Searching for a place to begin, I came across Vance Palmer’s Sydney Jephcott and Francis Adams sitting comfortably together on a Brisbane veranda; they were talking and gazing idly out onto the roadway when Jephcott was startled by the sudden appearance of a ghastly apparition. He saw “something limping” at them “from the front gate,” and squawked in fright: “Here comes Mephistopheles for one of us.” Shuffling toward them, from “limp to lips—and higher—hell-fired eyes and sweat-snaked locks, was the Tempter!” At Jephcott’s alarm Adams hissed back: “Damn your eyes, Jephcott, shut up! It’s Billy Lane. Hope he didn’t hear you.” And then, as this bizarre figure went upon his mad way, Adams settled back and remarked to Jephcott that it was funny he had never noticed Lane’s “family likeness till you spoke, but it’s there most undoubtedly” (Palmer 83-84).

In 1882 William Lane dragged his clubbed foot onto Australian shores for the first time. Once in the colonies, he settled in Brisbane and began vigorously contributing his feverish style to the political and print culture of the times. On hearing of his eventual death in New Zealand, fellow journalist Harry Taylor wrote a sketch of Lane coloured with Christ-like comparisons:

The man through whose burning faith was launched the most remarkable and significant attempt at the reconstruction of society . . . and who, in the unbounded devotion which he inspired in the breasts of simple men, was, more than any man
Taylor’s Messiah juxtaposed with Jephcott’s Tempter neatly captures the paradox that the figure of William Lane still presents. Contemporary literary historians have found some of the earliest signs of Australian feminism in Lane’s work, and have credited him with contributing to the cultural climate in which the Australian Labor Party (ALP) and the Australian union movement were born. Yet other critics have pointed to the extraordinarily vehement combination of racism, socialism and nationalism in his work. Many of Lane’s commentators have been apologists, dismissing his racism as merely a reflection of the ideas about racial purity which were held by the Australian labour movement and then fostered in the wider population when it was organised into the ALP. In *A New Britannia*, however, Humphrey McQueen uses Lane to forward his argument about the centrality of racism to the social and political origins of Australia, taking to task those previous historians who had drawn Lane as a revolutionary Marxist. And in “The Yellow Peril”—Invasion Scare Novels and Australian Political Culture” Neville Meaney points out that “the religious intensity with which he held this racial belief would seem to belie such an easy explanation” (232). Meaney seems correct in his suggestion that Lane’s racism was so virulent and sustained that it stood out from its contemporary climate.

Lane can also be seen simply as a madman, a lunatic, whose first manifestation was as a rabid preacher coughing forth the blackest of racist bile, manically powered by some idiosyncratic internal agitation—a violent heat to which converts could be drawn. And in a later manifestation, Lane-as-madman becomes the pseudo-religious paranoid leader of a group he brainwashes into travelling to South America to an isolated patch of the Paraguayan jungle to settle a utopian colony based on blood purity. In either manifestation, he can be seen as the disseminator of what Edward Said calls “short bursts of polemical, thought-stopping fury” and “antagonistic debate whose goal is a belligerent collective identity” (xvii). Thus the anarchist Larry Petrie, a contemporary of Lane’s, wrote of his fervid zealotry:

He is a madman, a knave seized with the madness of ambition, overpowered with a sense of the divinity of himself and his mission, and for that he will barter truth, justice and the whole world plus the handful of bigots he terms the faithful.

(qtd. in Whitehead 315)
Dubious mental health notwithstanding, the singularity of Lane’s character produced some of the most bizarre discursive spaces of late nineteenth-century Australia.

Traversing these spaces provides a peculiar perspective from which to re-examine the odd politics and rhetorics—bred at the ends of empire and within early modernity—that colour our colonial print culture. Here fears were refined into fantasies of utopian social revolution, or inhabited the hyperbolic language of fanatical racism and its morbid dissections of an “alien” culture. In Lane’s case, readers were entertained and unsettled by images of new urban spaces inhabited by crowds of idolatrous and “morally depraved” “others.” The very extremities of Lane’s work help exemplify the characteristics of a particular, but perhaps perennial, social and cultural milieu. Could Lane’s apparent “insanity” in fact be a common tendency lurking beneath the mainstream socialist tradition of which he was part, an eccentricity lodged at the heart of a normative political and cultural discourse? Perhaps Lane’s private madness is imbricated in a kind of public pathology. Reading Lane’s work in this way suggests the reality of, to use Charles Kirmess’s phrase, Australia’s “national waves of dementia” (73). Lane’s work offers glimpses of repressed violence within a potentially pathological national need for identity. It reveals an irrational social preoccupation with the contamination of bodies, the porosity of borders and the nature of crowds. The hysteria of his work puts into relief a kind of paranoid nationalism which erupts from an Australian culture obsessed by fears of horrific pollutions, invading crowds and sexual violence.

One example of such nationalist eruptions was Lane’s speculative fiction, “‘White or Yellow?’ A Story of the Race-war of A.D. 1908” (hereafter, “‘White or Yellow’”) which Lane serialised in his paper the Boomerang. The novel imagines Australia twenty years into the future, its tale set in 1908 when the Chinese “over-ran everything . . . they sat in Parliament, directed State departments, and one had even place upon the bench. Already the white migration was slackening as Australia became more and more distasteful to the Caucasian peoples” (14: 9). Sir Wong, their millionaire leader, has forged a plan with Lord Stibbins to take over the country and begin a dynasty based on the marriage between himself and Stella (Stibbins’s daughter). Stella and Wong go for a horse ride, and, on the slopes of Mt Cootha, become infatuated. On the way home they are insulted and threatened by Saxby, leader of the Anti-Chinese League. Sir
Wong then murders Saxby’s daughter in revenge and instantly, across the country, the white population starts crowding under the future flag of Australia. They violently revolt against their Chinese neighbours, and a clash between races ensues, a sort of civil war of Australian independence. In the ensuing violence a mansion is burned, hand-to-hand combat breaks out in the streets, heavy guns are charged, and the Chinese storm the parliament and literally rip Lord Stibbins to pieces. The climax comes when Sir Wong is hung and then shot (by Lady Stibbins). Subsequently, the entire population of Chinese immigrants is forcibly expelled, with American battleships lending a hand, and the shiny white Republic of Australia is joyously pronounced.

Part of our cultural refuse, “‘White or Yellow’” was one of Australia’s earliest invasion narratives. It belongs to a genre which had been created in late nineteenth-century Britain by writers like George Chesney and William Le Queux. Here mass literacy and mass manipulation paced one another; Le Queux’s *The Invasion of 1910* (1906) and Chesney’s *The Battle of Dorking* (1871) were popular entertainments with the clear purpose of shocking the public into an awareness of national shores dangerously susceptible to foreign invasion. This typically masculine and militaristic adventure genre was inspired by, and contributed to, fears about the permeability of national borders and the existence of predatory “others” outside. In the Australian colonies the invasion-narrative genre was easily translated to fit the specificity of the local conditions: the invasive threat was to come from the “yellow hordes” of Asia. These sensationalised narratives were the product of a form of nationalism which advocated, as Vance Palmer put it, “an exclusion of all elements likely to make trouble and even a keeping of the surrounding seas as free as possible from foreign neighbours” (10). Part of the language of the late nineteenth-century print culture and of the colonial politics of embryonic nationalism, early Australian invasion narratives like “‘White or Yellow’” are the textual productions of a nation obsessed with ceaselessly marking out, and protecting, its borders.

Though China remained the source of invading “others,” Lane inflected the European invasion-narrative formula so that the wave of “others” comes from within rather than without, from a settlement of immigrants rather than from the invasion of an army. From the outset Australia’s imaginary borders were compromised; the edges of geography, the purity of bodies and the constitution of crowds were all uncertain. Perhaps
the real fear in Australia ever has been an invasion of immigrants, the spectre of contamination by the crowd which defiles the purity of the nation. If necessary, this blood and border purity was to be defended with violence, and this is precisely the barbaric fantasy which Lane’s text dramatises. “White or Yellow” is an early manifestation of a long lineage of national paranoia, part of a history of primal anxiety which colours the contemporary rhetoric of border protection, illegal immigrants and the increasingly phobic suspicion that a multicultural Australia might include hidden cells—or “communities of interest”—within.

Texts such as Lane’s highlight the colonial peculiarities of a cultural fear of borders breached by invasive crowds. His work is particularly interesting because of the way in which he presents ideas about the relations between the individual and the mass that are inflected by both sexual and racial politics. In the nineteenth century the rise of eugenics and theories of degeneration inscribed the human body with anxieties and fears about impurity, contamination and racial degeneracy. The body became the site from which these fears sprang, and yet they were quickly translated onto the larger body of the nation itself. Metaphors that sexualised the national body gave the anxious discourse of invasion a set of tropes which linked race with sex—contamination and penetration—and issued in fantasises of national rape and the devolutionary horrors of miscegenation.¹ In “White or Yellow” these loci are particularly clear: Saxby is certain that, within a generation of the marriage between Stella and Sir Wong, “there won’t be a pure-blooded white man in Australia” (15: 9). Here it is the female body which has the symbolic potential for contamination. The central horror that Lane indulges is the same Saxby imagines: “the fate of a white girl among these leprous-minded Asiatics” (9). Sexual violence looms large in this tale, and rape is the highly charged pivotal trope of a text which dramatises colonial paranoias about the protection and containment of female sexuality. The detail of the narrative of “White or Yellow” revolves around the sexual politics of two separate horrors. The first is the miscegenous marriage between Stella and Sir Wong, and the second is the attempted rape and murder of another white girl, Saxby’s daughter Cissie. Lane’s peculiar psychology warps and sensationalises a fear of national contamination and a colonial obsession with female sexuality by playing them out in the apocalyptic crowd collisions of a race war.
Reading Lane’s work, and its language of invasion and defilement, in terms of the crowd helps illuminate a cultural discourse which at many levels was obsessed with collectivity: the mass was bound up with discourses of reform, the process of democratisation and the new economic-political reality of “the people.” Yet, according to John Plotz, the crowd also became a phenomenon which changed the quality of urban spaces, introducing “random encounters with strangers, inexplicable aggregations” and “sudden eruptions of violence” (1). As Lane’s work allows us to see, the crowd comes to be represented not only as a new social force, but also as an anarchic or alien one. The invasion narratives of early Australian modernity have a core concern with the crowd, partly because, as Vance Palmer writes, “[o]ne of the chief characteristics of this fiction is that it is never, or very rarely, written from the eyrie of a detached observer, well above the crowd, but from some point in the working community” (170). In Australia, “writing the crowd” was born in the nineteenth century, and arguably was nursed in part by a tiny population’s paranoid fears of invasion and their lusts for horror and sensation. Premised on the clash between a horde of Chinese invaders and a population of white defenders, “White or Yellow” is brimming with multiple and interconnected images of modern (and primitive) crowds—antagonistic crowds, revolutionary crowds, the city’s fever of crowds, war crowds. Exploring this dominant set of images in Lane’s invasion fantasies provides a way of also exploring a broader collection of intersecting themes and psychologies inherent in the violent paranoid nationalism of Australian invasion narratives.

Consider the crowd of Chinese immigrants in “White or Yellow” who inspire the nation’s fear of an Asian invasion from within, the fear of a slow outnumbering, a buying up, an internal invasion. Here invasion paranoia collides with ochlophobia, the obsessive fear of crowds. The text is driven by Lane’s language of “hordes” and “crowding out.” This is the multitude of Chinese who inhabit the city of “White or Yellow”: “gathered in dense crowds”; “a vast mob encircled Parliament House”; and “at the doors of the swarming kennels” (21: 9). Yet, paradoxically there is also the white revolutionary crowd bent on violence, expulsion, nation building, and a “pure” white Australia. Here the crowd becomes a locus for developing public consciousness. This is the crowd which “swarmed below . . . as if this were an excited anthill,” a “vast multitude” that “was gathering at the foot of Hospital hill, where all public centred” (11).

Elias Canetti’s *Crowds and Power* is illuminating in regard to Lane’s politics. His explanation “of the surface activity of revolutions” corresponds to
Lane’s tale of revolutionary uprising in the Australian colonies. For Canetti, revolutionary activity throws up “baiting crowds” in which “[s]ingle people are hunted and, when caught, are killed by the crowd, with or without the formality of a trial” (68). While the leader of the Chinese immigrants is hunted down and killed by the white revolutionaries without trial, the Anti-Chinese Leaguers decide that it is impossible to slaughter the entire population of Asian immigrants, more perhaps in terms of logistics rather than any deep humanistic or moral motivation. The leaders of the revolution muse, “How was this vast horde to be subdued and how was it to be disposed of?” (17: 9).

John Saxby, the Brookfield farmer and man of action, leaps to his feet and puts forward the plan of ludicrous logistics and uncompromising violence upon which they all agree:

“Let us strike while the iron is hot and before they are ready. Let us terrorize them so that they will never recover. Let us convince them that we are desperate and that their only chance is to obey. We can fire Chinatown. . . . We can burn down every Chinese store and house and plough up every Chinese garden. We can hang every white man who is a traitor to the whites in this war. And we can start to do this throughout Queensland, perhaps throughout Australia, this very night.”

“And the Chinese themselves?” queried Dow, while the other committeemen leaned to listen breathlessly. (17: 9)

Saxby’s easy answer to this is to forcibly freight every single Chinese immigrant to Darwin, and then expel them off-shore toward the East Indies. As Canetti writes, “(a)mong the death penalties which a horde or a people can inflict . . . two main forms can be distinguished. The first is expulsion” (56).

The other penalty meted out by the (revolutionary) crowd, according to Canetti, is more direct: it is the penalty of “one unashamedly primitive pack—the pack which operates under the name of lynching law” (137). The victim of lynching law in the case of the primitive politics of “White or Yellow” is Sir Wong, leader and representative of the Chinese population. Sir Wong fits Canetti’s description of such victims: “He differs in looks and behaviour from his murderers, and the cleavage they feel or imagine between themselves and him makes it easier for them to treat him like an animal” (137). In Lane’s Australia:

Judge lynch’s procedure is short and sharp, as Sir Wong found that night. They dragged him with muttered curses to the great tree that stood by the steps and drew round his neck the noosed
rope . . . then the doomed Chinaman was dragged into the air, his body writhing convulsively, his knees almost doubling, his fists clenching, in the death-agony. And his judges stood there in the flickering torch-light . . . while their victim still tossed and squirmed like a cat being drowned. (18: 9)

This is Lane at his most primitive and barbaric, infusing his irrational fear and hatred into this description of the lynching pack. Canetti argues that underlying such a mentality is a latent cannibalism: the “brutalities they permit themselves may be explained by the fact that they cannot eat the man” (137).

By the time the *Boomerang* was being published, the reality of “lynch law” was extremely rare, if not extinct. But Lane happily revives it as an acceptable punishment for his Chinese villain. The similarity between Canetti’s analytic description and Lane’s portrayal of the crowd suggests something deep within the nature of Lane’s politics, perhaps the seductive pleasure of open unsublimated violence. As Canetti’s work predicts, the “crowd” seems to serve a number of functions in Lane’s work, yet throughout it manifests a modern pathology and paranoia.

In terms of the narrative’s logic Sir Wong’s crime of murder is merely an alibi for two other crimes for which he is really being punished and which relate back to Lane’s anxieties about blood purity. Sir Wong, who had “sensuality . . . stamped upon his heavy lips and drooping eyelids,” is lynched for two sex crimes (14: 9). The first is found in the oblique reference to the sexual violence with which Cissie was threatened, but avoided, by forcing her would-be rapist to become a murderer instead: “They knew that little Cissie . . . had yielded up her life to save her honour” (15: 9). The second of sensual Sir Wong’s sex crimes is his marriage to the white girl, Stella; he is killed on their wedding night, the hunting crowd surprising him in a mutely erotic embrace, only moments before its consummation (9). Again, sex between the two races is just barely avoided by another death. To Lane these sex crimes are far greater than any simple murder; thus John Saxby and Bob Flynn would rather murder Cissie, their daughter and fiancé respectively, than see her have sexual relations and produce progeny with a Chinese man. As Saxby says, just as Cissie is being murdered in a nearby paddock, “I’d sooner kill her with my own hands than have her live to raise a brood of coloured curs” (9). The way in which the politics of the individual and the crowd play out in these metaphors of sexual violence and fascination with racial and bodily contamination is reflected in Canetti’s analysis:

The sexual accusation in which this sort of pack often originates transforms the victim into a dangerous being. His actual or
supposed misdeeds are imagined, and the association of a black man with a white woman, the vision of their physical proximity, emphasizes the difference between them in the eyes of the avengers, the woman becoming whiter and whiter and the man blacker and blacker. (137)

This transformation is enacted in “White or Yellow” where descriptions of Wong’s “parchment yellow” skin proliferate, just as the paleness of Stella’s skin becomes a textual obsession.

In Lane’s work morbid fascinations and paranoias also might be linked with the growth of Australia’s urban spaces. His persistent journalistic depictions of the Chinese presence are part of discursive urban ramblings which magnified the horrors, corruption and pollution of the city. The structure of his ethnographic urban sketches suggests a desire to open up and expose the inner parts of the crowded city to surveillance; and they seem to illustrate how, as Walter Benjamin writes, “[f]ear, revulsion, and horror were the emotions which the big-city crowd aroused in those who first observed it” (131). In “White or Yellow” the latent fears inspired by the proliferation of city crowds are transferred onto the Chinese population, who stand in for the fear of encroaching modernity and its corrupting, alien and alienating urban spaces. Thus Lane focuses on the concentration of Chinese who deface and “other” Brisbane’s urban landscape:

The stone buildings, the vast “blocks,” the pillared banks, of Western architecture were tainted by the peculiar gilding and atrocious painting that mark the beautiful in the eyes of the Turanian. In 1888 only two or three yellow firms had entered Queen-street; in 1908 only two or three white firms were left. The great Courier building had been turned into a Chinese restaurant . . . in the top floors of which two thousand people slept. . . . The Queensland National Bank building looked strangely for it had been a fancy of Sir Wong’s, when he became its chairman of directors, to paint its pillars black and the background of mingled stripes, pea-green, yellow and sky-blue. The great dry-goods men and the hardware men of a generation before had been replaced by Too Loo Hung’s and Sam Wah Ho’s and Ko Ah Lee’s. The House of Shong Tai No dominated them all. . . . But if Queen-street was held by Chinese merchants, the streets around were drenched in all the infamy of Chinese vice and shame. They might be virtuous in their own land, might the Turanians be, but in this one . . . they indulged their hideous
passions. . . . The stench of opium was wafted from every door; in many a “joint” white women could be seen, the hapless victims of these yellow invaders’ lusts; and even little girls, whose unformed bodies should have saved them, lived there among these aliens and were lost forever to happiness and virtue. (21: 9)

The much-feared dense crowd of “others,” the mob who sleep in “kennels,” have torn at and defaced the vast blocks of architecture; they have contaminated the place of the crowd, made it exotic and erotic—in a confusion of colour they have written an alien language onto the city.

Canetti equates the “smoothness” and “order” of modern western architecture with the uniformity of teeth—“the armed guardians of the mouth” (244)—and describes how they both operate “as a threat to the outside world” (242). As a narrative of invasion, “White or Yellow” clearly emphasises the symbolic loss of defences against outside “others.” Yet in mourning the once-smooth and “pure” aesthetic signals of western superiority, Lane marks not just the modern city’s suffering of alien chaos. When he creates this city, he seems also to express a latent fascination with its spectacle of vice, its rainbow-hued architecture and promise of illicit pleasures. Returned here may be repressed fantasies about alternate cities, perhaps the desire for a “Chinese Brisbane.” It is precisely Lane’s “insanity,” the tenor of his paranoia, which makes it possible to read in his work the repressed desire for the modern city as a place of dark erotic pleasure, the disarticulated pleasure of his Chinese city. And here, once again, the sensation of miscegenous sexual violence lurks at the edges of this architecture, where the unformed bodies of little girls are exposed to the lusts of invading yellow men.

Lane’s “White or Yellow” reveals the outlines of a nationalism shot through with a deep irrationality. As an early part of the public articulation of collective identity in Australia, the rhetoric of invasion narratives may have contributed to the development of a peculiar pathology in the national psyche. While the virulence of Lane’s racial politics was extreme even within his own milieu, he was essentially a populist; his work tapped into social sentiments within the settler nation that were driven by a set of profoundly “unsettled” anxieties about identity and belonging. Such narratives could then be interpreted as part of a cultural insecurity bred from unacknowledged guilt about the white invasion of the continent. Yet ““White or Yellow” simulates the sudden genesis of national identity through a fictive race-war which inaugurates Australia’s independence; without such a decisive birth—without a real revolution or fight for freedom—national identity was instead rehearsed discursively as violent fantasy.
Thus there appears to be a violence latent in the Australian search for collective identity which rises to the surface in works such as Lane’s, a violence based on a perception of alien and threatening crowds, either within, or poised and waiting on the periphery. This is not a specifically Australian or colonial idiosyncrasy, as Mark Harrison writes in his *Crowds and History*: “The supposed intimidation represented by mythical packs of strangers is what makes possible international and intercultural violence” (xiii). Making visible a relationship between the tropes of crowds, contamination, and violence in Lane’s text highlights how these primal anxieties about threatening “packs of strangers” translate into the colonial peculiarities of a cultural dread about the possibility of vulnerable borders tainted by infectious impurities. This emphasis also suggests how the fear of being overwhelmed was expressed in an aggressive desire for racial and sexual containment. From this perspective it seems possible to speculate that Lane’s apparent madness is indicative of a kind of public pathology, an irrationality which may still persist and periodically re-erupt in the national psyche, as it appears to have done in the contemporary hysteria over encroaching “hordes” of asylum seekers, or in the recent riots on Australian beaches, which—fuelled as they were by primitive insecurities about invasive crowds of unknown “others”—mirror precisely the insanity of William Lane’s tale of racially motivated mob violence.

**ENDNOTES**

1 These ideas on the gendered inflections given to debate about race and nation are influenced by both Robert Dixon’s reading of invasion narratives in *Writing the Colonial Adventure* and Kay Schaffer’s discussion of landscape, nation and representations of gender in her study *Women and the Bush*.

2 Writing the crowd was a key feature of nineteenth-century post-industrial novels such as Thomas Hardy’s *Far from the Madding Crowd* and Margaret Oliphant’s *A Beleaguered City*. A novel like Charlotte Bronte’s *Shirley* centred on Chartism’s crowds of the 1840s, while Walter Scott’s *The Heart of Midlothian* opened with a description of the Porteous riots (focussing on a lynching scene strongly reminiscent of the one found in Lane’s text) and introduced an evocation of crowd psychology which was arguably new to the tradition of the novel; in both there is an explicit link between the spectacle of the mob and eruptions of violence. While part of this tradition, William Lane’s crowd descriptions suggest a specifically colonial construction of the modern crowd, one influenced by nascent nationalism,
a paranoid fear of engulfment, rapid urbanisation and the open spaces and distances of the Australian continent.

In “White or Yellow” the sentiment behind this emphasis on the crowd and the working community is clearly described in Lord Stibbins’ remorseful realisations, moments before his death:

it struck him as something fresh—that the firemen understood one another, that not a bell-note sounded but it was answered by another, that not a man in this great mass of men stood alone, but he himself. He realised that he had been swept away by these rushing tides of humanity. . . . This mighty mass which swept over him would have borne him upwards upon its crest had he only bent his energies to its service instead of to its destruction, had he been but loyal to all instead of seeking the gratification of his own selfish ambition. (9)

Standing largely unvoiced behind much of Canetti’s critique of crowds and power is the figure of Adolph Hitler; it is interesting, however, to see how precisely his analysis can be translated onto Lane. In her work on socialism and the labour movement, In Our Time, Verity Burgmann suggests that the historical figure Lane could best be compared with was Joseph Stalin.

In fact, as a millionaire, Sir Wong represents another threatening crowd. Canetti argues that money too can become a crowd symbol, one linked to modern metropolitan capitalism: “The abstract number has become filled with a crowd-meaning . . . the word million is ambiguous, standing for both a large sum of money and a large number of people, particularly the people inhabiting a modern city; and that one meaning passes into the other and feeds on it” (217-18). Thus Sir Wong’s wealth becomes a second threatening crowd force for the white Australians. The cultural anxiety here might also be associated with the urban disenchantment of colonial modernity and the rise of commodity capitalism.

An item from the Argus of 1855, which cites the lynch principle in practice on the mining fields, describes the punishment as fifty lashes. In prefacing this report (written a year after the Eureka period from which Lane draws his national flag) for their collection, Such Was Life, Russel Ward and John Robertson comment that lynching “—in the sense of the actual killing of an accused person—seldom, if ever, occurred” (13).

For example, see Lane’s “Daylight and Dark” series from the Boomerang, January-March 1888.

This reference was suggested by Vanessa Smith’s paper “Crowd Scenes,” an excellent discussion of the phenomenon of the crowd in eighteenth-century accounts of Pacific voyages.
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