½ dozen in the twelve months of 1910.<sup>37</sup> Although it requires a comparison between nine months of catches in 1909 against twelve months in 1910, the latter seems to have been the better year. It is difficult to avoid the impression that Gallwey presented the project's failure in deliberately misleading terms. In truth, the collapse of the short-lived industry had little to do with the size of the catches and everything with the inadequate price offered to the fishermen.

Mosely's patriotic and philanthropic motivations were closely linked, as expressed in a speech he made at the Constitutional Club in London in June 1910 in the presence of Gallwey and Lord Crewe, Secretary of State at the Colonial Office. Mosely said he was:

[..] hopeful of the future, although the task was difficult on an island 4,500 miles away, where everything was on a very small scale, and the people had been accustomed to earn money very easily. It was the duty of every man who had the time to spare to devote himself to those small outlying parts of the Empire, for a place like St Helena required the practical help of a businessman.<sup>38</sup>

Mosely was nothing if not logical in his thinking. If the fortunes of St Helenians could not be improved through the export of fish and other goods, then the obvious alternative was to physically export the Islanders themselves to a place where, in his opinion at least, they could find fortune and better lives. He must have discussed this contingency with Gallwey, who wrote to Mosely privately in February 1910 discouraging him from taking his ideas of mass migration any further. Even though he was writing a private letter, Gallwey obviously felt the need for discretion, hiding his message (highlighted below) as a single sentence in a section about entirely different subjects – the development of the lace, flax (to make carpets) and fishing industries:

Yes the girls of the island have their lace industry well started. You say nothing of an industry for youths. How is the carpet making idea progressing? **The population increases very slowly and so emigration is not an actual necessity yet awhile.** In connection with the fishing industry, funds have been collected to buy a boat. The latest idea is to place it in Clayton's hands and for him to take out the older school boys two or three nights a week and teach them the art. They will of course benefit by selling their catch at your factory.<sup>39</sup>

Gallwey finally left St Helena in September 1911 to take up his new appointment as governor of Gambia.<sup>40</sup> With Gallwey no longer involved, Mosely must have felt free to pursue his own ideas for the island. He boarded SS Adriatic at Liverpool on 19 October and sailed to New York.<sup>41</sup> He seems to have then travelled around the USA for upwards of a year. Compared to his quiet profile in Britain, he was now almost garrulous with his opinions reported by newspapers on a range of disparate subjects. Thus, he expressed surprise that so many Americans seemed entirely ignorant of the possibility that the Balkan conflicts could easily result in a major European war within the next year.<sup>42</sup> He next

opined that Americans were flat-footed because they were over-reliant on transportation.<sup>43</sup> By January 1912, he had made his way to California, where he made an astonishing proposal:

Mr Alfred Mosely is now in San Francisco consulting the immigration officials about a plan to bring 3,000 poverty stricken residents of St Helena to California.<sup>44</sup>

This story circulated widely in America with headlines such as “All St Helena to America” and “St Helena Residents to Be Brought Here”, the earliest dating from 11 January in Californian newspapers.<sup>45</sup> Within weeks, the news had spread to British, Australian and New Zealand newspapers. However, the island newspaper did not publish the story nor was it mentioned in official government records. Tracking US newspapers, Mosely travelled to Coronado, near San Diego in California. Newspapers reported that he wanted to buy land where St Helenians could live and work.



**Coronado Hotel and part of Tent City**

It is strongly suspected that Mosely thought immigrant islanders could be employed in the tourist industry. Coronado had a rapidly developing tourist industry based around the Hotel del Coronado. Tent City, a vast tent accommodation complex, had been constructed south of the hotel from 1900 and offered the prospect of employment for St Helenians. The land in the area is semi-desert so there was little prospect for them to work in agriculture. Mosely said he would send his plans to immigration officials at Angel Island, San Francisco Bay. Immigration into the country was harder through this port than New York via Ellis Island. Not only had San Francisco been devastated six years earlier by an earthquake but the Chinese Exclusion Act passed through Congress in 1882 placed considerable limitations on immigrants arriving at Western seaports, some would-be immigrants languishing at Angel Island for years compared with an average of only a few hours or days for arrivals at Ellis Island. Rather than St Helenians taking the shorter and more obvious sea route to New York, Mosely must have thought they should travel through the Panama Canal to San Francisco because it was so much closer to San Diego and Coronado (about 500 miles) than New York (about 2,800 miles).

Mosely's plans fell onto stony ground. By November 1912, San Francisco newspapers reported that he believed the British government were working behind the scenes to persuade the American authorities against a settlement from St Helena.

Alfred Mosely, an English philanthropist, who has been engaged during the last year in a project for the establishment of a home in California for a number of dwellers in the desolate island of St Helena, returned from abroad yesterday and registered at the Palace hotel. Mosely is commander of the Order of St Michael and St George and is also a doctor of laws. He intends to make home in California and has confided to friends that San Diego will be his choice of a location. Mosely is well known in America. [...] He says that his plan to bring a colony of St Helena islanders to California may fail through the opposition of the British government. St. Helena now has a population of 3,000, and because of the withdrawal of the troops these men and women live in poverty Mosely believes that California offers a wonderful field for their activity, and that their coming would help develop the great empire of the west.<sup>46</sup>

US immigration officials certainly had reason to object to Mosely's scheme on demographic grounds because the 1910 US census showed Coronado had a permanent population of only 1,477.<sup>47</sup> An influx of 3,000 St Helenians must have seemed an impossibly high number for the area to absorb.

Mosely was logical in his thinking, persistent in his actions but unrealistic in his expectations. Notwithstanding the population's poverty and lack of opportunities, few St Helenians were likely to agree to leave the island in 1912, certainly not most of the population. Whenever they have been accorded their right as full British citizens to travel and live in the UK (i.e. excluding the period 1981-2002), most St Helenians have preferred to stay at, or return to, the island of their birth.

There is a little-known sidelight to the Mosely story. A month after announcing his idea to depopulate St Helena, in February 1912 during a Parliamentary debate on foot and mouth disease, it was argued that the island's isolation made it an ideal place to deliberately infect cattle for research purposes.<sup>48</sup> Had its population been reduced to an unsustainable size by Mosely, with this kind of thinking, especially at a time of war, it would have been a small step to remove the remaining residents and then use the island for chemical, biological or nuclear research.

Thanks are due to Colin Fox for retrieving documents at the Bodleian Library, Alexander Schulenburg for his advice and to Karen Henry at Jamestown Archives for several searches. All internet references were accessed in March 2017. URLs have been provided for many references below in condensed tinyurl format.

**Postscript:** It is presumed that Governor Gallwey pulled the wool over the eyes of the Colonial Office with his excuse that the short-lived fishing industry failed because of a shortage of fish. He was not to know how Philip Gosse, in his "standard history" of the island, would later extend this claim to the point where the fish entirely disappeared:

On the 26<sup>th</sup> February, 1909, the canning factory was duly opened at Jamestown. [...] But no one, not even the expensive experts, had reckoned on the unaccountable behaviour of the mackerel. Everything had been thought out and provided for. Mr Mosely had bought new fishing boats, and fishing gear. Fishermen had been engaged, the factory built, the new machinery was in order, the empty tins in thousands were there in which the mackerel were to be hermetically sealed. And there were no mackerel! Never before had there been no mackerel. The experts were unable to offer any explanation of this sudden lack of mackerel; only the St Helenians knew - it was all due to a comet which had unexpectedly crossed the heavens at the time the factory was opened. For ten months the factory and the canners waited in vain for any mackerel to can and then the factory was shut down ...<sup>49</sup>

Attention has been drawn in the past to factual carelessness and textual overdramatizations by Gosse.<sup>50</sup> The above extract is a case where several incorrect facts allowed him to tell a good story:

- The fish "factory" started on 26 February in 1910, not in 1909.
- The mackerel was cured, not canned. Mr Dunn merely made sample cans of cured albacore. It should be noted that canned tuna was manufactured by the St Helena Canning Company at



Rupert's Valley between 1987-2012 and it has been reported that some of the equipment dated back to the time of Mosley.<sup>51</sup> He may indeed have sent machinery to St Helena but no record exists for the export of canned fish either in 1910 or the immediate years that followed.

- No reference to the construction of a factory or “empty tins in thousands” have been found. Gosse neglected to give any sources. In fact, Gallwey used the term “factory” unusually and was referring to a group of workers, not to a building within which they worked.
- Several details show that Gosse must have accessed Gallwey's 1910 official report where he ought to have read the fish *DID* arrive that year, reflecting some carelessness on his part.
- Given the negative results of Joseph Cunningham's research on alternative fishing techniques, the supply of new fishing gear to the fishermen seems unlikely.
- Since the fishermen did not live up to their promises, the supply of extra boats is improbable.

Several authors writing about the island's fishing industry have fallen into the trap of quoting Gosse, thereby repeating these errors.<sup>52</sup> The lesson drawn from this is that Gosse gives a valuable summary of St Helena's history, but the greatest caution is needed before using it as a primary source.

<sup>1</sup> 'Obituary. Mr Alfred Mosely', *The Times*, 24 July 1917, 5. Alfred Mosely was the youngest of six children by Abraham (dental surgeon) and Ellen Mosely. His birth was registered in the last quarter of 1856 [Bristol, Vol 6a, p48]. He was educated privately and at Bristol Grammar School. It is believed he emigrated to Kimberley, South Africa before 1871 aged 14/15. He married "Florence, daughter of the late Mr Thomas Roberts" on 20 October 1881 at the Central Synagogue in London. They had two sons and four daughters.

<sup>2</sup> 'Cecil Rhodes Statue to Remain at Oxford University after Alumni Threaten to Withdraw Millions', *Daily Telegraph*, 29 January 2016; 'Rhodes Statue Stays after Controversy Costs College £1m in Donations', *The Times*, 29 January 2016. Oriel College announced on 6 November 2015: "We are starting the process of consultation with Oxford City Council this week in advance of submitting a formal application for consent to remove the Rhodes plaque on No. 6 King Edward Street, an Oriel-owned property. This plaque was erected in 1906 by a private individual. Its wording is a political tribute, and the College believes its continuing display on Oriel property is inconsistent with our principles. The plaque is not listed but consent is required for its removal because it is within a conservation area." [<http://tinyurl.com/hrp972w>].

<sup>3</sup> Joseph H. (Joseph Herman) Hertz, *The Jew in South Africa* (Johannesburg: The Central News Agency, 1905), 13. [<http://tinyurl.com/zzpx4qx>]

<sup>4</sup> George V. Worthington, 'The Princess Christian Hospital In South Africa', *The British Medical Journal* 1, no. 2103 (1901): 949–51.

<sup>5</sup> *London Gazette*, no. 27293 (17 March 1901): 1763. [<http://tinyurl.com/zcbx9ne>].

<sup>6</sup> Image sourced from Beale Hotel's website on the history of their West Lodge Park facility, leased by Alfred Mosely 1890-1917, [<http://tinyurl.com/h8fdm79>]

<sup>7</sup> M.C. Lupton, 'The Mosely Education Commission to the United States, 1903', *The Vocational Aspect of Education* 16, no. 33 (1 March 1964): 36–49; 'Mr Mosely's Educational Commission', *The Times*, 17 August 1903, 6.

<sup>8</sup> *The Times*, 7 June 1906, 9; 'American Teachers to Visit Europe', *The Times*, 10 December 1906, 6.

<sup>9</sup> 'London Standard', *Manchester Evening News*, 12 January 1918, 3.

<sup>10</sup> Ian Bruce, 'The First Dozen Years', *Wirebird: The Journal of the Friends of St Helena* 45 (2016): 6–25.

<sup>11</sup> '1909 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 638' (London: Colonial Office, 1910).

<sup>12</sup> '1910 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 675' (London: Colonial Office, 1911).

<sup>13</sup> 'Alfred Mosely, Diamond Merchant and Philanthropist: Papers Rel to Agriculture and Fishing on St Helena (MSS. Atl. S. 21)', 26 February 1910, The National Archives: Bodleian Library of Commonwealth and African Studies at Rhodes House.

<sup>14</sup> 'An English Visitor: Rich Londoner at Freehold Last Week', *Red Bank Register*, 6 May 1908, 14. [<http://tinyurl.com/jbldrhf>]

<sup>15</sup> 'Interesting Ceremony', *Berkshire Chronicle*, 2 June 1909.

<sup>16</sup> Edgar E. Stokes, 'MSS. Atl. S. 21: Papers Rel to Agriculture and Fishing on St Helena: A Report on the Island of St. Helena; Its Agricultural Conditions, and General Suitability for the Growth of Vegetables for Canning and Preserving Purposes.' (Oxford University Bodleian Library, 1910), The National Archives.

<sup>17</sup> J. T. Cunningham, 'On the Marine Fishes and Invertebrates of St. Helena.', *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* 80, no. 1 (1 June 1910): 86–130. [<http://tinyurl.com/hawjdck>]

<sup>18</sup> Alasdair J. Edwards, *Fish and Fisheries of Saint Helena Island* (Centre for Tropical Coastal Management, 1990), 26.

<sup>19</sup> St Helena mackerel, *Scomber japonicus* [Ibid., 122–23].

<sup>20</sup> Bastard Albacore, *Thunnus alalunga* [Ibid., 124.].

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 5–6.

<sup>22</sup> 'National Archives, CO 879/93/9: Notes on the Situation Arising out of the Withdrawal of the Garrison, African No 856' (Colonial Office, October 1906), 24.

<sup>23</sup> John Barnes, *A Tour Through the Island of St. Helena (2007 Reprint)* (Western Cape, South Africa: Fish Hoek Printing, Castell Collection, 2007), 192.

<sup>24</sup> John Charles Melliss, *St Helena: A Physical, Historical, and Topographical Description of the Island* (London: L. Reeve & Co, 1875), 102.

- 
- <sup>25</sup> R.A. Sterndale, 'Sancta Helena: An Island "in Extremis"' (London: St Helena Relief Fisheries Fund, 1894), 10.
- <sup>26</sup> '1897 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 240' (London: Colonial Office, 1898), 6.
- <sup>27</sup> '1903 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 420' (London: Colonial Office, 1904), 34–37.
- <sup>28</sup> '1909 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 638', 18.
- <sup>29</sup> '1903 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 420', 35.
- <sup>30</sup> 'Alfred Mosely, Papers Rel to Agriculture and Fishing'.
- <sup>31</sup> The photo is dated circa 1910 and the only mackerel curing operation at St Helena at that time was Mosely's. The image comes from Norman Le Rougetel's 1910-1912 family album held by St Helena Heritage Society Museum. Le Rougetel was a telegraphist at the Eastern Telegraph Company.
- <sup>32</sup> 'Alfred Mosely, Papers Rel to Agriculture and Fishing'.
- <sup>33</sup> '1911 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 714' (London: Colonial Office, 1912), 13.
- <sup>34</sup> "The Comet" probably refers to the Great January Comet of 1910, formally designated C/1910 A1, often referred to as the Daylight Comet because it was very bright and visible during the day. It was first seen in South Africa in January 1910. [David J. Eicher, *Comets! Visitors from Deep Space* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 42–43. <http://tinyurl.com/gpn2lbi>]. Halley's Comet was also visible in May 1910 but this later date makes it less likely.
- <sup>35</sup> '1910 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 675', 12.
- <sup>36</sup> The 1813 figure was drawn to Gallwey's attention by Joseph Cunningham, whose report on fish at St Helena had been submitted to the Colonial Office in 1909. This quoted fish catches in 1813 sourced from the 1809-1813 St Helena Monthly Registers. [Edwards, *Fish and Fisheries*, 22–23. Mackerel catches were recorded for nine months of that year comprising 12,597 dozen for September and an average of only 1,967 dozen for the other eight months. A full contents list of the 1811-13 St Helena Monthly Register compiled by Trevor Hearl can be accessed from the St Helena Institute website. <http://tinyurl.com/mksfnzy>].
- <sup>37</sup> '1909 Annual Colonial Report: St Helena, No 638', 19.
- <sup>38</sup> 'The Future of St Helena', *The Times*, 22 June 1910, 9.
- <sup>39</sup> 'Alfred Mosely, Papers Rel to Agriculture and Fishing'.
- <sup>40</sup> *St Helena Guardian*, 14 September 1912.
- <sup>41</sup> Ancestry web site, passenger lists, <http://tinyurl.com/n88b3td>
- <sup>42</sup> 'Europe's War next Spring', *New York Times*, 3 November 1911, 10. <http://tinyurl.com/lcf3ylm>
- <sup>43</sup> 'A Flat-Footed People', *New York Times*, 16 November 1911, 8. <http://tinyurl.com/krywjcg>
- <sup>44</sup> *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, 24 January 1912, 11. <http://tinyurl.com/m3s4zf5>
- <sup>45</sup> *San Francisco Chronicle*, 11 January 1912, 1. <http://tinyurl.com/l6ra3m6> 'All St Helena to America', *Cumberland Evening Times (Maryland)*, 13 January 1912, 10. <http://tinyurl.com/k5ws6gk> 'St Helena Residents Seek California Home', *The San Francisco Call*, 29 January 1912, 3. 'St Helena Residents to Be Brought Here', *Oakland Tribune*, 29 January 1912, 7. <http://tinyurl.com/lmgymf> 'St Helena's Poor', *Wanganui Chronicle (New Zealand)*, 23 January 1912, 7. <http://tinyurl.com/lbyjjac> 'American News', *The Age (Australia)*, 2 March 1912, 24. <http://tinyurl.com/mdkf8gy>
- <sup>46</sup> 'From Island of St Helena', *The San Francisco Call*, 11 November 1912, 1.
- <sup>47</sup> Wikipedia, <http://tinyurl.com/n2l2sg3>
- <sup>48</sup> 'Board of Agriculture and Fisheries' (Hansard, House of Commons, 26 February 1912).
- <sup>49</sup> Philip Gosse, *St Helena 1502-1938* (Oswestry: Anthony Nelson, 1938), 348–8.
- <sup>50</sup> Alexander Schulenburg, 'Note. Philip Gosse and the Discovery of St Helena', *Notes & Queries* 45, no. 4 (1998); Alexander Hugo Schulenburg, 'Transient Observations: The Textualizing of St Helena through Five Hundred Years of Colonial Discourse' (University of St Andrews, 1999), 139, 186 & 191; Alexander Hugo Schulenburg, 'Joao Da Nova and the Lost Carrack', *Wirebird: The Journal of the Friends of St Helena* 16 (Autumn 1997): 19–22; A. H. Schulenburg, 'The Discovery of St Helena: The Search Continues', *Wirebird: The Journal of the Friends of St Helena* 24 (Spring 2002): 17.
- <sup>51</sup> URL: <http://sainthelenaisland.info/fishprocessing.htm>
- <sup>52</sup> Examples include Margaret Stewart Taylor, *St. Helena, Ocean Roadhouse* (London: Hale, 1969), 47; Sue Steiner, Robin Liston, and Richard Grundy, *St Helena: Ascension, Tristan Da Cunha* (Bradt Travel Guides, 2007), 19; Rex Bartlett, *Curious Little World: A Self-Imposed Exile on St. Helena Island* (Gabriola Island, British Columbia: Toppermost Books, 2007), 72–73; 'Mackerel Trick', *St Helena Wirebird*, No 86, February 1962.