Barnes F, Higgins DM.

Brand Image, Cultural Association, and Marketing: 'New Zealand' Butter and Lamb Exports to Britain, c.1920-1938.

Business History (2017)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2017.1344223>

Copyright:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Business History* on 04/07/2017, available online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2017.1344223>

Date deposited:

02/08/2017

Embargo release date:

04 January 2019

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Brand Image, Cultural Association and Marketing: ‘New Zealand’ Butter and Lamb Exports to Britain, c 1920-1938.¹

Abstract

This article examines the branding and marketing strategies of New Zealand Producers Boards which were established in the early 1920s to coordinate the export of butter and lamb to Britain. The brand ‘New Zealand’ featured prominently in the promotion of lamb exports to Britain, whereas much more emphasis was placed on the ‘Anchor’ brand for butter. Because the ‘Mother Country’ was by far the biggest single export market for New Zealand butter and lamb, the branding and marketing activities of the boards emphasised the strong cultural affinity that existed between Britain and New Zealand. Drawing on the relevant branding and marketing literature, the boards’ annual reports, and reports by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, we show that ‘New Zealand’ and ‘Anchor’ conveyed the fundamental message of a shared British identity.

Key words: ‘Anchor’; Brands; Culture; Country of Origin; ‘Fernleaf’; ‘New Zealand’; Empire;

Introduction

‘Anchor’ and ‘New Zealand’ are synonymous with butter and lamb. They are amongst the most famous and recognisable brands in the supermarket, and the former is the UK’s oldest butter brand with an estimated valuation, in 2016, of £95m.² ‘Anchor’ was ranked amongst the top 10 leading supermarket brands in Britain and according to Mike Walker, its senior brand manager, ‘Its simple, proud, iconic design stands out...People know they are buying proper butter and a brand they can trust.’³ Turning to lamb, in 2012, 73 per cent of the UK’s sheep meat imports originated from New Zealand. Recent advertising campaigns for lamb have used the ‘Meat New Zealand’ logo to emphasise that the country possesses, ‘a gentle climate, lush grass, unpolluted air and clean water, and television adverts showing prepared lamb being served with the New Zealand lamb rosette and the accompanying legend “It doesn’t get any more free range than this.”’ Moreover, the concentration on exports was often at the expense of the domestic market: ‘The country that was gaining an international reputation for high-quality lamb was not offering a similar level of quality in its domestic market.’⁴

This article examines the interconnections between brands, country of origin, and advertising using a case study of New Zealand’s exports of butter and lamb to Britain during the interwar period. Butter and lamb were branded and marketed as ‘New Zealand’, although the most successful butter brand was ‘Anchor’ (Figures 1-3). These brands were created before 1914 and were at the forefront of advertising campaigns launched by the New Zealand Dairy Produce Control Board (NZDPCB), and the New Zealand Meat Produce Board (NZMP), which were formed in 1924 and 1922, respectively, and the New Zealand Co-operative Dairy Company (NZCDC). We argue that the brands ‘New Zealand’ and ‘Anchor’ had strong cultural foundations which made them particularly appealing to British consumers. This article demonstrates that it is possible to build a major brand, based on country of origin, without trade mark protection. Moreover, we extend historical analyses of brand development by showing

that during the inter-war period, New Zealand was a pioneer in the use of mass-marketing campaigns to promote country of origin. This final contribution is particularly pertinent because it casts doubt on some of the more recent perspectives on the development of New Zealand food exports. Thus, the evidence presented in this article, which deals specifically with butter and lamb, suggests that some qualification needs to be made to the assertion of Eric Pawson and Tom Brooking that, 'Prior to 1973...New Zealand faced no pressing need to add value through branding food...according to consumer preference', and, most recently, the claim by Geoffrey Jones and Simon Mowatt, that by the mid-1920s, the 'commodity-driven approach' of New Zealand was in '*marked contrast*' to Danish dairy exports which, 'were attempting to compete by differentiation through the creation of strong brands, such as Lurbrand, which were gradually extended to other products...as a strategy to create a long-term national quality image in export markets'.⁵

Making 'New Zealand' attractive to consumers in the 'Mother country' was important because Britain was by far New Zealand's biggest export market. A defining feature of the evolution of the nineteenth century international economy was the growth of a global supply-chain for foodstuffs and primary products centred on the British market. One consequence of this trend was that many countries became heavily dependent on Britain for their economic survival and modified their production to 'suit the British food market'.⁶ Of these 'Anglo-adapted' producers perhaps the best known examples are Danish and New Zealand exports of bacon and butter, and butter and lamb, respectively.⁷ For example, between 1880 and 1914, Britain accounted for over 80 per cent of Danish butter exports; over a similar period Britain absorbed an average of 96.3 per cent, by value, of all meat exports from New Zealand.⁸ This dependence on Britain continued during the interwar period: between 1923 and 1938, Britain absorbed, on average, 93 per cent (by weight) and between 1923-1936, over 50 per cent (by

weight) of New Zealand butter and lamb exports, respectively.⁹ In other words, the viability of the New Zealand butter and lamb industries and, therefore, the agriculture sector as a whole, were critically reliant on maintaining their share of the UK market.

Studies of branding are becoming more prominent in business history and this provides one of the reasons for this special issue. Much of the previous work on brands focused on individual firms, especially those in the alcoholic beverages industry, in which international supply chains and multinational companies were paramount.¹⁰ Subsequently, this scholarship was complemented by articles on country of origin, with particular reference to Danish exports of butter and bacon in the pre-1914 period, and during the interwar years, respectively. Additionally, business-history studies utilising the country of origin effect have been extended to include US, Australian and New Zealand exports of beef, lamb and mutton prior to 1914.¹¹ This article develops the nascent business history literature on country of origin by discussing the promotion of New Zealand butter and lamb in Britain during the interwar period. In contrast to recent work on Denmark's domination of the British bacon market during the same period¹², we argue that New Zealand was able to appeal to the strong cultural and economic ties that existed between it and the 'mother country'. This relationship was communicated by the iconic brands 'Anchor', and 'New Zealand' for butter and lamb, respectively.

There exist significant differences between private brands and country of origin indicia. Perhaps the most important difference is that the latter can be used by all producers within a nation state. Often, such indicia were developed and then marketed by cooperatives: the 'Lur Brand' as applied to Danish butter exports, being an especially strong example. A further difference between private brands and country of origin is that the economic importance of the latter extends beyond individual firms to entire regions and, indeed, nations. This observation is especially relevant to the case study of this paper, given New Zealand's reliance on Britain.

Our discussion of New Zealand butter and lamb exports raises a number of fundamental questions. First, to what extent was New Zealand able to overcome the first-mover advantage that Denmark enjoyed in the British butter market? By 1914, Denmark was by far the single biggest supplier of butter to Britain, accounting for 40 per cent of total imports (by weight). Second, in the case of lamb, how successful was New Zealand in preserving its market share from growing competition from Latin America? On average, between 1909 and 1913, imports of mutton and lamb into Britain from empire sources (principally New Zealand), were 61.8 per cent, compared to 38.2 per cent for foreign countries (Latin America). However, the disruption caused by World War I eroded this difference: by 1924, the respective figures were 55.4 and 44.6 per cent.¹³

A further question to be considered is how successfully did major food exporters overcome British initiatives to increase domestic supplies? A recent study showed that Danish bacon reigned supreme during the interwar period, despite efforts to improve the supply-side response of British farmers.¹⁴ In this article we argue that the Danish experience is generalizable: New Zealand butter and lamb were also immune to British efforts to increase self-sufficiency. Part of the explanation for this immunity is that the NZDPCB and the NZMPB were able to launch extensive advertising campaigns using ‘New Zealand’ ‘Fernleaf’ and ‘Anchor’ because British consumers were confident that these brands guaranteed consistently high and uniform levels of quality. The contrast with the British response was stark. In the case of mutton and lamb, for example, an official investigation noted significant variation in the grading of carcasses, little (if any) standardisation and concluded: ‘Up to the present, the home product has received virtually no advertising’.¹⁵ Further, as detailed later, campaigns to promote British-grown produce were always compromised by empire. The Buy British Campaign of 1931, for example, not only promoted local products but also classified empire-grown produce such as ‘New Zealand’ butter and lamb as ‘British’.¹⁶

This imperial connection created two important differences from the Danish and Latin American experience. First, New Zealand's status as a dominion of the British Empire meant there were strong cultural, economic and political ties with Britain. Thus, between 1870 and 1914, British foreign investment in the Dominions (principally, Australia, Canada and New Zealand) increased rapidly from 12 to 37 per cent.¹⁷ James Belich has argued that these tightened ties created a 'recolonial' effect, bringing Britain and New Zealand into a closer cultural as well as economic relationship. The impact of this is explored in Section four, which considers the development of a 'British' New Zealand identity.¹⁸ On a priori grounds, therefore, there is reason to believe that New Zealand capitalised on 'British sentiment' to increase rapidly its share of the British market for butter and lamb, especially when these ties were further strengthened by the First World War and the participation of ANZAC forces in this conflict. According to Lord Jellicoe, consumption of New Zealand butter was a patriotic requirement for British consumers and, 'Anybody who ate Danish instead of New Zealand butter should be shot'.¹⁹ Second, as discussed later, by 1932 these imperial ties would provide a material advantage, being called upon to help exclude 'foreign' produce from Denmark and Latin America and bolster empire sales through imperial preference agreements signed at Ottawa.

This article is organised as follows. In section two we discuss country of origin in the branding and marketing literature and explain why its effects are potentially powerful in the case of foodstuffs. Section three examines differences in the legal protection afforded country of origin compared to private trade marks and brands and explains why this difference is not important for our case study. Section four examines the development of the 'New Zealand brand' through the formation of the New Zealand Meat Producers Board (NZMPB) and the New Zealand Dairy Producers Control Board (NZDPCB). These boards were established to

provide national control of the export of meat (principally lamb), and butter and dairy produce, respectively. The NZMPB initiated a marketing strategy in which the brand ‘New Zealand’ was a central feature. For butter, we argue that ‘Anchor’, a brand developed by the New Zealand Cooperative Dairy Company, eventually superseded the NZDPCB’s preferred brand – the Fernleaf – to become *de facto*, the principal brand applied to butter exports. The marketing strategies of both boards, which emphasised the cultural links between Britain (the Mother Country) and New Zealand, are examined and assessed in Section five. In section six we assess the effectiveness of the New Zealand branding and marketing campaign, before presenting conclusions in section seven.

Brands, Trade Marks and Country of Origin.

There is general agreement that brands and trade marks are closely connected. Trade marks denote the trade or commercial origin of a product. Statutory and common law definitions of this term indicate that it is, ‘a mark used or proposed to be used upon or in connection with goods for the purpose of indicating that they are the goods of the proprietor of such trade mark by virtue of manufacture, selection, certification...or offering for sale’.²⁰ Brands are similar to trade marks in that they, too, help producers differentiate their products from rivals. However, there can exist important differences between these indicia. The first is that *registered* trade marks give property rights to the proprietor who can take action for infringement. Only registered marks benefit from this protection --which prevents others from copying the mark. But brands need not be registered. In this case there exist a different class of legal remedies, usually relating to unfair competition, which can be employed to prevent others imitating the brand. Most famous brands are registered in order to secure the stronger protection afforded trade marks.²¹

A further distinction between trade marks and brands is the different messages they convey. Registered trade marks are no more than the ‘legal scaffolding’ on which brands are built.²² Protection against infringement ensures that the products sold by one producer cannot be represented as those of another. Brands go far beyond trade origin per se. It has been argued, for example, that the owner of a trade mark is not the owner of the brand: the brand image resides in the mind of the consumer, not the factory where the products are made.²³ Other scholars have argued that a brand is the sum of the product, the emotions it generates and its socio-cultural significance.²⁴ At a broader level, it has been suggested that cultural principles – the ideas or values according to which cultural phenomena are evaluated and construed – are substantiated by consumer products, such that, ‘goods are both the creations and the creators of the culturally constituted world.’²⁵

Advertising plays a crucial role in the communication of the meanings and associations attached to brands. Advertising is more than simply a ‘mediator between supply and demand’ because it, ‘embeds products, services and organisations in cultural contexts that are meaningful for consumers. It creates brands by linking culture and commerce...Advertising has become inextricably meshed with culture.’²⁶ The transfer of cultural meaning effected by advertising involves assessment of many factors, including: which cultural principles the manufacturer seeks for the product, and which cultural meaning is to be portrayed in the advertisement. Effective brand advertising encourages, ‘a metaphoric identification of “sameness” by the would-be consumer. World and good must be seen to enjoy a special harmony. They must be seen to “go together.” When this sameness is glimpsed...the process of transfer has taken place. Meaning has shifted from the culturally constituted world to the consumer good.’²⁷

It may appear ahistorical to discuss country of origin as a brand in the context of this paper: the earliest study in this field, conducted by Robert Schooler, was published in 1965.²⁸

Nonetheless, for contemporaries, clear indications of the country of origin effect were known by the First World War. Perhaps the most famous example of this was the ‘Made in Germany’ legend which became a *cause célèbre* in late nineteenth century Britain.²⁹ Subsequently, Gabriele Morello has shown that the ‘Made in Germany’ label was imposed by the victors to help consumers identify and avoid products from the former enemy. But even this initiative backfired: Germany’s reputation for good engineering enabled consumers to identify and purchase German products!³⁰ Turning to foodstuffs, contemporaries were well-informed about the merits of ‘Danish’ bacon and butter, as well as ‘US’ beef, ‘Canadian’ cheese, and ‘New Zealand’ butter and lamb.³¹

Since Schooler’s pioneering work, the volume of literature devoted to the country of origin effect has increased substantially.³² Much of this later scholarship was critical of ‘single-cue’ studies because they tended to exaggerate the importance of origin per se. Subsequently, a number of themes have emerged which have particular relevance to this article. First, consumers pervasively use country of origin, sometimes denoted as ‘Made in’, when it is an indicator of quality.³³ This relationship is strengthened by recognition that certain countries are renowned for particular products: France for perfume and haute couture; Germany for precision engineering, Italy for fashion. In the same vein, New Zealand has been described as ‘Butterland’.³⁴ The relationship between product *and* country moved the marketing debate on from ‘Made in’ to ‘product-country-image’ and its emphasis on ‘what origin information is available to consumers’. Of particular relevance to our study is the observation that country of origin can be promoted as a significant part of a brand’s unique selling proposition. In this regard, as we detail in section four, the marketing campaigns of the NZDPCB and the NZMPB, made extensive use of country image and representative symbols of origin (eg ‘Fernleaf’). Sometimes, the country of origin may be communicated

through the names of companies: in the same way that Lamborghini is understood to be ‘Italian’, and Toyota denotes ‘Japan’, so ‘Anchor’ became synonymous with New Zealand.³⁵

In other words, substantial consonance existed between the brands and country of origin indicia used by New Zealand: brand names such as ‘Anchor’ evoked beliefs for consumers about the brand itself and triggered recall of the country associated with it – its country of origin. This is a phenomenon with a long history, and a growing literature especially in relation to empire: trade cards depicting American Indians or Chinese workers helped eighteenth-century British consumers connect tobacco with America and tea with China, while recent work on the ‘cultural economy’ of the nineteenth century British empire argues that ‘Britishness’ was an important factor in facilitating trade between metropolis and colonies.³⁶ Later work by the Empire Marketing Board sought to create, and capitalise on, a shared sense of ‘British’ identity to promote sales of products from the dominions in particular.³⁷ Moreover, while consumers form overall images of a country’s ability to produce particular products, at the time of making the decision to purchase, this overall perception is mitigated by a corresponding identification of the country as a source of a *particular* product line.³⁸ Just as 18th century America was aligned with tobacco through the image of the ‘Indian’, so ‘New Zealand’ and ‘Anchor’ were perfectly aligned with New Zealand’s reputation for lamb and butter and became synonymous with this produce.

Marketing scholars have devised conceptual frameworks which differentiate between consumer perceptions of the country with which a product/brand is identified, and the country of manufacture. For example, ‘Honda’ is identified as a Japanese product, but the country of manufacture may be the US, or Britain.³⁹ Increasingly, the literature on country of origin recognises that the development of global supply chains means that ‘country of origin’

may differ from 'Made in'; that 'Made in' may refer to country of assembly, country of design, or country of manufacture.⁴⁰ However, while such considerations are particularly relevant to manufactures, there are two reasons why such issues have no bearing on this article. First, during the interwar period, 'Anchor' was owned by the NZCDC which was based in New Zealand, and which applied the 'Anchor' brand to butter produced in New Zealand.⁴¹ Second, it is tautological that when the name of a country is used to promote *produce* exports, the country of origin is an indication of geographical origin. Consequently, 'The cultural aspect of national image is irreplaceable and uncopiable because it is uniquely linked to the country itself'.⁴² In other words, country of origin cannot be delocalised. In contrast, *private* brands do not indicate geographical origin: the US company, Coca Cola, licenses the production of its beverages in the UK.⁴³

Within the marketing literature there is also growing awareness of the operational requirements for successful advertising of country of origin. As noted, particular countries are renowned for certain products. Consequently, an effective campaign extolling country of origin needs to focus on the products for which a country is most famous. To achieve success, it is imperative that the country of origin brand generates collective meaning, which is obtained in two stages. First, the various stakeholder interests (in our case, farmers, government inspectors, shippers and UK retailers) need to be coordinated by an industry marketing association which represents the industry. Second, once this coordination is achieved, emphasis switches to developing country of origin branding which facilitates an interactive process: collective meaning and identity is developed and enhanced by farmers, the industry as a whole and, importantly, the final consumer.⁴⁴ Such a perspective reinforces our central argument that the brands 'New Zealand' and 'Anchor' had strong cultural foundations which made them particularly appealing to British consumers.

Differences in legal protection

The 'New Zealand' brand possess a number of features which differentiate it from privately owned brands: it could be used by all producers based in New Zealand provided their butter reached a minimum, officially defined standard.⁴⁵ Viewed from this perspective, 'New Zealand' functioned as a certification mark.⁴⁶

A further feature of the brand 'New Zealand' is that it was not registered as a trade mark during the inter war period.⁴⁷ In fact, on-line examination of the UK Patent Office suggests that 'New Zealand Lamb' was not registered until 1976. In the case of butter, 'Fernleaf' was registered as a trade mark in 1925, but the mark 'Fernleaf' accompanied by the words 'New Zealand butter' was not registered until 1950. In other words, during the interwar period, the marketing campaigns of the NZDPCB and the NZMPB developed the brand 'New Zealand' even though it was not eligible for registration as a trade mark.⁴⁸ It might appear odd that a famous brand has developed without trade mark registration. Providing an explanation for this observation further helps to differentiate country of origin indicia from private trade marks.⁴⁹

In Britain, a series of Trade Mark Acts established the 'essential particulars' that a trade mark had to possess:⁵⁰ the name of an individual or firm 'printed, impressed, or woven in some particular and distinctive manner', and, 'a distinctive device, mark, brand, heading, label or ticket'.⁵¹ The 1875 Act, and its successors, ensured that the proprietor of a registered trade mark had exclusive rights to use this mark. Consequently, those who sought to copy or imitate a registered mark could be subject to an action for infringement. What, then, of geographical marks? Before the Registration Acts, some geographical names functioned as trade marks. This occurred when the geographical term had acquired 'secondary meaning' and indicated the goods of a particular trader.⁵² However, the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1888, specifically excluded geographical names as trade marks.⁵³ This stipulation caused problems

because certain geographical names were being used when their *primary* signification, to the ‘ordinary’ observer, was not geographical. One of the leading cases which clarified this issue involved the Magnolia Metal Co (1897). In this case, the company’s name, ‘Magnolia’ was also the name of numerous small towns in the US. The key question to be decided was: did the term ‘Magnolia’ indicate that the company’s metal was produced in a location with that name? If the answer to this question was positive, then ‘Magnolia’ could not be registered. According to Lewis Sebastian, a leading counsel on these matters, ‘Magnolia’ was registered because its geographical allusion was not generally understood in Britain and, ‘The effect of this decision appears to be that a word is not to be regarded as geographical unless its primary signification is geographical, or unless it has become recognised in this country as a geographical word’.⁵⁴

Because ‘New Zealand’ was ineligible for registration in Britain, it did not benefit from the higher protection afforded trade marks. But this did not mean that the brand was totally defenceless against misuse. Indeed, it is significant that Britain was a pioneer among common-law countries in the prevention of unfair competition, which includes: ‘Conduct of every kind, which is calculated to pass off the goods of the defendant as those of the plaintiff...[and includes] the imitation of the general appearance or ‘get up’ of his goods as they appear in the market; or of the imitation of the name under which he trades’.⁵⁵ In 1887, Britain introduced the Merchandise Marks Act which prohibited the use of false trade descriptions, including ‘the place or country in which any goods were made or produced’.⁵⁶ As a result of this Act the misuse of geographical indicia was made illegal and punishable under criminal law. The 1887 Act remained the principal Act governing misrepresentation throughout the interwar period.

In contrast, ‘Anchor’ was registered in Britain in 1905 by the New Zealand Dairy Association (later the New Zealand Co-operative Dairy Company) – the largest butter

cooperative in New Zealand. Initially, this brand was used within trade circles but during the inter war period it became, de facto, the export brand for New Zealand butter. As explained below, by the late 1920s, it had superseded the 'Fernleaf' which had been established by the NZDPCB in 1925.

Producer boards and the development of the 'New Zealand' brand

The development of the 'New Zealand' brand followed the establishment of producer boards. As noted in the introduction, by 1914, and during the interwar period, New Zealand butter and lamb exports were heavily dependent on the British market. In this respect, New Zealand was comparable to Denmark, whose butter and bacon exports were also concentrated on Britain. Other similarities between these two countries can also be observed by 1914. For example, the cooperative system was firmly established in both countries (though less so in the case of New Zealand meat production.)⁵⁷ Additionally, both countries had introduced rigorous grading standards for their exports.⁵⁸ However, unlike Denmark, New Zealand did not possess a country of origin brand comparable to 'Lur Brand' or 'Danish', and nor did it benefit from the same degree of centralised control over exports. Instead, New Zealand meat and dairy producers developed a multitude of brands, shipping and grading marks. One shipment of 150,000 carcasses had 917 different identifying marks,⁵⁹ while dairy produce was sent under 600 or more different brands.⁶⁰

This situation changed radically after World War I when, prompted by volatile market conditions, both the meat and dairy industries turned away from free marketing and developed the world's first producer boards. The meat industry was the first to act, lobbying a sympathetic government to pass the Meat Export Control Act in 1922, with a similar export control act passed for the dairy industry in 1923. Initially, the newly constituted meat and dairy boards had

very similar mandates: power to control all exports, negotiate shipping and insurance rates, charge levies, institute and enforce grading regimes and carry out marketing and promotional activities. The meat industry's transition to board control was relatively straightforward, for whilst the industry was centralised, meat continued to be sold on the open market at Smithfield. However, a disastrous attempt by the NZDPCB in 1926 to institute compulsory pooling of produce, combined with fixed-price selling, led to a farmer revolt when returns failed to meet expectations. Consequently, some of the board's powers, including full control of selling, were rolled back. Dairy companies were once again free to choose how they marketed their produce, and, as we will see, this would have consequences for the success of the board's branding campaigns.

It may seem self-evident that these newly formed producer boards would adopt a country of origin branding strategy when marketing 'New Zealand lamb' and 'New Zealand butter'. Yet, as we will see, the issue was more complex. Certainly, the boards' operational goals of reducing costs and raising prices came, by default, to reinforce country of origin identity. Hundreds of brands and marks increased handling costs, and created opportunities for lower quality commodities from other countries to be passed off as 'New Zealand' produce, potentially dampening prices.⁶¹ For these reasons, both boards introduced standardised grading systems to ensure quality, reducing those hundreds of marks to just two export grades each. These quality marks were then linked with the brand 'New Zealand'. For example, from 1926, the dairy board's new 'Fernleaf' brand, 'designed to be a hall mark of quality' replaced 'all existing brands on butter boxes and cheese crates containing superfine or first grade quality.'⁶² Meanwhile the NZMPB congratulated its members for their 'united desire to uphold the good name of the Dominion in our meat trade by maintaining a proper and strict standard of grading.'⁶³

ARTWORK

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

FIGURE TWO ABOUT HERE

Advertising campaigns then worked to reinforce the connection developed between ‘New Zealand’ and ‘quality’ in grading systems. Starting in 1927, the meat board’s campaigns proclaimed ‘New Zealand lamb: the best in the world’ in posters, streamers, van signs and shop windows; it then invested in 1000 prime carcasses for display purposes to prove it.⁶⁴ Demonstrators cooked up lamb samples for shoppers to reduce any lingering stigma around frozen meat, while a million copies of a booklet ‘stressing the high quality of lambs, the freedom from disease, cleanliness in handling etc’ were distributed.⁶⁵ By 1932, the board claimed ‘it is impossible to visit any town or village in Great Britain without being reminded that “NEW ZEALAND LAMB IS THE BEST IN THE WORLD”’.⁶⁶ The link between New Zealand and quality was further reinforced in 1935, when the British government introduced a Meat Branding Order requiring all imported meat be marked as either ‘foreign’, ‘empire’, or with the country of origin. In response, the board developed a new semi-circular ‘New Zealand’ brand, aimed not just at the trade, but at shoppers as well. To familiarize the trade with this new brand, the board ran a competition showing ‘how, where and why New Zealand meat is branded’. The new design was ‘considered very much more legible when the meat is on sale at retail shops, and dissimilar to any brand used by other countries.’⁶⁷ New point of sale material quickly followed, and ‘all of this material pointedly stresses the fact that all New Zealand mutton and lamb is branded ‘NZ’ and invited the consumer to “look for the mark” “NZ”’.⁶⁸ Should those shoppers have had any difficulty, a million copies of an educational booklet were printed to show where on the joint the brand could be found. As a further quality safeguard,

retailers were only eligible to receive new point of sale material if certified by a wholesaler that 'he is a regular stockist of New Zealand lamb.'⁶⁹

Dairy advertising also sought to link New Zealand with quality. The board believed 'the central point in all our advertising propaganda must be to get New Zealand in the minds of the people', and from 1927, they began to undertake the same sorts of promotional activities as the meat board, with shopping weeks, posters and general newspaper advertising.⁷⁰ But there were two important differences between the meat and dairy boards. First, the dairy board's attachment to the 'Fernleaf' brand did not last long. Just three years later, in 1930, the board had begun joint marketing 'Empire butter' with Australia hoping to cash in on a more general campaign, developed by Britain's Empire Marketing Board, to encourage consumers to buy more empire produce. However, as a report issued in 1934 concluded, this may have 'helped New Zealand by encouraging consumers to buy Empire goods, but ...New Zealand had recently tended to lose by merger of its identity.'⁷¹ Second, they struggled to connect the Fernleaf brand with consumers. In the 1920s, butter, traditionally sold by the scoop, started to be sold in pats or packets. These wrapped pounds and half pounds were a growing part of trade, but the board failed to take advantage of the new marketing opportunity they provided. By 1932 they concluded that 'the sale of New Zealand butter in pats under the existing Fern Leaf Brand or any similar brand...is not a proposition that can be put across on this country.'⁷² In 1934 they worried that 'it would be unwise to push the sale of New Zealand butter in packets in opposition to the existing packet butters...it is safer to leave it to the importers and wholesaler to meet the demand for New Zealand butter in packets.'⁷³ Board butter continued to be sold in scoops, the only consumer marking being an impression of a fern stamped into 56lb bulk blocks, and the possibility that butter might be wrapped by a conscientious grocer in branded butter paper. Consequently, some considered the Fernleaf moribund, having become

‘a quality mark...[with] no sales value as far as the public is concerned.’⁷⁴ As late as 1938, the dairy board was still providing branded wrappers for bulk butter, not pre-packaged and ready-branded butter packets.⁷⁵

The space left for a major dairy brand was quickly taken by the NZCDC’s ‘Anchor’ brand. New Zealand’s largest dairy company, the NZCDC controlled around one third of national dairy exports. Formed by a series of mergers in 1919, the cooperative owned the ‘Anchor’ brand, which had been registered as a trade mark in 1905. By 1925 ‘Anchor’ was regarded as ‘*the superfine N.Z.*’ butter.’⁷⁶ When the powers of the producer board were rolled back in 1926, the co-operative developed its own marketing and distribution organisations. Already a de facto quality standard for the wholesale trade, the NZCDC was quick to capitalise on opportunities to promote ‘Anchor’ to consumers. Though the Dairy Board could not envisage how to promote pre-packed butter, 811 tons of ‘Anchor’ brand patted butter was sold in London in 1926. By 1932, the NZCDC had its own packaging plant in London.⁷⁷ Trade was bolstered by the NZCDC’s marketing agency, Empire Dairies, which undertook extensive consumer advertising. They even developed an ‘ANCHOR club’, for children, complete with a monthly magazine, badges, and ‘Uncle Anchor’, who wrote letters, organised outings and sent birthday cards.⁷⁸ Empire Dairies was so successful it was later bought by the Dairy Board to market all New Zealand butter and cheese.⁷⁹

The development of ‘Anchor’ as the de facto national brand suggests we should not be too quick to conclude that the institution of national producer boards automatically led to the promotion of country of origin. Indeed, there was also a brand battle for meat, but in this case, the NZMPB’s ‘New Zealand’ was the winner. Before their campaigns began in the 1920s, the best-known brand for New Zealand mutton and lamb was ‘Canterbury’, reflecting both the

region's long history of exporting frozen meat and its high quality. Nor did it hurt that British consumers sometimes confused New Zealand's Canterbury with the British version, increasing its appeal. These factors had a compounding effect. Farmers preferred their stock to be marketed by businesses with a 'Canterbury' brand, like the Christchurch Meat Company (CMC). Indeed, it was alleged as early as 1902 that some Canterbury processors bought up sheep elsewhere in the country and sold the end product as Canterbury lamb.⁸⁰ Smaller meat processors also hoped to export their product through such companies. In 1928, the Ocean Beach Freezing Company, which was based some distance from the Canterbury region in the southern town of Bluff, suggested the CMC might sell its meat so they would 'receive the premium paid for 'Canterbury mutton and lamb on the United Kingdom markets'.⁸¹ Losing that brand could likewise spell disaster, as a North Otago farmers' cooperative discovered when they took over their local freezing works in 1920. Suddenly, meat which 'had commanded the "prime Canterbury premium" when marketed under the Christchurch Meat Company mark sold at a discount under the [new] brand.' Farmers switched freezing works and by 1924 the company was 'in serious difficulty.'⁸²

These factors helped establish 'Canterbury' for consumers and trade alike.⁸³ Yet despite the brand's premium price and quality associations, when the NZMPB began to promote its meat to British consumers, it chose to market it as 'New Zealand' lamb or mutton. 'Canterbury' was retained as a quality mark only.⁸⁴ It is tempting to see this as a rational reaction to the growing proportion of frozen meat sourced from other parts of New Zealand by the 1920s, especially the North Island. But the reasons are more complex. As the earlier examples show, the Canterbury brand could be used for meat produced elsewhere in the country. Bluff farmers, far from Canterbury at the end of the South Island, would have happily sent their lamb to London under the Canterbury mark. But not all New Zealand farmers felt the same. When the

Christchurch Meat Company founded a freezing works in the North Island town of Wanganui, they changed their name to the New Zealand Refrigerating Company as a ‘diplomatic move’.⁸⁵ Nor was internal farmer rivalry the only cultural consideration for the Board. It seems ‘Canterbury’ was not necessarily always associated with quality for British consumers. Instead, it had begun to be used as a generic term for all imported frozen meat.⁸⁶ A butcher prosecuted for passing off a South American leg of lamb as ‘Canterbury’ in 1930 claimed, as his defence, that ‘in general usage by the public “Canterbury” lamb covered frozen lamb.’ Another argued that in ‘South Shields, people called frozen meat “Canterbury” whatever it was.’⁸⁷ Though the judges in these cases remained unconvinced, it seems the Meat Board did recognise the problem. In 1931, they ran advertisements in Wales to inform ‘housewives ‘that “ all imported lamb is not New Zealand but the finest lamb sent to Britain comes from New Zealand.’⁸⁸

Whether for butter or lamb, then, the development of producer boards, with their emphasis on quality, played a key role in the establishment of a ‘New Zealand’ brand. But even more interesting is the nature of that brand. New Zealand producers were not simply ‘Anglo adapted’: in their advertising, they became ‘British.’

Constructing a ‘New Zealand’ brand identity

The interwar invention of ‘British’ New Zealand was shared by both butter and lamb advertising, which sought to excise the 12,000 miles separating New Zealand from its metropolis by reimagining the former colonial frontier as a neighbouring, British, farming hinterland. In shop windows and on billboards, geographical borders were deliberately blurred as New Zealand sheep were advertised as ‘British’, while New Zealand butter was made in the ‘British Empire Dairy Factory’.⁸⁹ Nor was ‘British’ New Zealand just a figment of a copywriter’s imagination. The Meat Board, for example, saw Britishness as integral to the

success of their product, noting that ‘the New Zealand producer is out to follow the traditions of British quality in the produce he exports to his homeland and, secure in the goodwill of his countrymen at home, he looks with confidence to an ever-expanding trade for increasing quantities of his prime New Zealand produce.’⁹⁰

The development of a strong ‘British’ identity was an essential component of the ‘New Zealand brand’. In contradistinction to the ‘New Zealand’ brand today, which emphasises an almost otherworldly, pristine natural environment, imaginatively distanced from the consumers’ daily grind, the interwar version of the brand preferred to create a sense of cultural closeness. Such an approach was of course made possible by New Zealand’s almost complete reliance on the British market. With nearly all New Zealand’s exports sent to Britain, the brand ‘New Zealand’ could be closely contoured to suit this one marketplace. But British New Zealand was also enabled by empire. The ‘New Zealand’ brand not only mobilised a ‘metaphoric identification of “sameness” by the would-be consumer’,⁹¹ that ‘sameness’ was underwritten by the dense cultural, social and political ties woven by imperialism. The brand ‘New Zealand’ both reflected and reinforced the idea of a wider British world.

Actual ties of kinship notwithstanding, a sense of cultural affinity was carefully constructed in advertising, which sought to emphasise the familiar and marginalise any ‘foreign’ elements. This was made easier by the nature of New Zealand’s commodities. Butter and lamb were the familiar products of British farms, not the exotic produce of colonial plantations. Indeed, it was claimed that Cornwall and Devon were two of New Zealand’s best butter customers, possibly because Cornish and New Zealand butter possessed similar flavour.⁹² Advertising reinforced their ‘Home-like’ nature, constructing images of New Zealand farms that owed as much to English rural idylls as they did to the actual New Zealand

landscape. Though milking in New Zealand was both increasingly mechanised and male-dominated, the dairy board hearkened back to a nostalgic ‘merry old England’ with cheery milkmaids in long aprons appearing in posters and in exhibition space. In deference to the ‘Fernleaf’ brand, their aprons sported a few silver ferns, which was more than some of the promotional farming landscapes did.⁹³ In these images, sheep and cows grazed on verdant, rolling hills, with any strange native flora carefully relegated to the margins. Tree stumps and remnants of bush burns, signatures of New Zealand’s newly cleared pastoral areas, but not features of ‘Home’ farms, were also notably absent.

It was not only native flora that was marginalised on the ‘British’ New Zealand farm. Just as in real life, there also seemed to be little room for the country’s indigenous inhabitants. Maori motifs, along with Maoris themselves, were almost non-existent in national branding campaigns. When they did appear, their role was carefully managed. Like the fernleaf, indigeneity could be used, sparingly, to add a dash of distinctiveness; it could also be used as a contrast, to highlight the country’s progress from colonial frontier to British farm. A Meat Board display in the New Zealand High Commission’s window on the Strand in 1935 illustrates this process in action. Designed to promote the new ‘New Zealand’ brand, the window’s centrepiece was a rather romantic-looking New Zealand farmhouse, nestled in a sylvan glade, surrounded by gently grazing sheep. A native cabbage tree was allowed to flourish in one corner, whilst at the edges of the display, safely corralled in small boxes, were a few distinctive New Zealand symbols: geysers, caves, and a couple of Maori figures, their traditional dress reminders of a now vanquished colonial past.

Co-option of Britishness was not limited to subtle shifts in New Zealand’s appearance. In 1930, when the Meat Board debuted its ‘British New Zealand lamb’, New Zealand became

‘British’ too, in an acutely transnational array of display material that included a map of New Zealand labelled ‘British!’ By 1931 the ‘British!’ New Zealand map was incorporated into window friezes, included in window streamers up to six feet long, printed on window discs and even hung around the necks of cut-out cardboard lambs. Should consumers have somehow missed the message, a later campaign assured them New Zealand meat was ‘British to the backbone’. Even the Dairy Board, which had chosen to promote Empire, rather than New Zealand butter, still adopted a British tone. In 1930, in a ceremony complete with trumpeters and the ubiquitous dairymaids, the Lord Mayor of London specially welcomed the first shipment of Australian and New Zealand butter. A similar welcome would be extended to Empire cheese the following year.⁹⁴

However, as we have noted, it was the NZCDC’s ‘Anchor’ brand, not the Dairy Board’s ‘Fernleaf’, that had taken the lead in dairy advertising, and this too drew on explicitly British imagery. The fouled anchor symbol seems to have been inspired by a tattoo on a factory worker’s arm. Yet as one historian has noted, ‘Britain has been the single largest external influence on New Zealand’s trademarks...presumably to act as reminders of home’.⁹⁵ New Zealand’s isolation meant naval symbols were also welcome reminders of British naval superiority.⁹⁶ The ‘Anchor’ brand was particularly reassuring, for the fouled anchor was the top ranking naval symbol, adorning the Admiralty flag from 1856. The naval theme continued in the advertising of ‘Anchor’ which, from around the 1930s, featured a sailor boy. The sailor boy worked in two ways. Along with being a recognisably British symbol, the sailor helped to elide the distance between Britain and New Zealand. In one extant poster, he is seen not on a ship, but striding over farmland, carrying a package of ‘Anchor’ butter ‘Direct From New Zealand’. Blurring geographical boundaries further, an airy image of St Pauls floated, cloud-

like, over the farm.⁹⁷ Even ‘Uncle Anchor’ worked to blur those boundaries. Children’s letters were sent, not to far-off New Zealand, but to the Birmingham branch office.⁹⁸

The ‘Anchor’ brand also worked to encourage a feeling of propinquity, in both its senses of physical proximity and kinship, through its Christmas gift schemes. New Zealanders were encouraged to ‘send a gift of Anchor’ to ‘friends at “Home”’. Orders and messages could be placed at any NZCDC factory or office ‘for delivery in Great Britain or on the Continent.’⁹⁹ The producer boards offered similar schemes. In another strategy to reduce the stigma around frozen meat, the Meat Board introduced a ‘Lamb Presentation Scheme’, which encouraged New Zealanders to gift legs of lamb to their family and friends at ‘Home’.¹⁰⁰ Butter could be sent through the Dairy boards ‘gift butter’ programme, with two thousand four pound cartons being sent in its second year of operation.¹⁰¹ For the board, these were two thousand attempts at ‘vitalising connecting links between the two countries.’¹⁰²

The British nature of all three organizations was also supported by the work of the Empire Marketing Board.¹⁰³ The EMB’s key message was to ‘buy Empire’, but its campaigns clearly differentiated between the white dominions and other types of colonies, in part by stressing the dominions’ familiar British qualities in the same way that the producer boards did.¹⁰⁴ In EMB posters, produced by British artists, New Zealand butter and lamb were posed in front of ‘Homelike’ rural scenes, devoid of indigenous symbols,¹⁰⁵ while distance was diminished in straplines like ‘New Zealand serves our Table’ and ‘Direct from New Zealand’.¹⁰⁶ Like the producer board gift schemes, EMB newspaper advertisements also imagined commodities as ‘vitalising connecting links’. A 1926 Christmas campaign imagined friends discussing their children farming overseas: ‘For all I know’, mused one, ‘I may actually be eating stuff from their own farms or if not, it comes from their friends or from sons of my friends. Anyway, it’s all in the family as it were. I always like dealing with my own people. Everybody ought to do the same.’¹⁰⁷

The assertion of New Zealand's familial 'British' identity may have helped producers cosy up to British consumers, but it also had competitive implications. New Zealand's most important competitor in butter was Denmark, so claims to Britishness also meant Danish butter, despite its Anglo-adapted nature, could be positioned as 'foreign'. The same advantage obviously did not apply in the case of Australian competition, but their butter presented less of a market threat. Indeed, from time to time, Australia and New Zealand would join forces, marketing 'Empire' butter, which again bolstered both over their 'foreign' Danish rival. Likewise, New Zealand's 'British' lamb offered a familiar edge over 'foreign' Latin American meat. In both cases, branding New Zealand as British was a reminder that Denmark, Latin America, and other producers, such as Estonia, or the Netherlands, were not.

Evaluating Success

New Zealand's butter and lamb marketing, whether undertaken by producer boards, the NZCDC or the EMB, relied heavily on the construction of a shared British identity, enhancing similarities and carefully managing any differences. The co-option of 'Home' and empire aimed to both increase the acceptability of New Zealand's produce and differentiate it from 'foreign' non empire competitors like Denmark and Latin America. But the question remains: how successful were these campaigns? Did that shared identity translate into greater sales, increased market share, or premium prices? Of course, data for this period is limited and some have been sceptical of advertising's ability to effect change. Assessing the EMB's contribution for example, Ian Drummond found it 'hard not to laugh' at the board's efforts to promote empire buying, allowing only that 'one could see why politicians might think [advertising] could make the British housewife prefer Australian butter to Danish.'¹⁰⁸ Yet a study of the Buy British campaign of 1931, organised by the EMB in the depths of the depression to help

stimulate consumer demand for 'Home' and empire produce, is more positive. Whilst noting the limits of contemporary market research, Stephen Constantine argued that the campaign did have an effect on consumers, based on the board's own surveys of retailers and reports from dominions like New Zealand, which claimed a noticeable increase in sales of meat and dairy produce.¹⁰⁹ It appears sentiment could be effective in guiding consumer choice. Contemporary Australian marketing made even bolder claims: the head of Australia's trade publicity organisation claimed shops stocking Australian produce had risen from 12-14,000 in 1926 to 36,000 by 1933 thanks to their sales efforts.¹¹⁰

However, Constantine also draws attention to the difficulties of attributing success, or, for that matter, failure, to the campaigns alone, given the multitude of external factors that might contribute to increased sales, including falling prices, or changes in wages and employment levels throughout the period. In the case of New Zealand produce, we must also take account of the effects of the Ottawa agreements from 1932. Following the Ottawa Conference of 1932, Britain introduced imperial preference: differential rates of duty and quotas were applied to products according to whether they were imported from the Empire or non-Empire (foreign) countries. According to Tim Rooth, 'imperial preferences, confirmed and extended at Ottawa, were effective in increasing the Empire's share of the British market...Where foreign countries lost in the British market the prime cause was imperial competition...in general, foreign trading partners with a heavy dependence on agricultural exports tended to suffer lower export values and shares'.¹¹¹

These factors make it difficult to be precise about the impact of such campaigns. Still, in broad terms, there are two ways in which their success may be measured. First, we may consider changes in the origin of British imports. Such a metric indicates changes in the *relative* competitiveness or attractiveness, of imports from various countries. A second, and related benchmark, is to assess changes in the *total* volume of imports of butter and lamb into the

British market. This latter variable reveals how successful British farmers were in responding to government initiatives that Britain needed to be more self-sufficient. Each is considered in turn.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

[TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

The first metric, major changes in British butter imports, is shown in Table 1, from which a number of observations can be made.¹¹² Over the period 1923-38, empire exports gained at the expense of foreign countries. Such an observation accords with Rooth's comments, reported above. The performance of the empire countries is particularly noteworthy because total British imports over the same period almost doubled. However, the distinction between empire and foreign obscures performance differences at the country level. A second observation is that among the empire countries, the Australian share grew faster than New Zealand's (though it starts from a much lower base); in any event, throughout the period, New Zealand's total market share was comfortably in excess of Australia's.¹¹³ A further observation is the comparatively poor performance of Denmark: its market share grows much slower than that of other Empire countries (though it starts from a much larger base). In fact, during the 1920s, New Zealand's share of the British butter market converged on Denmark's and in 1934, New Zealand overtook the latter to become the UK's biggest butter supplier.¹¹⁴ Finally, it is apparent that the rates of growth achieved by the Netherlands and the Baltic countries exceeded those of all other major exporters, though again, they start from a low base.

With the exception of Britain, all of the countries referred to in Table 1 had a common characteristic: their butter exports were branded with country of origin indicia, often

accompanied by a quality grade. For example, 'Nederlandsche Botercontrole', 'Esthonian Brand butter' and 'New Zealand Produce: Pure Creamery Butter' accompanied by a Fernleaf on which 'New Zealand' was embossed. Such country of origin indicia were valuable in the marketing campaigns because they also communicated quality. From the late nineteenth century, all the major butter exporting nations had systems for the inspection, grading and certification of butter.¹¹⁵

We indicated above that in broad terms, empire producers gained at the expense of foreign countries. One feature of this trend which deserves further commentary was the emergence of New Zealand as Britain's principal butter supplier. Although New Zealand acquired market share at the expense of Denmark, this was not uniform. The majority of New Zealand butter was imported via London, whereas Danish butter was imported via East-coast ports, principally Grimsby and Newcastle. One consequence was that a marked geographical bifurcation existed: Danish butter was overwhelmingly consumed in the northern cities and regions of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Yorkshire and Scotland. In contrast, New Zealand butter was more prominent in London, Bristol, the South West and Wales.¹¹⁶

This geographical division has a bearing on our discussion of price differences between butter according to its country of origin. In broad terms, taking the interwar period as a whole, the price of foreign butter can be ranked in descending order as: Danish, Irish, New Zealand, and Australian. The most expensive butter was, in fact, home-produced butter.¹¹⁷ Such comparisons need to be treated with caution. First, Australasian butter supplies exhibited greater seasonality compared to Denmark.¹¹⁸ Secondly, investigations conducted in the 1930s indicated that Danish butter was always considerably more expensive than New Zealand butter in the North of England, and slightly more expensive in Liverpool and Birmingham. Conversely, Danish butter was cheaper than New Zealand butter in London, Bristol and the South West.¹¹⁹

Competition in the British market for mutton and lamb is shown in Table 2. The main trends may be summarised as follows: British dependence on imports increased by 18 per cent – a figure which is almost identical to the difference in the relative shares of Empire and foreign supplies. Throughout this period, Australia and New Zealand continued to be the principal Empire suppliers to Britain, though on average during our period, New Zealand was about three times as important as Australia.¹²⁰ Finally, and in contrast to butter, Table 2 also indicates that the Empire gained at the direct expense of foreign suppliers. Argentina, was particularly badly hit by the provisions of the Ottawa Conference of 1932. Following this Conference, Britain's imports of foreign (non-empire) beef, lamb and mutton were progressively reduced and by the mid-1930s, they were 65 per cent of their 1932 level. Because Argentina was heavily reliant on the British market, the Ottawa agreement meant it had few alternative outlets, and during the 1930s the number of sheep in Argentina declined by 11.5 per cent.¹²¹

Turning to the ruling prices obtained for mutton and lamb, the picture is comparable to that noted for butter. Generally, British lamb commanded a significant premium over imports from the empire and Argentina. However, this observation only applies to the very best qualities of English lamb: by the 1930s, it was apparent that the best New Zealand lamb was selling at a higher price compared to the lowest quality English. It was also the case that English and New Zealand lamb command a premium over Australian and Argentine lamb.¹²² This last observation is particularly important: supplies from empire and foreign countries were frozen. In other words, it is remarkable that New Zealand lamb was beginning to command a premium over fresh English lamb.

Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate that throughout the interwar period Britain's dependence on butter, mutton and lamb imports increased. The corollary of this was that British farmers

were unable to satisfy the demands of the domestic population. For example, between 1929-32 and 1936-39, British consumption of mutton and lamb increased by 7.9 per cent, whereas over the period 1930 and 1937, domestic supply increased by just 2.9 per cent.¹²³ Why, then, were British farmers unable to keep pace with rising domestic demand?

Structural weaknesses in British agriculture were formally identified by the Linlithgow Committee, appointed in 1922. In its final report, the Committee emphasised the need for British farmers to develop a 'marketing sense'. Particular emphasis was placed on the need for grading and standardisation of produce by which foreign countries had secured an increasing share of the British market. In this regard the practices of the Danish bacon industry were highlighted as exemplary. The committee also recommended that cooperative structures be developed because they were integral to the standardisation and production of high-quality produce.¹²⁴

From the late 1920s, legislation was enacted to improve the competitiveness of British farming. Such Acts permitted: the application of 'grade designations' to indicate that produce had reached a particular standard; the establishment of schemes regulating the marketing of produce; they empowered (producer and marketing) boards to determine the grading, marking and packing of the produce of registered producers. Such boards were also authorised to encourage agricultural co-operation, research and education. Additionally, the Acts regulated the importation and sale of agricultural products (without which schemes for reorganisation could not succeed), and approved the power of boards to make loans and grants.¹²⁵

Investigations by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF), recognised the considerable benefits that empire and foreign countries derived from indications of country of

origin, but were highly doubtful of whether such schemes would be successfully adopted by British butter and mutton and lamb producers. For butter, the MAF thought adoption of a national mark was potentially dangerous: the extreme variation in quality and grading of British butter meant that adoption of such mark might backfire and become a mark of disrepute and encourage consumers to seek out empire and foreign butters.¹²⁶ To the best of our knowledge, a national mark scheme for butter was only adopted in 1934, for a trial period of one year.¹²⁷ Turning to mutton and lamb, a similar MAF report lamented the absence of a uniform system of grading.¹²⁸ Again, to the best of our knowledge, British mutton and lamb producers never adopted the national mark during our period.

Conclusions

This article has examined the branding and advertising of ‘New Zealand’ lamb and the related brands of ‘Anchor’ and ‘Fernleaf’, on butter during the inter war period. Our discussion focused on Britain which was, by far, New Zealand’s biggest export market for this produce. A central argument of this article is that the marketing campaigns of the NZMPB and the NZDPCB emphasized the cultural links that existed between New Zealand and Britain. In the pre-1914 period, which was characterized by rapidly growing exports, the coordinated and centralized production and marketing of these outputs was absent. In contrast, the highly volatile interwar period marked the beginning of a concentrated export campaign promoting ‘New Zealand’ in Britain. Put bluntly, by the inter war period, agricultural exports were vital to the national economy and it was therefore inevitable that the state became heavily involved in regulating and coordinating the activities of the NZDPCB and the NZMPB.

As indicated in the previous section, structural weaknesses meant Britain continued to be heavily dependent on imported supplies of butter and lamb. Moreover, import restrictions necessarily placed limits on the ability of Denmark and Argentina to supply more butter and lamb, respectively to the British market. Nonetheless, it cannot be assumed that the emergence of New Zealand as Britain's principal butter supplier was a *fait accompli*: Australian exports, and those from the Baltic increased rapidly during the interwar period (though from a much lower base). A similar comment can be made in relation to lamb, for which Australian exports grew rapidly.

One of the principal themes which has emerged from our discussion is the way in which a variety of different indicia were initially used to promote New Zealand butter and lamb. In the former, we have shown how the 'Anchor' brand gained ascendancy over the 'Fernleaf'. For the latter, we have discussed the battles that ensured 'New Zealand', not Canterbury Meat Company (CMC), became the dominant export brand. It appears from our analysis that the structural characteristics of the dairy and meat industries had a role to play in these conflicts. For example, the dairy industry was substantially more cooperative in organization and benefitted from higher levels of concentration. A survey in 1933 indicated that of 478 dairy factories, 91 per cent were cooperative. One of these companies, the New Zealand Cooperative Dairy Company, resulted from the amalgamation in 1920 of the New Zealand Dairy Association, Thames Valley Dairy Co., and Waikato Dairy Co. As a result of this combination, the parent company not only owned the 'Anchor' brand but was reckoned in the 1930s to be 'one of the largest (if not the largest) cooperative dairy companies in the world.'¹²⁹ In contrast, the lower levels of cooperation and concentration in the meat industry meant that, 'no individual company held the combination of resources and market share to create an individual brand that could displace consumer recognition of New Zealand lamb in international markets'.¹³⁰

In a similar vein, it is instructive to consider the extent to which images previously used to promote country of origin can fall into abeyance and then be resurrected as part of a broader --and more appealing -- marketing campaign. For example, we argued that the Fernleaf became moribund as a New Zealand butter brand by the early 1930s. However, as a national icon, the silver fern persists and thrives today. This brand has been jealously guarded by the All Blacks and it was adopted by the country's leading trade and development agency, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise, to promote coherence and consistency:

The potential benefits of implementing a country trademark as an embodiment of a country brand include the creation of a coherent country image, protection of national symbols, and value enhancement. These opportunities were recognized by NZ government authorities who undertook various activities as part of a coherent country trademark program¹³¹

A further conclusion which results from this article is that, like private brands, country of origin indicia can benefit from considerable longevity. The investments made by the NZDPCB and the NZMPB to improve quality and uniformity in butter and meat instilled confidence among British consumers and helped dispel any remaining myths about the quality of frozen or chilled produce exported from New Zealand. It was claimed that in the 1900s the export of New Zealand butter represented a 'triumph of human ingenuity' but by the 1920s, 'the freshness, as well as the quality, of the article is now taken as a matter of course'.¹³² The goodwill that was created for New Zealand produce by the heavy advertising campaigns of the

dairy and meat produce export boards resonates today: the hygiene standards adopted in the meat industry, for example, exceed the specifications of any exporting country and a survey conducted in 2004 indicated that, '80 per cent of British consumers mention New Zealand when asked what countries produce lamb...and British consumers prefer New Zealand lamb more than lamb from any other country'.¹³³

Our final conclusion is that during the interwar period, the branding and advertising campaigns of the NZDPCB and the NZMPB established 'Anchor' as the major butter brand in southern England, and entrenched 'New Zealand' as the premier country of origin brand for lamb in Britain. The marketing campaign of both cooperatives was based on their cultural appeal to citizens of the 'Mother country' and were in stark contrast to insipid British initiatives to reclaim a larger share of the domestic market.

References

Original Sources

New Zealand Meat Producers Board *Annual Report and Statement of Accounts*, Wellington, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington.

New Zealand Dairy Produce Control Board, *Annual Report and Statement of Accounts*, Wellington, National Library of New Zealand, Wellington.

Official Sources

Report and Proceedings of Conference to Consider the Position of the Frozen-Meat Industry. Wellington: New Zealand Government, 1896.

Empire Marketing Board. *The Demand for Empire Butter*. London: HMSO, 1930.

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. Departmental Committee on the Distribution and Prices of Agricultural Produce: *Final Report*. Cmd.2008. London: HMSO, 1924.

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Sheep, Mutton and Lamb in England and Wales*. London, HMSO, 1931

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Dairy Produce in England and Wales: Part II Butter and Cream*. London: HMSO, 1932.

Secondary Sources

Anholt, Simon. *Competitive Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Barnes, Felicity. *New Zealand's London: A Colony and its Metropolis*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2012.

Barnes, Felicity. “‘Bringing Another Empire Alive?’ The Empire Marketing Board and the Construction of Dominion Identity, 1926-33.” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 42, no.1 (2014): 61-85.

Belson, Jeffrey. *Certification Marks*. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 2002.

Bently, Lionel. "The Making of Modern Trade Mark Law: The Construction of the Legal Concept of Trade Mark (1860-1880)." In *Trade Marks and Brands*, edited by Lionel Bentley, Jennifer Davies and Jane Ginsburg, 3-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Belich, James. *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bickham, Troy. "Eating the Empire: Intersections of Food, Cookery and Imperialism in Eighteenth-Century Britain", *Past and Present*, 198, February (2008): 88-94.

Brodie, Roderick, and Maureen Benson-Rea. "Country of Origin Branding: an Integrative Perspective." *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 25, 4 (2016): 322 - 336

Clemens, Roxanne, and Bruce Babcock. "Country of Origin as a Brand: The Case of New Zealand Lamb." *MATRIC Briefing Paper* 04-MBP 9, November, 2004.

Constantine, Stephen. *Buy and Build*. London: HMSO, 1986.

Constantine, Stephen. "Bringing the Empire Alive: The Empire Marketing Board and Imperial Propaganda, 1926-33." In *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, edited by John Mackenzie, 192-231. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986.

Diamantopoulos, Adamantios, Bodo Schlegelmilch, and Dayananda Palihawadana "The Relationship Between Country-of-Origin Image and Brand Image as Drivers of Purchase Intentions." *International Marketing Review* 28, No.5 (2011):508-524.

Drummond, Ian. *British Economic Policy and Empire, 1919-1939*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1972.

Duguid , Paul . " Developing the Brand: The Case of Alcohol." *Enterprise & Society* 4, (September 2003): 405 – 441 .

Duguid, Paul. " Networks and Knowledge: The Beginning and End of the Port Commodity Chain, 1703–1860." *Business History Review* 79 (Autumn 2005): 493 – 526 .

Evans, Benjamin Lindsay. *A History of Agricultural Production and Marketing in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Keeling and Mundy, 1969.

Faber, Harald. *Cooperation in Danish Agriculture*. London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1931.

French, Michael, and Jim Phillips. *Cheated not Poisoned?* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

George, Alexandra. "Brand Rules: When Branding Law Meets Trade Mark Law." *Brand Management* 13, no.3 (2006): 215-232.

Hansen, Per. "Co-Branding Product and Nation: Danish Modern Furniture and Denmark in the United States, 1940-1970", in *Trademarks, Brands and Competitiveness* edited by Teresa da Silva Lopes and Paul Duguid, 77-101. New York: Routledge, 2010: 77-101.

Hayward, Dai *Golden Jubilee: The Story of the First Fifty years of the New Zealand Meat Producers Board, 1922-1972*, Wellington: Universal Printers, 1972.

Henriksen, Ingrid and Kevin O'Rourke. "Incentives, Technology, and the Shift to Year-round Dairying in Late Nineteenth Century Denmark." *Economic History Review* LVIII, no.3 (2005): 520-554.

Higgins, David. "Mutton Dressed as Lamb? The Misrepresentation of Australian and New Zealand Meat in the British Market, c. 1890-1914." *Australian Economic History Review* 44, no.2 (2004): 161-184.

Higgins, David and Mads Mordhorst. "Reputation and Export Performance: Danish Butter Exports and the British Market, c. 1880-1914." *Business History* 50, no.2 (2008): 185-204.

Higgins, David, and Mads Mordhorst. "Bringing Home the Danish Bacon": Food Chains, national Branding and Danish Supremacy Over the British Bacon Market, c. 1900-1938." *Enterprise & Society* 16, no.1 (2015): 141-185.

Higgins, David Michael. *Brands, Geographic Origin, and the Global Economy: A History from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (forthcoming).

Hoffman, Andrew. *From Heresy to Dogma. An Institutional History of Corporate Environmentalism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Hunter, Ian. "Commodity Chains and Networks in Emerging Markets: New Zealand, 1880-1910." *Business History Review* 79, no.2 (2005): 275-304.

Jaffe, Eugene, and Israel Nebenzahl. *National Image and Competitive Advantage*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School, 2001.

Jensen, Einar. *Danish Agriculture: Its Economic Development*. Copenhagen: J.H. Schultz Forlag, 1937.

Jones, Geoffrey, and Simon Mowatt, "National Image as a Competitive Disadvantage: The Case of the New Zealand Organic Food Industry." *Business History* 58, no.8 (2016): 1262-1288.

Jones, Stephen. "Brand Building and Structural Change in the Scotch Whisky Industry." *Business History* 45, no.3 (2002): 72-89.

Kotler, Philip, and David Gertner. "Country as Brand, Product and Beyond: A Place Marketing and Brand Management Perspective." *Brand Management* 9, no.4-5 (2002): 249-261.

Kornberger, Martin. *Brand Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Regan-Lefebvre, Jennifer. "John Bull's Other Vineyard: Selling Australian Wine in Nineteenth-Century Britain." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* published online 1 March, 2017: 1-25

Libecap, Gary. "The Rise of the Chicago Packers and the Origins of Meat Inspection and Antitrust." *Economic Inquiry* XXX, April (1992): 242-262.

Loach, Albert Cyril. . *A History of the New Zealand Refrigerating Company*. Christchurch: Caxton, 1969.

Lopes, Teresa da Silva. *Global Brands: The Evolution of Multinationals in Alcoholic Beverages*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

McGee, Gary and Thompson, Andrew. *Empire and Globalisation : Networks of People, Goods and Capital in the British World, c.1850-1914*. New York : Cambridge University Press, 2010

McCracken, Grant. *Culture and Consumption*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Moore, Jonathan Allen. "Selling empire: a historical perspective on selling foreign products in domestic markets." *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing* 8, no.2 (2016): 263-283

Morello, Gabriele. "International product Competitiveness and the 'Made in' Concept". In *Product Country Images*, edited by Nicolas Papadopoulos and Louise Heslop, 285-309. New York: International Business Press, 1993.

Papadopoulos, Nicolas, and Louise Heslop. *Product Country Images*. New York: International Business Press, 1993.

Pawson, Eric and Tom Brooking. "Empires of Grass: Towards an Environmental History of New Zealand Agriculture." *British Review of New Zealand Studies* 17, (2008): 95-114.

Perren, Richard. *Taste, Trade and Technology*. Aldershot: Gower, 2006.

Pharr, Julie. "Synthesizing Country-of-Origin Research from the Last Decade: Is the Concept still Salient in an Era of Global Brands?" *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 13, no.4 (2005): 520-554.

Philpott, Harold. *A History of the New Zealand Dairy Industry*. Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer, 1937.

Raustiala, Kal, and Stephen Munzer. "The Global Struggle Over Geographic Indications." *The European Journal of International Law* 18, no.2 (2007): 337-365.

Routh, T. *British Protectionism and the International Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Schooler, Robert. "Product Bias in Central American Common Market." *Journal of Marketing Research* 2, no.4 (1965): 394-397.

Schultz, Majken, Yun Antorini, and Fabian Csaba. *Corporate Branding*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School, 2005.

Self, Robert. "Treasury Control and the Empire Marketing Board." *Twentieth Century British History* 5, no.2 (1994): 153-82.

Sebastian, Lewis. *The Law of Trade Marks*. London: Stevens & Sons, 1911.

Simpson, James. "Selling to Reluctant Drinkers: The British Wine Market, 1860-1914." *Economic History Review* 57, no.1 (2004): 80-108.

Steele, Frances, "New Zealand is Butterland": Interpreting the Historical Significance of a Daily Spread." *New Zealand Journal of History* 39, no. 2 (2005): 475-9

Stephens, F. "The Processing and Marketing of New Zealand Foodstuffs". In *Agricultural Organisation in New Zealand*, edited by Horace. Belshaw, 648-678. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1936.

Stringleman, Hugh., and Scrimgeour, Frank. 'Dairying and dairy products - Cooperatives and centralisation'. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, updated 13-Jul-12*
URL: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/dairying-and-dairy-products/>

Trentmann, Frank. *Free Trade Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009 (paperback edition).

Usunier, Jean-Claude. "Relevance in Business Research: The Case of Country-of-Origin Research in Marketing." *European Management Review*, 3 (2006): 60-73.

Ward, Arthur. *A Command of Co-operatives*. New Zealand Dairy Board: Wellington, 1975.

Webber, Grahame. *The Anchor Story*. n.p., 1988.

Blanco White, Thomas. *Kerly's Law of Trade Marks and Trade Names*. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1966.

Williams, Ernest. *Made in Germany*. London: William Heinemann, 1897.

Wolfe, Richard. *Well Made New Zealand*. Auckland: Reed Methuen, 1987.

-
- ¹ Some of the research for this article was funded by the Nuffield Foundation, Grant: SGS/33846. We have benefitted from many useful comments made by referees. Dev Gangjee provided incomparable advice on the broader legal framework. The usual disclaimer applies.
- ² We are grateful to Nicola Hedge (Arla Foods) for supplying this figure.
- ³ <http://2012.effective design.org.uk/pdf/2012/gold/4.1.9.pdf>
- ⁴ Clemens and Babcock, 'Country of Origin': 5; 7.
- ⁵ Emphasis added. Pawson and Brooking, 'Empires': 108; Jones and Mowatt, 'National image': 1266. Ironically, the latter are correct to argue that New Zealand's well-established 'green' reputation undermined attempts to foster a country of origin for organic foodstuffs after the 1970s. We are grateful to a referee for this observation.
- ⁶ Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, p. 447.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Higgins and Mordhorst, 'Reputation': 187-188.
- ⁹ Calculated from *Annual Reports* of the NZMPB and NZDPCB. The figures quoted for lamb are based on carcasses. After 1936, the lamb export data are reported in tons, so it is not possible to construct a meaningful series for the entire period 1923-38.
- ¹⁰ Lopes, *Global Brands*; Duguid, 'The emergence'; Simpson, 'Selling to reluctant'; Bower, 'Scotch whisky'; Jones, 'Brand building'.
- ¹¹ See, for example, Higgins, 'Mutton dressed as lamb?'; Higgins and Mordhorst, 'Reputation'; Liebcap, 'The Rise'.
- ¹² Higgins and Mordhorst, 'Bringing Home'.
- ¹³ *Report of the Imperial Economic Committee on the Marketing and Preparing for Market of Foodstuffs Produced in the Overseas parts of the Empire. Second Report, Meat: 7*
- ¹⁴ Higgins and Mordhorst, 'Bringing home'.
- ¹⁵ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the marketing of Sheep, Mutton and Lamb in England and Wales*. Economic Series No.29, London: HMSO, 1931: 91.
- ¹⁶ Constantine, "The Buy British Campaign": 44
- ¹⁷ Kenwood and Loughheed, *The Growth*: Table 4, p.30.
- ¹⁸ For New Zealand see Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders*; for recolonisation, or 'export rescue' as a phenomenon in the Anglosphere generally, see Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*
- ¹⁹ Times, 13 January, 1928:7. Jellicoe was appointed Governor-General to New Zealand in 1920.
- ²⁰ Blanco-White, *Kerly's Law of Trade Marks*: 18.
- ²¹ In Britain, 'brands' originally referred to the practice of producing a mark by burning. The word 'brand' was introduced by the Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883. Blanco-White, *Kerly's Law of Trade Marks*: 21.

-
- 22 George, 'Brand Rules': 217.
- 23 Anholt, *Competitive identity*: 5.
- 24 Olins, quoted in Schultz, Antorini and Csaba, *Corporate Branding*: 28.
- 25 McCracken, *Culture and Consumption*: 76-77.
- 26 Kornberger, *Brand Society*: 60; 64.
- 27 McCracken, *Culture and Consumption*: 79.
- 28 Schooler, "Product Bias".
- 29 Williams, *Made in Germany*.
- 30 Morello, 'International product': 287.
- 31 Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Sheep, Mutton and Lamb in England and Wales*; Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Dairy Produce, part II Butter and Cream*.
- 32 Pharr, 'Synthesising': p.34. by 2002, over 700 papers had been published on this subject; a recent search of GOOGLE scholar using 'country of origin' appearing in article titles only, yielded 3,460 publications.
- 33 Kotler and Gertner, 'Country as brand': 252.
- 34 See Steele, 'New Zealand is Butterland'.
- 35 Papadopoulos, 'What product and country images'.
- 36 Bickham, 'Eating the Empire'; Thompson and McGee, *Empire and globalisation*; Regan-Lefebvre, 'John Bull's Other Vineyard';
- 37 Allen-Moore, 'Selling empire'; Barnes, 'Bringing Another Empire'.
- 38 Jaffe and Nebenzahl, *National Image*: 55; 93.
- 39 Jaffe and Nebenzahl, *National Image*: 25-26.
- 40 Jaffe and Nebenzahl, *National Image*: 26-30; Diamantopoulos, Schlegelmilch and Paliawadana, 'The relationship'; Usunier, 'Relevance'.
- 41 Ironically, the 'Anchor' brand is now owned by Arla Foods (previously Arla Foods Fonterra, AFF). AFF had imported 'Anchor' butter from New Zealand. But, in 2009, Fonterra sold its share in AFF. Subsequently, Arla switched the production of 'Anchor' butter from New Zealand to Britain. Prior to this restructuring, 'Anchor' butter was always produced in New Zealand. In contrast, 'Lurpak' is only produced in Denmark. We are grateful to a referee for this observation.
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/business/news/article.cfm?c_id=3&objectid=11173058
- 42 Anholt, 'Foreword': 236.
- 43 Other brands do indicate geographical origin – eg wine appellations such as Champagne, Cognac, but these appellations are owned by all producers within that region.
- 44 Brodie and Ray, 'Country of Origin'.

⁴⁵ These are discussed in the next section.

⁴⁶ “Certification marks are principally indicia of conformity of goods or services to particular standards stipulated by the proprietor of the mark...Certification may be in respect of geographical origin, material, mode of manufacture...The mark signifies that its proprietor vouches for the conformity of the goods...to approved and often quantitative standards. To the extent that the standard goes to quality, the certification mark attests to attainment of an absolute level of quality”. Belson, *Certification Marks*: 20.

⁴⁷ It should be emphasised that although ‘New Zealand’ indicates country of origin, it is not a geographical indication (GI). The latter indicate that produce derives its reputation, quality or characteristics from a specific geographical location. For example, ‘Champagne’ can only be lawfully produced in the Champagne region in France. GI’s were not defined as such until the TRIPS Agreement, 1995, although terms such as ‘appellation’ and ‘appellation of origin’ were well-established by the interwar period. Raustiala and Munzer, ‘The global struggle’: 342. We are grateful to a referee for this comment.

⁴⁸ International registration of the name of a country as an appellation was not possible until the Lisbon Agreement, 1958. Registration of ‘New Zealand Lamb’, surrounded by a rosette, would have constituted a composite or figurative mark, not a purely word mark. Additionally, this mark would have acquired distinctiveness to indicate a trade source. We are grateful to Dev Gangjee for this explanation.

⁴⁹ This observation does not conflict with the Danish butter industry because ‘Lurbrand’, *not* ‘Denmark’, was registered as a trade mark. Higgins and Mordhorst, ‘Reputation’: 196.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of the legal and business issues involved in the campaign which led to the Trade Marks Act, 1875, see Bently, ‘The Making of Modern’: 3-41.

⁵¹ Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875, 38 & 39 Vict., Ch.91: s.10; Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883, 46 & 47 Vict., Ch.57: s. 64.

⁵² The key point here is ‘secondary meaning’ which indicates that a geographical name is associated with the products of a particular firm and is not descriptive of the place. Kerly’s *Law of Trade Marks*: 253; 758-59.

⁵³ Patents, Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1888, 51 & 52 Vict., Ch.50: s.64 (1) (e).

⁵⁴ Sebastian, *The Law of Trade Marks*: 60. Subsequently, an Act in 1905 permitted the registration of geographical terms which, in their ‘ordinary signification’, were not understood as denoting geographic places. Trade Marks Act, 1905, 5 EDW. 7. Ch.15, s.9 (4).

⁵⁵ Blanco-White, Kerly’s, *Law of Trade Marks*: 4.

⁵⁶ Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, 50 & 51 Vict., Ch.28: s.3 (1) (b). This Act repealed the more limited Merchandise Marks Act of 1862, and became the principal means by which governments could protect their national marks against misuse.

⁵⁷ It has been argued that in the New Zealand meat industry, greater emphasis was placed on ‘collaborative links’ between entrepreneurs and the formation of networks whereas in dairy, the cooperative organisation became more important. Hunter, ‘Commodity chains’: 287; 300. We are grateful to a referee for this observation.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Faber, *Cooperation*; Jensen, *Danish Agriculture*; Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Dairy Produce, part II Butter and Cream*.

⁵⁹ Ibid: 48.

⁶⁰ Barnes, *New Zealand’s London*: 171.

⁶¹ See, Higgins, ‘Mutton Dressed As Lamb?’.

-
- ⁶² New Zealand Dairy Produce Control Board, *First Annual Report and Statement of Accounts*, 31 January 1924- 31 July 1925: 10.
- ⁶³ New Zealand Meat Producers Board, *Sixth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, Year ended 30th June 1928*: 10.
- ⁶⁴ Barnes, *New Zealand's London*: 159.
- ⁶⁵ New Zealand Meat Producers Board, *Sixth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, Year ended 30th June 1928*: 23.
- ⁶⁶ New Zealand Meat Producers Board, *Tenth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, Year ended 30th June 1932*: 8. This intensive marketing campaign simultaneously addressed two questions which have featured in the country of origin literature: do consumers notice origin information? And, what origin information is available to consumers? Papadopoulos and Heslop, *Product Country Images*: 14.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid: 6.
- ⁶⁸ New Zealand Meat Producers Board, *Tenth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, Year ended 30th June 1932*: 8.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰ Ward, *A Command*: 57.
- ⁷¹ New Zealand Dairy Industry Commission, *1934 New Zealand Dairy Industry Commission*, New Zealand, 1934, p.34, quoted in Barnes, *New Zealand's London*: 173.
- ⁷² *NZ Dairy Produce Exporter*, 30 January 1932: 18.
- ⁷³ *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, 1934 Session I, H-30 Dairy Industry Commission, p.36.
- ⁷⁴ *NZ Dairy Produce Exporter*, 30 January 1932: 18.
- ⁷⁵ Though Messrs Joseph Nathan & Co., operating in New Zealand and Britain, maintained a packing factory in England for the use of factories that wished to sell their butter in pats. Stephens, 'The processing': fn.35: 676.
- ⁷⁶ Ward, *A Command*: 56.
- ⁷⁷ Barnes, *New Zealand's London*, 173.
- ⁷⁸ Webber, *The Anchor Story*: 4.
- ⁷⁹ Evans, *A History*: 193.
- ⁸⁰ *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, 1902 Session I, I-10, Frozen-meat Committee: Report, together with minutes of evidence and appendix, p.42.
- ⁸¹ Loach, *A History*: 93.
- ⁸² Ibid, p82.
- ⁸³ NZ Meat Producers Board *Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, Year Ending 30th June 1925*: 6.
- ⁸⁴ 'Canterbury' continued to be used by meat retailers like W and R Fletchers in their independent advertising eg *Lincolnshire Echo*, 16 July 1931: 5.

-
- 85 Ibid: 80.
- 86 Hayward, *Golden Jubilee*: 28.
- 87 *Press*, 5 November 1930: 16.
- 88 *Press*, 4 December, 1931: 12.
- 89 Barnes, *New Zealand's London*: 162; 183.
- 90 NZ Meat Producers Board Eighth *Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, Year Ending 30th June*:
16.
- 91 McCracken, *Culture and Consumption*: 79.
- 92 *Times*, 27 February, 1930: 11.
- 93 Barnes, *New Zealand's London*: 172.
- 94 Ibid: 168-172.
- 95 Wolfe, *Well Made*: 8.
- 96 Ibid: 45.
- 97 The New Zealand Co-operative Dairy Company, *New Zealand Dairy Group, 1919-2001*.
- 98 Webber, *The Anchor Story*: 4.
- 99 *New Zealand Dairy Exporter*, 1 October 1932: .54.
- 100 Barnes, *New Zealand's London*: 160.
- 101 Ibid: 171.
- 102 New Zealand Dairy Produce Control Board, *Third Annual Report and Statement of Accounts*,
Wellington, 1927: 9.
- 103 There is a substantial literature explaining the formation of the EMB and assessing its impact. See, for
example: Constantine, *Buy and Build*; Constantine, 'Bringing the Empire'; Self, 'Treasury Control'; Trentmann,
Free Trade Nation.
- 104 Barnes, 'Bringing Another Empire?'
- 105 Ibid: 68-69.
- 106 'British Cloth in NZ', H.S. Williamson, CO 956/145, PRO; 'NZ Serves Our Tables', H.S. Williamson,
CO 956/147, PRO.
- 107 *The Times*, 22 December 1926: 9.
- 108 Drummond, *British Economic Policy*: 67.
- 109 Constantine, 'Buy British': 57.
- 110 Publicity - Australian Trade Publicity reports, A2910/430/1/98 PT 5, Monthly Report No. 48, August,
1933, p.9, National Archives Australia.

¹¹¹ Rooth, *British Protectionism*: p.238. The exercise of imperial preference complicates an assessment of the effectiveness of the advertising boards. We return to this later in the article.

¹¹² UK imports almost double over the period 1923-1938, and we return to this point later.

¹¹³ Between 1931 and 1938, New Zealand accounted for 27.5 and 53.6 per cent, of total UK butter imports, and UK butter imports from the Empire, respectively. The corresponding figures for Australia are 19.5 and 36 per cent.

¹¹⁴ Obtained from comparing Danish and New Zealand shares of British imports during the 1920s and 1930s. Calculated from sources in table 1.

¹¹⁵ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Dairy Produce, part II Butter and Cream*: 47-62. In the pre-1914 period there was no general requirement that imported products be marked with the country of origin. The major exceptions to this were if an imported article bore a trade mark which was identical with or similar to a British trade mark, or if the imported product was embossed with a indication of geographic origin which was similar to a British locality. Irrespective of origin, British legislation (the 'Butter' and 'Margarine' Acts), stipulated that the term 'butter' could only be lawfully applied if it met certain standards of composition regarding water content and butter fat. This latter legislation was a response to concerns about misrepresentation of the composition of foodstuffs, not their origin. See for example, French and Philips, *Cheated not Poisoned*'. We are grateful to a referee for this comment.

¹¹⁶ Empire Marketing Board, *The Demand for Empire Butter*: 14.

¹¹⁷ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Dairy Produce, part II Butter and Cream*: 33. However, the same Report noted that high-quality home-produced butter was found 'only rarely'.

¹¹⁸ See, for example, Henriksen and 'O'Rourke, 'The transition'.

¹¹⁹ Empire Marketing Board, *The Demand for Empire Butter*: 28. A detailed discussion of price differentials in the butter trade during this period is provided in Higgins, *Brands, Geographic Origin*.

¹²⁰ Imports from Eire were either infinitesimally small or not recorded.

¹²¹ Routh, *British Protectionism*: 213;232; Perren, *Taste, Trade*: Table 4.7: 108.

¹²² This ranking of prices is confirmed by examination of Ministry of Agriculture, *Agricultural Statistics : Report on the Prices and Supplies of Agricultural Produce and Requirements in England and Wales*. Various issues.

¹²³ Calculated from Perren, *Tastes, Trade*: Table 5.2: 124; Imperial Economic Committee, *Meat*: Table 31: 48.

¹²⁴ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. Departmental Committee on the Distribution and Prices of Agricultural Produce: *Final Report*: 12-14; 27-29; 31; 39.

¹²⁵ Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marketing) Act, 1928 (18 & 19 Geo.5. Ch.19); Agricultural Marketing Act, 1931 (21 & 22 Geo.V.c.42); Agricultural Marketing Act, 1933 (23 & 24 Geo.V.c.31); Agricultural Marketing (No.2) Act, 1933 (24 Geo.V.c.1).

¹²⁶ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Dairy Produce, part II Butter and Cream*: 62-63.

¹²⁷ *Times*, 17 December, 1934: 7

¹²⁸ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, *Report on the Marketing of Sheep, Mutton and Lamb in England and Wales*: 105.

¹²⁹ Stephens, 'The Processing and Marketing': 653.

-
- ¹³⁰ Clemens and Babcock, 'Country of origin': 6.
- ¹³¹ Florek and Insch, 'The trademark protection': 297
- ¹³² *Times*, 12 November, 1923: 18. Similar sentiments applied to New Zealand lamb. *Times*, 9 January, 1925:8.
- ¹³³ Clemens and Babcock, 'Country of origin': 10.

Table 1. Total volume¹ of imports of butter into the UK, 1923-1938 (Selected dates)

	1923	1925	1928	1931	1933	1935	1938	Percentage Change, 1923-38²
UK total imports	5096	5853	6113	8060	8832	9608	9509	87.0
Total Empire	2201	2989	2654	3865	4654	5435	4803	118.0
Total Foreign	2894	2864	3459	4195	4178	4173	4706	63.0
New Zealand	1131	1255	1222	1926	2512	2638	2582	128.0
Australia	533	1161	873	1558	1692	2113	1798	237.0
Denmark	1838	1658	2016	2466	2519	2186	2365	29.9
Netherlands	175	76	129	96	146	464	712	307.0
Baltic Countries ³	95	47	1	204	334	493	751	691

Notes 1 In 000's of cwts.

2 Figures rounded-up

3 Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. No data is recorded for Lithuania between 1923 and 1925, inclusive, or Latvia and Estonia in 1928

Sources: 1923-1925 from Imperial Economic Committee, *Marketing and Preparing for Market of Foodstuffs Produced Within the Empire*, 1926, p.103; 1928 and 1931, from Rooth, *British Protectionism*, p.121; 1933-1938, from Imperial Economic Committee, *Dairy Produce Supplies*, 1938, p.16.

Table 2. Total volume¹ of imports of lamb and mutton into the UK and the relative shares of New Zealand, Australia and Argentina. (Selected dates)

	1923	1925	1928	1931	1933	1935	1938	Percentage Change, 1923-38²
UK total imports	5862	5465	5643	7132	6696	6752	6913	18.0
Total Empire	3559	3030	3363	5024	5087	5471	5608	59.0
Total Foreign ³	2303	2435	2280	2108	1609	1281	1305	(-) 43.0
New Zealand	2287	2502	2795	3470	3734	3634	3676	61.0
Australia	1272	527	547	1529	1306	1784	1898	49.0
Argentina	1744	1841	1511	1553	1146	906	894	(-) 49.0

Notes 1 In 000's of cwts.

2 Figures rounded-up.

3 Argentina was by far the biggest exporter of mutton and lamb to the UK throughout this period.

Sources: 1923, 1925 and 1938, from *Annual Statement of Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Countries*, Vol. II, various issues. Data for 1928-1935, inclusive, obtained from Imperial Economic Committee, *Meat: A Summary of Figures of Production and Trade*, 1935, p.40; Imperial Economic Committee, *Meat: A Summary of Figures of Production and Trade*, 1938, pp. 48-49.

Figure 1. Point of sale material for butcher-shop windows. New Zealand Meat Producers Board Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, 1930, Wellington, 1930, n.p.

Figure 2. Meat marketing in the New Zealand High Commission Window of the Strand, London. New Zealand Meat Producers Board Annual Report and Statement of Accounts, 1930, Wellington, 1939, n.p.

**To friends
at Home
send a gift of
ANCHOR**

Friends or relatives at home would much enjoy receiving a Christmas Gift of Anchor, New Zealand's choicest Butter.

Sending need mean no bother to you. Place your order at any of the New Zealand Co-op. Dairy Company's Factories or offices, and we will arrange delivery in Great Britain, or on the Continent.

Anchor Gift Cartons cost: 1lb., 1/11; 2lb., 3/8; 3lb., 5/3; 4lb., 6/8. We will enclose any message or card you may wish to send. If unable to call, attach a postal note to the coupon below.

S.Z. CO-OP. DAIRY CO., LTD., AUCKLAND.

Enclosed please find postal notes for..... Please deliver to address below.....lb. carton of Anchor Butter.

Name

Address

(Signed) Address Ex.

(Attach message)

Suitable mails for Christmas deliveries in Britain are as follow:—

Monterey leaves	Oct. 25.
Makura leaves	Nov. 1.
Niagara leaves	Nov. 16.
Mariposa leaves	Nov. 22.

The last-named will barely give time for despatch so earlier attention is requested.

Figure 3. Anchor advertisement for wrapped, patted, butter. New Zealand Dairy Exporter, 1 October 1932, p.54.