Sarah Heinz

Mobilizing the Cozy Homestead: Sedentarist Notions of Home and Irish Traveller Belonging in Paul Rotha's *No Resting Place* (1951)

— ※ —

Abstract Modern nation-states base their governance on the creation of a bounded national space that is mapped onto home as a place of staying. Such sedentarist conceptions imagine a homeland as a stable, organic community that shares and has always shared a pre-existent space. The underlying notions of home are predominantly connected to positive feelings like comfort, warmth, or safety. In the Irish case, sedentarist imaginaries of the nation-state were central to nationalist discourse before and after independence, and politicians and public media glorified ideas of an Irish countryside 'bright with cozy homesteads.' Moving populations like Irish Travellers undermine such constructions of the nation-state as a fixed home space and were, therefore, seen as a pathology or threat to an inherent Irish essence. The paper looks at a key filmic representation of Irish Travellers from 1951, Paul Rotha's *No Resting Place*. It analyses how the film's focus on the Travellers' resistance to the Irish nation-state and its norms of home-making challenges sedentarist notions of belonging, but it also shows how Rotha's cinematography problematically naturalizes the Travellers' presence within Irish landscapes. Ultimately, the film mobilizes notions of home and inserts Irish Travellers into the story of the nation as a story of mobility.

Zusammenfassung Moderne Nationalstaaten begründen ihre Staatsgewalt durch die Konstruktion von abgegrenzten nationalen Räumen, deren Modell das sesshafte Heim und Zuhause ist. Heimat/land wird hier als eine stabile, organische Gemeinschaft imaginiert, die einen prä-existenten Raum teilt und schon immer geteilt hat. Die zugrunde liegenden Bewertungen von Heim/Zuhause sind dabei dominant positive wie Behaglichkeit, Wärme und Sicherheit. Im Fall von Irland waren sesshafte Konzepte von Heim und Heimat zentral für den nationalistischen Diskurs vor und nach der Unabhängigkeit, und

Heinz, Sarah: Mobilizing the Cozy Homestead: Sedentarist Notions of Home and Irish Traveller Belonging in Paul Rotha's *No Resting Place* (1951). In: Radmila Mladenova (Ed.): Counterstrategies to the Antigypsy Gaze, Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Publishing, 2024, p. 235–249. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17885/heiup.1039.c19477

Politiker und Medien konstruierten ein Ideal von Irland als Land ‚behaglicher Heimstätten.' Mobile Bevölkerungen wie die Irish Traveller untergraben solche Konstruktionen des Nationalstaates als fester Heimatort und wurden daher als Pathologie oder Gefahr dargestellt. Der Aufsatz analysiert mit Paul Rothas *No Resting Place* (1951) einen zentralen Film über Irish Travellers. Es wird gezeigt, wie der Fokus des Films auf den Widerstand der Traveller gegenüber dem irischen Nationalstaat und seinen normativen Praktiken sesshafte Begriffe von Zugehörigkeit und Heimat hinterfragt. Es zeigt sich allerdings auch, dass Rothas Cinematographie die Traveller durch seine Landschaftsaufnahmen auf problematische Weise naturalisiert und essentialisiert. Insgesamt mobilisiert der Film Heimatvorstellungen und fügt Irish Travellers in die Geschichte der Nation als einer Geschichte der Mobilität ein.

Introduction: Constructing Irish Homelands

On St Patrick's Day 1943, Éamon De Valera, then taoiseach (or prime minister) of the Irish Free State, held one of his most famous public speeches in which he celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the Gaelic League. In the speech, he presents his vision of Ireland as "a land whose countryside would be bright with cozy homesteads, whose fields and villages would be joyous with the sounds of industry, with the romping of sturdy children, the contest of athletic youths and the laughter of happy maidens" (qtd. in Lee 334). At the heart of this ideal and of the speech is the "cozy homestead": a very specific imaginary of domestic space and a family home that functions as a microcosm of an idealized, essentialised, and timeless national homeland.

My paper will trace the forms and functions of this idealized home at the heart of the Irish nationalist project in order to assess the role that the figure of the Irish Traveller has played in this idea of the nation. I argue that sedentarist imaginaries of home and homeland have been central to Ireland's self-conception since independence. Travelling populations, and especially Irish Travellers and their mobility and culture, were thus presented as a pathology or threat to an inherent Irish essence, while sedentary homes or "cozy homesteads" were seen as the epitome of authentic Irishness. This simultaneous idealization and invisible normalization of a settled nationalism marginalizes and exoticizes Travellers and their mobility while, at the same time, using (and needing) this 'exotic' Other to fabricate a sense of Irish identity. In effect, mainstream ideas about and representations of Irish Travellers

in media like film are, thus far, more central to the Irish narrative of a natural homeland than commonly acknowledged. My argument thus shares Mary Burke's claim that interpretations of Traveller figures in the media are "much less a study of the Traveller record than a critical analysis of successive fantasies of the 'tinker'" (Burke 1).[1]

In my paper, I will look at a key representation of Irish Travellers on film, Paul Rotha's *No Resting Place* from 1951. Rotha's film is one of the earliest movies that attempted to create an unsentimental, balanced, or even "disinterested portrayal" of Irish Travellers and to present their "negotiation of majority society" on the screen (Burke 232). I will show how the film's visual and narrative prioritization of the Travellers' home-making practices as well as the problematic actions of figures of authority challenge sedentarist notions of home as a place of staying. The film 'mobilizes' notions of home and, ultimately, re-tells and inverts the story of the nation through the perspective of the Traveller community. However, I will also show that the film's use of landscape shots and its politics of casting tend to undermine its own message of mobile belongings by naturalizing imaginaries of Irish Travellers as an organic part of impressive landscapes and presenting them as unfit for or uncomfortable in interior settings.

I will first sketch the function of sedentarist discourses of home for conceptions of the nation and the position and history of Irish Travellers in Ireland. I will then analyze Rotha's film, first by looking at its narrative and visual challenges to sedentarist imaginaries of homeland, and, secondly, by outlining its problematic naturalization of Irish Travellers' mobility and social positioning in the film's landscape shots.

Sedentarist Notions of Home and the Irish Traveller

Modern nation-states base their governance and the creation of a national space on ideas of home as a space of staying. In such sedentarist conceptions, a homeland is imagined as a stable, even organic

1 'Tinker' is a problematic and derogatory term that was used by the settled Irish mainstream to refer to Irish Travellers until the 1960s, when the more neutral term 'Irish Traveller' began to gain currency. The term's history and use are similar to the term 'gypsy,' and in the following, I will only apply it if the material or source itself employs it, e.g., in my film analysis of Rotha's *No Resting Place*, where both the Travellers and the settled community talk about the Traveller protagonists as 'tinkers.'

community that shares (and has always shared) a pre-existent dwelling place it calls home. Such notions of home are, more often than not, connected to positive feelings and experiences like comfort, warmth, or safety, and these feelings of safety and warmth are associated with home as stable, bounded, and a place of belonging.

Morley describes such understandings of home as part of a "sedentarist metaphysics" that focuses on being there, on proximity (both physical and emotional), rather than on movement (*Communications* 59). This sense of home can take on "rather cosmic proportions," as for example in Martin Heidegger's concept of dwelling as a place "that one's life emerges in and (in the larger sense) to which it returns at death. So being *in* (and *from*) a place integrates one's life" (Fox 21, emphasis in original; see also Heidegger). Heidegger here connects the linguistic roots of *bauen*, the act of building, with *buan*, to dwell, and, finally, with a human's self or being, in German *bin* or *bist*. He thus creates an intense, organic relation between dwelling and identity that, in turn, enables humans to build and create homeplaces: "Heidegger develops the *essential* continuity of being, building, dwelling, and thinking" (Hofstadter xiii, emphasis mine; see also Blunt and Dowling 3–5). The logical flipside of such organic notions of home is, then, that "all forms of mobility, which 'disembed' individuals from their local communities, have been seen to undermine social cohesion" and have been associated with danger, pollution, and destruction (Morley, *Communications* 59). McVeigh relates these negative associations to the racist pathologization of nomadic modes of existence and notes the key effect of this racist system of ideas and practices: the normalization and reproduction of settled society (see 9–10; see also Helleiner). In a famous definition, George therefore defines home as "the place where one is *in* because an Other(s) is kept *out*" (27, emphasis in original; see also Morley, *Home Territories* 31–41). Such organic, biological imaginaries and their mapping of the family home and the homeland make it unnecessary to explain *why exactly* people's feelings for their homeplaces should also 'naturally' be how they relate to their national or other collective communities (see Heinz, "Making"), and it not only naturalizes such mappings but turns the racism and exclusion experienced by mobile populations into a seemingly 'natural' reaction of the settled population.

Moving populations and their home-making practices therefore posit a challenge to constructions of the nation-state as a natural, bounded home space. If the ultimate goal of the ideologies behind a speech like de Valera's is to "produce national subjects" (Lloyd 196), and if these

national subjects are imagined as organically belonging to their nation as a sedentary home, then mobile peoples like Irish Travellers challenge ideas of national community and Irishness. Accordingly, Irish Travellers, along with their languages and histories, have been marginalized in the Irish project of nation-building after independence. Given that "landownership was a central tenet" in the colonial history of Ireland as well as after the division of Ireland in 1922, "the separateness of the nomadic minority became a particularly undesirable distinctiveness. As a consequence, […] a tendency arose to officially define Travellers not as a discrete culture, but as a problematic underclass in need of correction, housing, charity, and literacy classes." (Burke 4). The result is a paradox at the heart of Irishness: Travellers were turned into "a dramatic spectacle of cultural Otherness, one which was assimilated into the originary development of the Nationalist imaginary in Ireland, and the very project of Irish identity itself" (Ó hAodha 2). Based on notions of landownership, inter-generational continuity, and a sedentarist belonging that took the shape of the homely or "cozy" homestead, the Irish nationalist imaginary could only integrate the Irish Traveller communities by exoticizing them as the outsiders within Irishness, or as an 'Other' that was "perceived as both inside and outside Ireland's collective ideation" (Ó hAodha ix). Specifically when looking at cultural production about Travellers, such as Rotha's film, this ambivalent position within as well as outside the national imaginary and the collective home shapes how Travellers are being represented. Overall, it becomes clear that mainstream representations of Irish Travellers function as "an inverted image of the domicentric" rather than an engagement with nomadic spaces and cultures (Burke 6).

Irish Travellers have been a presence in Ireland for many centuries, and various theories have attempted to explain their origins (see Burke 4). The 2016 census reported that around 31,000 Travellers live in the Republic of Ireland (which makes 0.7 percent of the total population), while a further 6,000 live in Northern Ireland (see Ó hAodha 1). People of Irish Traveller ancestry have also lived as distinct communities in the USA since the mid-nineteenth century, and a number of Traveller communities seasonally move between Ireland and Britain as well as between rural and urban areas within Ireland (Burke 2). Irish Travellers have been recognized as an ethnic minority in Northern Ireland since 1997 and in British law since 2000. In the Republic of Ireland, this recognition was granted as late as 2017 and only after Traveller rights groups had advocated for ethnic status (see Haynes, Joyce,

and Schweppe). Although consisting of various groups and engaging in various occupations, Travellers were and still are seen as a homogenous group. This sense of homogeneity was primarily based on their mobility, which set them apart from the settled community. In line with the sedentarist Irish nationalism sketched above, this mobility or nomadism was framed "within a regime of degradation and inferiority as encompassing attributions of primitivism and the anti-social" (Ó hAodha x). Accordingly, Irish Travellers were depicted as criminals, prone to drinking and fighting, illiterate and uneducated, lazy and avoiding 'honest' work, and only answering to their own laws and authorities.

The Traveller community is also presented as deviant in terms of their social conventions and cultural traditions, e.g., underage marriage and gender inequalities. This imaginary has recently taken on the forms of documentaries like Channel 4's popular *Big Fat Gypsy Weddings* (2010–2015), a series that focused on underage Traveller girls who head into marriage to often problematic young husbands. The series claimed to present and make visible the lives of often overlooked mobile communities but, in effect, repeated images of an excessive and problematic minority or even 'underclass,' whose cultural practices and gender relations were 'corrected' and commented upon by a normalizing, sedentarist voiceover and often patronizing interviewer questions. Both Irish Traveller and British 'Gypsy' representatives have, therefore, criticized the show for misrepresenting their communities and only posing as a documentary (see Frost). Such media formats, as well as movies like Guy Ritchie's 2000 film *Snatch*, therefore repeat and cash in on established stereotypes about Travellers as inarticulate, violent, excessive, and sneaky, with American actor Brad Pitt famously featuring as Irish bare-knuckle boxing champion Mickey O'Neil in Ritchie's movie (a problematic representation, even if the Traveller protagonist ultimately outsmarts the British crime network that wants to instrumentalize him; see Burke 245).

Cozy Homesteads: The Challenge to Sedentarist Irishness in *No Resting Place*

Many of these established sedentarist stereotypes are taken up in the filmic case study under discussion in the following, but they are not simply repeated to reinforce or exploit negative ideas of Irish Travellers. I want to argue that one key strategy of Rotha's film to avoid such a

reinforcing is its visual representation of Traveller home-making practices and the contradiction between what we as viewers *see* and what we are *told*, e.g., by written titles, by signs, or through the representation of dialogue. As a consequence, the film is more about how the Traveller protagonists navigate, deal with, and sometimes use such stereotypes in their dealings with settled society and national authorities, rather than about these stereotypes as more or less valid descriptions of an existing minority.

No Resting Place is the first feature film of British director Paul Rotha, who previously made documentaries, a background that becomes palpable in Rotha's ambition to "take [his] sort of documentary approach to film a real subject" (Orbanz 30).[2] It is based on the 1948 novel of the same name, written by Scottish novelist Ian Niall. Like the novel, the movie centers upon "the tribulations suffered by a Traveller man due to a combination of personal failings and structural prejudice," and it ends with the death of the protagonist's wife and his arrest by the police (Burke 232). In effect, the movie thus ends with the destruction of the Traveller protagonist's sense of home and community, and the fate of his underage son remains uncertain at the end of the film. In contrast to the novel, which has a Scottish setting, Rotha hibernicizes both setting and language (with some of the dialogue being in Irish), and he shot the entire film in Wicklow, Ireland. *No Resting Place* is thus an early example of the use of location shooting, an aspect that I will come back to later. As a director, Rotha also moves away from the mannerisms of acting established in the British and American mainstream of the time and adapts the more toned-down, naturalistic acting style established by Dublin's Abbey Theatre (Rockett, Gibbons, and Hill 104–105). A contemporary 1951 review of the film accordingly noted its "intimate realistic work shot against natural backgrounds" and lauded the casting of mostly unknown actors and their acting as "the kind of natural, fresh authenticity one associates with the best modern Italian films" (Lambert 20).

One key aspect of this naturalism is the film's representation of home spaces and the home-making practices of the Traveller protagonists. In an interview, Rotha stresses that "[t]inkers are very much the original Irish people, […] and they have a particular life of their own."

2 In the following, all references to Rotha's film will be indicated by the short form *NRP* and the minutes of the scene or shot referred to. For a discussion of his documentary work, see the chapter on Rotha in Aitken, 152–178, and his own discussion of documentary film and its aesthetics in the interview with Orbanz.

(Orbanz 30). *No Resting Place* therefore opens with idyllic music that uses traditional Irish instruments, a harp, flute, and violin. Scenes of Traveller camp life are then shown while the opening credits are rolling. This is no coincidence, as depictions and discussions of Traveller campsites, both romanticized and demonized, have dominated settled peoples' images of the Irish Traveller community (see Burke 7–9). This has continued into the present. Recent analyses of public opinion within the Republic of Ireland show that opposition to Travellers' halting sites can be seen as part of symbolic politics rather than only an expression of realistic group conflict (see Fetzer). This issue of 'the campsite' relates anti-Traveller attitudes within the Irish mainstream to prejudice held towards other itinerant populations in Ireland, such as Roma people, and reactions towards and the locations of Traveller and Roma camp and halting sites in the Republic show striking resemblances (see Drummond). Imaginaries of 'the campsite' and its framing by law enforcement (especially in the context of police management of campsites via spatial regulation strategies; see Mulcahy) and cultural production about 'the campsite,' as well as the socio-cultural discourse at large, show how politics of place meet politics of identity in a sedentarist claim to decide what forms dwelling and, therefore, home and belonging are allowed to take. In effect, Traveller campsites function as a materialization of settled society's fear of mobile populations, but Rotha's film also underlines that they are sites where concrete home-making practices establish a sense of homeliness and Traveller conviviality. The "contested place-making" of Irish Travellers on their campsites (Roosvall 343) therefore puts settled–Traveller relations into a nutshell and is dominantly featured at the beginning of Rotha's film.

During the film's opening credits, we see women cooking, skinning a rabbit, and making a fire, and men doing work on metal objects, while in the background we see sleeping tents and other forms of shelter. In a key frame of this sequence, the movie's title, *No Resting Place*, is superimposed on these scenes of camp life. In this particular part of the opening credits, we see a woman washing clothes and a father and son petting a small dog. These three people are the family of Alec Kyle, the Traveller protagonist that the whole movie will circle around, and they are presented as a well-organized unit that has a clear sense of domestic life and belonging. In these scenes, the Kyles do feel very much at rest in their self-constructed surroundings that look homely, cozy, and safe. Images and music thus show a safe place of rest or even a cozy homestead, but the movie's title overlaying these scenes creates a

strong contradiction. Who says that these people have no resting place, and whose perspective are we as viewers invited to share: what we read in the title or what we see in the cinematography and hear on the soundtrack? The movie gives two conflicting answers to this question. On the one hand, the Kyles are not *allowed* to stay within their resting places by Irish authorities, which would imply that they might actually like to take up a more sedentary life. On the other hand, however, the movie also makes clear that the settled community simply disregards or ignores the Kyles' practices of home-making, denying that their way of life is at all able to create homely spaces of rest.

This central contradiction is repeated only slightly later, when the viewer is offered a written intertitle with a short text, stating: "This is the story of the Kyles, a family of tinkers, the wandering people of the countryside. For centuries, society has tolerated their kind but they have never accepted society." (*NRP* 00:04:02). While the viewer reads this text, we see a man standing on the roadside of a rural Irish landscape, putting up a large sign. When the short text has vanished from the screen, the Kyles drive past and ask the man what the sign says. The short dialogue that follows contradicts the tolerance towards the Travellers that the intertitle has just claimed, and this contradiction is again indicative of the movie's inversion of Irishness and national belonging. Tom Kyle asks the man: "What does it say, mister?" and gets the reply: "Can you not read straight English?" Tom answers in Irish, and the man, who is picking up his tools by now, does not understand. Tom then explains that what he just said was "a bit of straight Irish." This answer inverts both the movie's title and the text on the sign, which says: "Notice: No Resting Place for Itinerants—By Order" (*NRP* 00:04:18). Title and sign exclude the Irish Travellers from the national homeland while claiming a practice of tolerance that is belied by all interactions between settled Irish and Travellers in the movie. At the same time, the presentation of cozy homesteads, loving families, and the use of Irish rather than English makes the Travellers more Irish than the majority that rejects them. Returning to my initial quote from de Valera's speech, the only "sturdy children" that we see "romping the countryside" in the film are the Travellers' children, the only laughter we hear is of the Traveller wives, and the only sound of industry is connected to the work that the Traveller families do while harvesting carrots or stacking barley. The movie's settled society, on the other hand, mainly consists of elderly men who regulate, order, or even harm the Traveller community and their children and who have very little emotional connection to each

other. The settled community of Ireland might, therefore, have houses and built environments, but the cozy homesteads that the movie actually shows are those of the Travellers.

I would claim that this jarring contradiction and conflict is at the heart of the movie's structure overall: while the movie includes the settled Irish communities' negative evaluations of the Traveller families, including the derogatory term 'tinkers,' it gives most of its screen and speaking time to the Irish Travellers themselves. The camerawork does not simply follow the Travellers but invites the viewer to share their sense of the world and their sense of home and home-making practices. This becomes especially obvious when the Kyles are interrogated by police officer Mannigan, the chief antagonist of the movie. After a short and rather aggressive dialogue, in which it becomes obvious that Mannigan already believes that the Kyles have done something illegal (without actually knowing whether something illegal has happened at all), the Kyles leave the policeman, and the camera shows this figure of authority slowly receding from view. This is done in a point-of-view shot that visually takes the viewer onto the pony cart of the Kyles, leaving the officer behind us. We thus share the Travellers' perspective on Mannigan, who represents both racist sedentarist attitudes towards the Traveller community as well as the law and the state enforcing them: "[…] if anything happened they were always the people to be blamed" (Orbanz 30). The sedentarist position of both the law and the nation is thus problematized, and the camerawork, literally and metaphorically, mobilizes our assessment of Irish mainstream society and the "cozy homesteads" at their heart as the norm.

Naturalizing the Traveller: Landscape Cinematography and Casting

After this assessment of the film's critique and inversion of settled Ireland's imaginary of home and homeland, it is necessary to also include a few comments on its problematic aspects. Here I want to focus on two issues, specifically, the use of landscape shots in the film's cinematography and the issue of casting and production.

As indicated above, *No Resting Place* was completely shot on location in County Wicklow, a region of Ireland located to the south of Dublin. The name derives from the old Norse name Víkingaló, which can be translated as 'Vikings' Meadow.' This already indicates the geographical features of Wicklow, which is famous for its beautiful scenery, including

extensive woodlands, the impressive Wicklow Mountains, and romantic ancient ruins. Rotha includes multiple long shots of the Kyles within this landscape, and these shots almost always show the Kyles when moving across Wicklow in their pony carts or when within their mobile camps, doing activities such as fishing and cooking. In these panoramic long shots, the figures of the Kyles are dwarfed by the immensity and beauty of this ancient landscape, frequently featuring morning fog, sunny expanses, and dramatic clouds. Alternatively, their figures are not only small but also integrated into the landscape, their clothes and skin receding into the natural scenery, as in a scene towards the end of the movie where Alec is fishing with his son (see *NRP* 01:13:20). This camerawork problematically repeats white, colonialist imaginaries of indigenous peoples as part of the landscape rather than shaping and ordering their natural surroundings, an ideology that was used to justify and legalize the white seizing of lands across the globe for centuries (see Heinz, "Stay on Country"). This focus on the Traveller as a pre-industrial figure belonging to, moving in, or even merging with nature is informed by traditions of "the tinker as dweller in an archaic chronotope" (Burke 235). In its use of such panoramic long shots, the film's whole mise-en-scène therefore tends to counteract the visual strategies discussed above that show the Kyles' home-making practices as a part of an Irish homeland. In the film's use of panoramic shots, it is exactly their 'natural' Irishness, their being "the original Irish people" (Orbanz 30), that makes them an organic part of the landscape, but this belonging also makes them a part of 'nature' and the wilderness, a common stereotype of itinerant populations. In effect, the camerawork thus defines the Kyles' 'Travellerness' as an inherent nature externalized through their positioning within the landscape, a strategy that, in inverted form, naturalizes and reproduces the racist sedentarism of the Irish settled mainstream.

This sedentarist undercurrent of the movie's landscape shots is reinforced by scenes in which the Kyles are inside built environments, for example the pub, the police station, or the farmhouses and barns where they work. In contrast with their ease and happiness outside, expressed through laughter, singing, and bodily touch, the Kyles are shown to be uncomfortable and awkward in closed spaces, and their postures and gazes evade both the camera (and thus the viewers) as well as the settled community or officers sharing these settings. The film may thus question the privileging of home as a built environment in its contrasting of what is shown and what is told, as analyzed above, but it

equally makes clear that the Kyles are not fit for home spaces that come up to the expectations of the settled Irish mainstream (and, implicitly, the viewer). Rotha's own statement that there "was a need to make a film for their [the Travellers'] side" is thus undermined (Orbanz 30).

This undermining of the film's balanced representation of Traveller home spaces and home-making practices is also outlined by Rotha's casting. While minor characters were played by Irish (but not Irish Traveller) actors, first and foremost from Dublin's Abbey Theatre, and while Rotha also worked with non-professional, 'ordinary' people, the two key roles, officer Mannigan and Alec Kyle, were cast with British character actors Noel Purcell and Michael Gough. Director of photography was Wolfgang Suschitzky, an Austrian-born British cinematographer, who would later become famous for his work on the iconic 1971 film *Get Carter* (see O'Reilly). The question of who represents whom is key to films about marginalized social groups, and Rotha remains part of cinema's tendency to represent communities like Irish Travellers in *No Resting Place* rather than have the communities represent themselves. As a consequence, Rotha's film remains part of cultural production that fantasizes about the figure of the Traveller from the perspective of settled society, in spite of its sympathetic representation of the Kyles' sense of home, belonging, and conviviality.

Conclusion

I have shown how Paul Rotha's 1951 movie *No Resting Place* inverts the settled community's ideals of cozy homesteads and 'good' home-making practices. The film gives the majority of its screen time to the Traveller communities, their homes and families, and it makes the viewer share the Travellers' perspectives through its camerawork. Consequently, the film makes clear that de Valera's ideal that I started with is far more alive and vibrant within Irish Travellers' home spaces than in the settled communities they are marginalized by. In that sense, the film itself attempts to become a home space for Irish Traveller conviviality, and a sedentarist ideal of home and homeland is, visually and narratively, 'mobilized' for the viewer. However, I have also shown that the film repeats and naturalizes problematic associations of Irish Travellers with outside spaces and ideas of 'nature', visually integrating the protagonists into the vast landscapes of Wicklow. In spite of this drawback, I would argue that the film, overall, outlines the "incapacity of the nationalist

discourse to assimilate change and resolve the conflicts engendered by exclusion" (Graham 7). Travellers might not simply be the itinerant others of Irishness but, rather, help to mobilize inflexible nationalist ideas of home and homeland.

ORCID®
Sarah Heinz https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0390-1651

Films and TV

Big Fat Gypsy Weddings. Channel 4, 2010–2015. TV.
No Resting Place. Dir. Paul Rotha. Associated British Films, 1951.
Snatch. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Columbia Pictures, 2000.
Get Carter. Dir. Mike Hodges. MGM-British Studios, 1971.

Bibliography

Aitken, Ian. *The Documentary Film Movement: An Anthology*. Edinburgh: UP, 1998. Print.
Blunt, Alison, and Robyn Dowling. *Home*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.
Burke, Mary. *'Tinkers': Synge and the Cultural History of the Irish Traveller*. Oxford: UP, 2009. Print.
Drummond, Tony. "Keep on Moving, don't stop now: Anti-trespass laws on the Island of Ireland." *Travellers, Gypsies, Roma: The Demonisation of Difference*. Eds. Michael Hayes and Thomas Action. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007. 37–52. E-Book.
Fetzer, Joel S. "Opposition to Irish Travellers' Halting Sites in the Republic of Ireland: Realistic Group Conflict or Symbolic Politics?" *Irish Journal of Sociology* 25.2 (2017): 195–206. Print.
Fox, Michael Allen. *Home. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: UP, 2016. Print.
Frost, Vicky. "Channel 4's big fat Gypsy ratings winner." *The Guardian* 7 Feb. 2011: n. pag. Web. 13 Dec. 2021. <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2011/feb/07/big-fat-gypsy-weddings>.
George, Rosemary Marangoly. *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Cambridge: UP, 1996. Print.

Graham, Brian. "Ireland and Irishness: Place, Culture and Identity." *In Search of Ireland: A Cultural Geography*. Ed. Brian Graham. London and New York: Routledge, 1997. 1–16. Print.

Haynes, Amanda, Sindy Joyce, and Jennifer Schweppe. "The Significance of the Declaration of Ethnic Minority Status for Irish Travellers." *Nationalities Paper* 49.2 (2021): 270–288. Print.

Heidegger, Martin. "Building Dwelling Thinking." In: Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Transl. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975. 141–160. Print.

Heinz, Sarah. "Making Yourself at Home: Performances of Whiteness in Cultural Production about Home and Homemaking Practices." *Routledge Handbook of Critical Whiteness Studies*. Eds. Shona Hunter and Christi Van der Westhuizen. London: Routledge, 2021. 258–268. E-Book.

———. "'Stay on Country': The Indigenous Australian Challenge to White Property, Terra Nullius, and Native Title in Tara June Winch's *The Yield*." *Symbolism: An International Annual of Critical Aesthetics* 21 (2021): 77–96. Print.

Helleiner, Jane. *Irish Travellers: Racism and the Politics of Culture*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2008. Print.

Hofstadter, Albert. Introduction. In: Heidegger, Martin. *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Transl. Albert Hofstadter. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975. ix–xxii. Print.

Lambert, Gavin. "The Current Cinema: *No Resting Place* and *White Corridors*." *Sight and Sound* 21.1 (1951): 20.

Lee, J. J. *Ireland 1912–1985: Politics and Society*. Cambridge: UP, 1989. Print.

Lloyd, David. "Counterparts: Dubliners, Masculinity and Temperance Nationalism." *Future Crossings: Literature between Philosophy and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Krzysztof Ziarek and Seamus Deane. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2000. 193–220. Print.

McVeigh, Robbie. "Theorising Sedentarism: The Roots of Anti-Nomadism." *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*. Ed. Thomas Acton. Hatfield: U of Hertfordshire, 1997. 30–52. Print.

Morley, David. *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

———. *Communications and Mobility: The Migrant, the Mobile Phone, and the Container Box*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017. Print.

Mulcahy, Aogán. "'Alright in their own place': Policing and the spatial regulation of Irish Travellers." *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 12.3 (2012): 307–327. Print.

Niall, Ian (pseud. of John McNeillie). *No Resting Place*. London: Heinemann, 1948.

Ó hAodha, Mícheál. *'Insubordinate Irish': Travellers in the Text*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2011. E-Book.

O'Reilly, Paul. "World of Plenty: The Cinematography of Wolfgang Suschitzky." *Visual Culture in Britain* 13.2 (2012): 249–268. Print.

Orbanz, Eva. *Journey to a Legend and Back: The British Realistic Film*. With essays by Klaus Wildenhahn, Stuart Hood, and Jim Allen. Berlin: Edition Volker Spiess, 1977. Print.

Rockett, Kevin, Luke Gibbons, and John Hill. *Cinema and Ireland*. London: Croom Helm, 1987. Print.

Roosvall, Anna. "The Mediated Politics of Place and People: Picturing the 'Contested Place-Making' of Irish Travellers at Dale Farm." *Social Identities* 23.3 (2017): 343–359. Print.