

**THE FRIENDS' SCHOOL HOBART :**

**FORMATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT**

THE FRIENDS' SCHOOL HOBART :  
FORMATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT

by

William Nicolle Oats, B.A. (Hons.Adel.),  
B.ED. (Melb.)

submitted in fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Education

University of Tasmania

Hobart.

October, 1976.

I hereby declare that this thesis,

*The Friends' School Hobart : Formation*

*and Early Development,*

contains no material which has been accepted  
for the award of any other degree or diploma  
in any university, and that, to the best of  
my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains  
no copy or paraphrase of material previously  
published or written by another person, except  
where due reference is made in the text of the  
thesis.

(signed)  .....

(W.N. Oats)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction .. .. .	1
<u>PART ONE : FORMATION : 1832-1887</u>	
Ideas and events leading to the foundation of The Friends' School Hobart in 1887.	4
CHAPTER 1 : The Influence of James Backhouse and George Washington Walker ..	6
CHAPTER 2 : A Question of Survival ..	30
Initial difficulties ..	31
The education and alienation of a young Quaker ..	49
Education - a key to survival .. ..	62
CHAPTER 3 : Moves to Establish a Friends' School 1864-1886 .. ..	74
<u>PART TWO : EARLY DEVELOPMENT : 1887-1900</u>	
CHAPTER 4 : Curriculum and Methods ..	107
CHAPTER 5 : Problems of Development Accommodation, Finance and Staffing	146
CHAPTER 6 : The Anatomy of a Crisis ..	171
CHAPTER 7 : Impact .. ..	208
Appendix 1 : Particulars of Donations and Loans to The Friends' School Hobart 1887-1900 .. ..	239
Appendix 2 : Statement of Assets and Liabilities to December 1900. Working Account for 1900 Schedule of fees 1900 ..	241



	<u>Page</u>
Appendix 3 : Staffing from England and Australia 1887-1900	.. 243
References	.. .. 244

\* \* \* \* \*

## A B S T R A C T

The foundation of The Friends' School Hobart in 1887 was the result of a number of formative influences dating back to the arrival of the two English Quakers, Backhouse and Walker, in Hobart in 1832. Part One of this thesis examines the link between Backhouse and Walker's sponsorship of the British and Foreign School Society's principles and the support non-Friends ultimately gave to a Friends' School which appeared to offer an alternative both to the sectarianism of the Church Schools and the secularism of the newly-established State Schools.

The special characteristics of the small Friends' Meeting organized by Backhouse and Walker in Hobart in 1833 are outlined as a basis for showing how education came to be regarded by this group of Friends as providing a key to their survival. Five attempts to start a small school for children of Friends failed in the mid-century decades and a move to set up a boarding-school by Melbourne Friends in the mid-seventies also failed. The thesis attempts to answer the questions: Why then did a Friends' School succeed in Hobart in 1887, where previous attempts had failed? Why in Hobart and not in Melbourne or Sydney?

Part Two describes the early development of the school during the years 1887 to 1900 and the importance in this development of three key figures - Edwin Ransome in England, Francis Mather in Hobart and Samuel Clemes who came out from England to be the school's first headmaster. Support was given by English Friends with finance and

with staffing. The school, however, was a viable proposition only because of the extent of support given by the non-Friend community in Hobart. The school made an impact on non-Friends by reason of its claim to offer something distinctive in curriculum and methods. In curriculum, emphasis was placed, for example, on science rather than on the classics, on the importance of the practical as well as the academic skills, and on training for leisure. The school was regarded as "modern" in its methods because of its introduction of co-education, its reliance on co-operative rather than on competitive techniques in the classroom and its attempt to formulate a non-sectarian approach to religious education.

The years 1887 to 1900 cover the period of Samuel Clemes' headmastership. The reasons for his resignation in 1900 are analysed in some detail in the chapter, "Anatomy of a crisis".

The thesis concludes with a summary of the impact of the school as a Friends' school within the context of the philosophy and practices of the Religious Society of Friends and as a 'High' school within the context of the wider non-Friend community.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the help and encouragement of the following:

Paul Cadbury, Brandon Cadbury, the Barrow Cadbury Trust, the Edward Cadbury Trust, the Juniper Hill Fund, Amy E. Wallis, R. Morgan Johnson, Headmaster of Wigton School, Edward Milligan, Malcolm Thomas and staff of the Friends' House Library, London, Robert Mather and the Board of Governors of The Friends' School, Hobart, Marguerita Robey, Nancie Hewitt, Jack Annells, John Clemes, Edgar Beale, Peter Walker for permission to use the Walker Papers, Shirley King, archivist of the University of Tasmania Library, the staff of the Tasmanian State Archives, Nell Gill, Clive Sansom, Gerald Johnston, Dr. Edgar French, Dr. Michael Roe, Professor R. Selby-Smith

- and Marjorie.

## ABBREVIATIONS

B. & F.S.S.	British and Foreign School Society
C.J.H.	Charles J. Holdsworth
E.R.R.	Edwin R. Ransome
F.H.A.L.	Friends' House Archives London
F.S.H.L.	The Friends' School Hobart Library
G.W.W.	George Washington Walker
J.B.	James Backhouse
J.B.M.	Joseph Benson Mather
J.F.M.	Joseph Francis Mather, son of J.B.M.
J.B.W.	James Backhouse Walker, son of G.W.W.
M.M.	Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends
S.A.G.	Society of Australian Genealogists, Sydney
T.S.A.	Tasmanian State Archives, State Public Library, Hobart
T.U.A.	Tasmanian University Archives, University of Tasmania, Hobart
Y.M.	Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends

\* \* \* \* \*

## INTRODUCTION

### THE ROSE AND THE WARATAH

The English rose and the Tasmanian waratah on the Friends' School badge are a reminder of the two traditions which came together in the founding of The Friends' School in Hobart in 1887.

Quakers are not given to heraldry, nor to coats of arms, but when Ernest Unwin, Headmaster of The Friends' School from 1923 to 1944, was attempting to symbolize the traditions of the school, he chose the badge as a shield of faith, not as a symbol of war, with the Christian symbol of the cross against a field of simple Quaker grey.

He represented the most significant historical features of the school by flanking the central torch of learning with an English rose and a Tasmanian waratah.<sup>1</sup>

The rose was a reminder of the contribution which the Society of Friends in England made to the foundation and subsequent development of the school; the waratah was a declaration that the school was not merely an English transplant in a colonial setting but a genuine Tasmanian product.

To understand the characteristics of the school which developed as a result of the combination of English and Tasmanian influences it is necessary in retrospect to retrace the history of the small group of Friends in Tasmania at least back to 1832, the year of the arrival of

---

1. The heraldic description of The Friends' School badge is given as "Azure, a cross Quaker grey, English rose and Tasmanian waratah gules, torch azure, flame gules". *The Friends' School Seventy-fifth Anniversary*, Hobart, 1961, p.42.

the two English Quakers, James Backhouse and George Washington Walker, in Hobart.

Few schools will have had as long a period of gestation, or one as fully documented as The Friends' School Hobart. It is therefore possible to identify the variety of influences, both within the local group of Friends and external to it, which finally culminated in the birth of the school.

Although it was a Friends' School and has remained under the control of the Society of Friends from 1887 up to the present, it nevertheless departed somewhat from some of the educational practices of the traditional English Friends' schools. The main lines of development were worked out in the years 1887 to 1900.

There was a second area of interaction. The school was operating within the local Tasmanian community. Non-Friend members of this community gave the school strong and sympathetic support, because the school appeared to offer a type of education which had a strong religious base - the cross against a background of Quaker grey - and yet was not sectarian.

Educational policy was not imported from England ready-made; it was woven into a strong worsted on the spot in Hobart. It is possible therefore to examine the fabric of these years and determine the characteristic strands of the pattern.

Whatever the metaphoric terms employed to describe the formation and birth of the school - hybrid product of rose and waratah, or new weave of varied strands, or surprising advent after a long and unsuspected period of gestation, the main body of this thesis is

directed to a study of the ideas which found expression in the early formative years of the school's history and which shaped the subsequent development of the school.



PART ONE

FORMATION - 1832 to 1887

Ideas and events leading to the foundation  
of The Friends' School, Hobart, in 1887.

The first fourteen years, 1887-1900, the period of the headmastership of Samuel Clemes, were the formative years in the history of The Friends' School, Hobart. The birth of an institution, like that of a human being, is not an isolated happening. It is the outcome of a combination of influences, ideas and events. To understand therefore what led to the birth of The Friends' School in 1887 and what determined its characteristic features some examination of the school's pre-natal history is necessary. These features of the school as it developed and grew were the result of a variety of influences reaching as far back as 1832, the year of the arrival of James Backhouse and George Washington Walker in the colony of Van Diemen's Land.

The answer to the question why a Friends' School was established in Hobart and not elsewhere in one of the larger centres of population lies basically in this historical event. A direct result of the arrival of Backhouse and Walker in Hobart was the formation and establishment of a Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers).<sup>2</sup> These two Friends provided not only the initial leadership, but also the continuing spiritual guidance. Without them it is unlikely that there would have been a group of Friends in Hobart of sufficient

---

2. The first Meeting for Worship was held in Backhouse's sitting-room in Hobart on 12 February 1832. The first recognized Business Meeting was held in Hobart on 20 September 1833.

strength to establish ultimately a school. How did this group of Friends come to decide to seek in education a key to survival? How did such a group, which remained numerically small and somewhat exclusive, succeed finally in establishing a school which was sufficiently attractive to merit the support of a significant number of non-Friends?

Again the roots of the answers to these questions lead back to the influence which Backhouse and Walker had, not only on their immediate fellow-members of the Religious Society of Friends, but on the wider community in Tasmania. To understand therefore the reasons for the establishment of the school, the origins of its characteristic features and the manner of its formation it is necessary to describe the contribution which Backhouse and Walker made to the creation of a climate of concern for education amongst Hobart Friends, to analyse the nature and attitudes of this small and somewhat exclusive group as it struggled for survival and to trace the history of the ideas and events which led Hobart Friends to seek in education a key to that survival.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE INFLUENCE OF JAMES BACKHOUSE AND

### GEORGE WASHINGTON WALKER.

James Backhouse, born in Darlington, County Durham, in 1794 was educated at J. Tatham's boarding school in Leeds. His sister, Sarah, recalled that he was not happy at school and found his school-fellows uncongenial and irritating. A possible reason for this was a seriousness of purpose which became apparent early in boyhood. Sarah (Backhouse, S., 1877) records that one of his first requests to his schoolmaster was for a Bible and she noted also that he "read George Fox's Journal with great interest and received many beneficial impressions which were never effaced" (p.3).

On leaving school he first worked in a grocery, drug and chemical business conducted by two Friends at Darlington, but ill-health caused him to seek an outdoor occupation, and so his interests were drawn to botany and to the occupation of nurseryman. In 1816 he joined with his brother, Thomas, to take over an old and well-established nursery in York. His interest and expertise in botany are evident from his *Narrative of a Visit to the Colonies*, in which he recorded not only his observations on the condition of prisoners and the state of prisons in Van Diemen's Land and New South Wales, but also in great detail his scientific observations on the rich variety of the flora he found in this new land.

He took an active part in Friends' education as a member of the committees of the three Friends' Schools in Yorkshire: Ackworth,

Bootham and The Mount. He communicated to the students in these schools something of his own enthusiasm for natural and scientific pursuits. His sister, Sarah, commented: "Having found the advantage to himself of the cultivation of the mind in the study of natural and scientific objects he warmly recommended such pursuits to his young friends" (p.136).

The visit of James Backhouse to the colony of Van Diemen's Land (Tasmania) did not directly and immediately result in the setting up of a school modelled on the Yorkshire Friends' schools. Such an idea would have been quite unrealistic in the Hobart setting, where as yet no recognized group of Friends existed.

Backhouse's concern for education was a much wider one: he was activated by a strong philanthropic conscience, as were many of the relatively comfortable middle-class Quakers of the nineteenth century who found themselves uneasy when confronted with the illiteracy of the poor.

In the first half of that century conscience, reinforced by a new evangelical fervour, led many Quakers to teach the masses to read, for reading provided access to the Bible, the means of salvation. The promotion of literacy amongst the poor therefore was motivated not necessarily by theories of social equality but by the belief that the basis of moral education was ability to read the Scriptures. There were already examples of individual Friends in England who were pioneers in this field and who were the forerunners of the movement for universal elementary education.

James Backhouse had links with one of these pioneers, Joseph Lancaster, a Friend, who in 1798 set up a school in an outhouse in an

effort to give the lads of his neighbourhood an elementary education. From this simple beginning a groundswell of public support developed. By 1805 Lancaster's school had become one of the sights of London, on a par, perhaps, with the sight of Elizabeth Fry reading to the prisoners in Newgate Gaol. George the Third approved and wished "every poor child in my dominions should be taught to read the Bible. I will do anything you wish to promote this object" (Salmon, 1932, p. ix). In 1805 a Lancasterian Society, known later as the British and Foreign School Society (B. & F.S.S.), was formed to support Lancaster's work. One of his staunchest supporters, William Allen, a Friend,<sup>3</sup> made no secret of the fact that the Society had a double purpose. He was enthusiastic about the sight of Lancaster surrounded by hundreds of boys, taken off the streets and "all in perfect order", being trained "to habits of subordination and usefulness and learning the great truths of the Gospel from the Bible" (Sherman, 1851, pp. 59-60). He shared Lancaster's view that a national evil demanded a national remedy. The other reason for the formation of a Society was to save Lancaster from the results of his own lack of management skill. His head could not keep up with his heart and he was soon hopelessly in debt. It was fortunate that there were men of substance who were prepared to raise some £4,000 to save him from bankruptcy and then to organize the business side of the movement.

- 
3. William Allen, 1770-1843, one of the leading scientists of his day, was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1807. He lectured in chemistry to medical students at Guy's Hospital, London. He gave strong support to Lancaster and was Treasurer of the B. & F.S.S. until his death. He compiled the 'Extracts' from the Bible that were the basic reading texts used in Lancaster's schools. He travelled widely in the cause of education, even persuading Russian authorities to substitute Christian reading texts for 'infidel' writings. (*Biographical Catalogue*, 1888, p.10.)

James Backhouse moved in the circle of Friends, such as William Allen and Joseph Pease of Darlington,<sup>4</sup> who were Lancaster's supporters. Elizabeth Fry was another of the Friends who gave Lancaster financial support. James Backhouse visited Newgate with Elizabeth Fry and would have been influenced by her not only in the problems of prison reform, but also in her concern for education and in her support for the B. & F.S.S.

James Backhouse's involvement with the B. & F.S.S. had an important bearing on his work in Tasmania. First he espoused the principles on which Lancaster based his schools and openly advocated these in the colonies. Second, he entered the controversy which sprang up between the supporters of two rival models of public schooling, that of Bell, who had the support of the Anglicans, and Lancaster. This controversy was very much a live issue in the colonies at the time of Backhouse's arrival. Third, his own concern for the cause of public education set a pattern for other Friends to follow within the Hobart context. He created in fact a climate of concern which later was to lead several Friends individually to the support of a variety of educational causes, particularly those with a philanthropic basis, such as the Orphan Schools, the Ragged Schools and the Boys' Reformatory. This same climate of concern influenced Friends as a group fifty years later to found a school which based its religious teaching on the unsectarian and undenominational principles enunciated by Lancaster.

A brief survey of Lancaster's ideas is therefore necessary as

---

4. Joseph Pease, 1799-1872, was well-known as a pioneer of railways, particularly of the Stockton and Darlington Line, and as a Member of Parliament in the new Parliament which followed the Reform Act of 1831.

a background for an examination of Backhouse's influence on education in Tasmania. Friends thoroughly approved of the strong moral purpose which girded Lancaster's enterprise - and Backhouse was quick to see the relevance of this to the task confronting education in a penal colony. In his report to Lieutenant-Governor Arthur<sup>5</sup> on Penal Discipline Backhouse (1843) listed the "uneducated" at the top of the categories of those most likely to be attracted to a life of crime. Extension of the "means of education" was recommended as the first of the measures designed to prevent crime by "counteracting the causes that lead to the commission of crime" (Appendix F, p.1).

To counter the denominational emphasis of Anglican schools Lancaster stressed the non-catechetical curriculum and non-dogmatic reading of the Bible in his methods of teaching religion. Prayers were not compulsory, nor did teachers have to be confessing members of the Anglican Church. The stress was to be on a non-denominational approach to public education.

The B. & F.S.S. had watched with growing anxiety the growth of Anglican support for Dr. Bell, who had been a very successful missionary teacher in Madras, employing similar monitorial methods to those used by Lancaster. To cope with the large numbers clamouring to enter his school Lancaster, unable to afford to pay assistants, developed the idea of using monitors on the basis that those who learnt should themselves teach another.

In the first instance the school is divided into classes; to each of them a lad is appointed as monitor: he is responsible for the morals,

---

5. Colonel (later Sir) George Arthur was Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land from 4 May 1824 to 30 October 1836.

improvement, good order and cleanliness of the whole class. As the monitors leave school when their education is complete they were instructed to train other lads as assistants and successors. To be a monitor was coveted by the whole school, it being an office at once honourable and productive of emolument.

(Salmon, 1932, p.xxxiv)

Bell acknowledged his debt to Lancaster, but saw Lancaster's undenominational and unsectarian approach as a threat to the interests of the established church and fatal to what he understood as true religion. Lancaster saw his vision of a national system of education threatened by what Salmon called "a mere pharasaical sect-making spirit" (p.xxix footnote). Salmon continued:

But for the unsectarianism of Lancaster the development of English education would have been different; but for it he would not have been helped by Carston or Fox or Allen and there would have been no British and Foreign School Society; but for it Bell would not have been drawn from his retreat to establish rival schools and there would have been no National Society<sup>6</sup>: fewer schools would have been opened, government grants would have been later and legislation on other lines.

A report of the B. & F.S.S. in 1821 illustrated the nature of the rivalry, suggesting that the Anglicans had been roused to action only because of the success of the Lancaster schools.

During one year a new school was opened on an average every week and from the year 1808 to the year 1811 the schools went on multiplying to such a degree that the hierarchy were alarmed; and thought it high time also to be up and doing; and consequently Dr. Bell, who had very much improved a common school in Madras and who unquestionably possessed great talents for teaching, and who was settled in a small living in the North of England, was drawn out of his

---

6. Supporters of Bell formed the rival society under the umbrella-term 'national'.



obscurity, presented with a valuable living and made the head of a new establishment, which, though only calculated for a part of the community, was dignified with the title of National.

(*A Defence of the B. & F.S.S.*, 1921,  
pp. 10-11)

James Backhouse was to find on arrival in the Colonies that the rival claims of each system for national support were being just as vigorously debated there as at home. Shortly before leaving England he attended a committee meeting of the B. & F.S.S. at which he was supplied with a generous quantity of B. & F.S.S. textbooks for distribution in the colonies. Backhouse readily appreciated that Lancaster's vision was not limited to the British scene. The Society's very name indicated that the idea was for export. It was a British *and* Foreign School Society. The 1921 Report of the Society (p.32) described how advice had been sought from France in 1815 by a Baron de Gerando and claimed that in 1819 the King of Spain had issued a decree directing that Lancasterian schools be established throughout Spain. It also claimed that interest, if not in all cases action, had been aroused in Italy, Russia, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Malta, India, Sierra Leone, Capetown, Philadelphia, New York and Haiti.

There is no record of Backhouse being given a specific commission by the B. & F.S.S. committee to act as an official representative in the colonies, nor does the promotion of this system appear amongst the explicit objectives of the visit to the colonies.

When Backhouse announced to Friends his concern to visit the colonies the objectives were stated to be firstly "to preach the gospel everywhere amongst the prisoners and colonists, both publicly and from house to house"; secondly, "to inspect the penal settlements, gaols,

schools, and other public institutions", and to apply "the pure and comprehensive standard of the Gospel to the spirit and regulations which prevailed in them." The two remaining objectives were to "deliver the Colony from the scourge of Intemperance" and to inculcate "a just and humane conduct towards the residue of the aboriginal inhabitants" (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p. 33). Schools, however, along with penal settlements and gaols were listed as "public institutions" which were to be inspected.

The companion appointed by Friends to accompany Backhouse on his mission was George Washington Walker, born in London in 1800 of Unitarian parents. Walker had met Backhouse through a chance business association in 1820. Seven years later he joined the Society of Friends and when Backhouse was seeking a companion for his journey he chose Walker. In his letter accepting Backhouse's invitation Walker wrote: "I trust it is not an improper, nor a mistaken notion, when I think I perceive a sweet propriety in being instrumental, in the Divine Will, in acting towards thee in the capacity of a burden-bearer" (p.17). Their partnership was to carry them through eight years of what Friends called "travelling under concern in the ministry". The initiative lay with Backhouse, but the support given him by Walker was unfailing.

By the time that Backhouse and Walker had arrived in the colonies as unofficial promoters of the export product of the B. & F. S.S., the Bell system had already received official sponsorship in the colonies. In 1820 the Colonial Office had advised Governor Macquarie<sup>7</sup> that the Bell system was "the best adapted, not only for securing to

---

7. Lachlan Macquarie was Governor of New South Wales from 1 January 1810 to 1 December 1821.

the rising generation in N.S.W. the Advantage of all necessary Instruction, but also in bringing them up in Habits of Industry and Regularity and for implanting in their Minds the Principles of the Established Church."<sup>8</sup> In 1831, the year preceding the arrival of Backhouse and Walker, the Secretary of State for Colonies, Lord Stanley, introduced non-sectarian principles into the schools which were being established in Ireland, and when Governor Bourke<sup>9</sup> was deliberating about the system to be adopted for schools in New South Wales, he opted for Lord Stanley's model and proposed that "schools for the general education of the colonial youth, supported by the Government and regulated after the manner of the Irish schools ... would be well suited to the circumstances of this Country."<sup>10</sup>

The action taken by Lord Stanley in Ireland gave weight to the unsectarian principles of those who opposed the exclusively Anglican Bell system. The main difference between the Irish and B. & F.S.S. systems seemed to lie in the fact that the Irish system used only a few selected passages from the Bible for general reading, whereas the appeal of the B. & F.S.S. system lay in the use of the whole Bible which was to be read without note or comment. For this reason the B. & F.S.S. system was likely to gain the support of non-Anglican Protestants and to arouse the bitter opposition of Anglicans and Catholics who both wanted the schools to serve sectarian purposes.

Backhouse and Walker were not slow in demonstrating their

- 
- 8. Bathurst to Macquarie, 13 May 1820, H.R.A. I, x, 304.
  - 9. Sir Richard Bourke was Governor of New South Wales from 3 December 1831 to 5 December 1837.
  - 10. Bourke to Stanley, 30 September 1833, H.R.A. I, xvii, p. 231.

interest in inspecting schools and their advocacy of the principles of Lancaster. On 28 February 1832, twenty days after their arrival in Hobart, they visited the King's School, "conducted on the National School plan" (the Bell system) "in which there were upwards of forty boys, who pay from four pence to sixpence a week, but attend irregularly" (Backhouse, J., 1843, p.23). They accompanied Governor Arthur on an inspection of the Old Orphan School and then went on to New Town to see the unfinished building, designed to accommodate up to six hundred orphans. Two days later during a visit to the New Norfolk area they called in to see a Government school. This visit gave them the opportunity to suggest to the teacher, William Macqueen, the advantages of the B. & F.S.S. system. One of Backhouse's letters describes the relatively tactful way he conveyed to William Macqueen the need for scriptural teaching somewhat wider than the catechism.

In the forenoon we went to visit a government school at the Back River on the opposite side of the Derwent to New Norfolk. It is conducted by William Macqueen, an honest Scotch Presbyterian, who appears to do his best with the children. We heard them read the first chapter of John and asked them a few questions; they were unable to inform us who the Word was: this led to some conversation with the master, by which we found that they were chiefly questioned out of the catechism; we pointed out to him the advantage of questioning them out of the Scriptures also, in order that it might be ascertained how far the children understood what they read and that their misconceptions might be corrected; he took our remarks in good part: we gave him one of the compendious reports of the British and Foreign School Society and presented each of his pupils with one of the little books printed in Birmingham, which we find very acceptable presents to children.

(Backhouse, J., 1838, Vol.I, p.21)

There is no record of the private reactions of William Macqueen to this unofficial B. & F.S.S. inspector, nor of the children's reaction

to the books which were distributed to them. For the latter, at least, the visit may have been a welcome diversion from what must have been normally very dull educational fare.

Backhouse and Walker were indefatigable distributors of pamphlets and textbooks produced by the B. & F.S.S. This cornucopia was not exhausted until they were in Western Australia on their way to Africa after six years of travelling in the Australian colonies, for Backhouse (1843) reported: "On arriving at Fremantle we put up the only set of lessons that we had left, and the remainder of the school furniture with which we were entrusted by the B. & F.S.S. and sent them to the charge of Major Irwin" (p.548).

By the time of their departure in 1838 they felt that their sponsorship of the B. & F.S.S. system was meeting with some response. In the previous year in Hobart they had accompanied the colonial chaplain, Philip Palmer, on his visits to the schools of which he was superintendent. These were conducted experimentally according to the principles of the B. & F.S.S. and supported by contributions from parents (six pence to nine pence per week) and from the government. Backhouse commented:

The experiment of the application of the system has proved satisfactory, notwithstanding a little opposition from prejudiced persons that it has to contend with. In the institutions of these schools we furnished a stock of lessons, etc. from those committed to our care by the committee of the British and Foreign School Society.

(p.474)

There is insufficient evidence to justify a claim that the favourable attitudes of Governors Arthur and Franklin<sup>11</sup> to the B. &

---

11. Sir John Franklin was Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land from 6 January 1837 to 21 August 1843.

F.S.S. system were the result of the advocacy of this system by Backhouse and Walker. According to the historian, John West (West, 1971, p.166), the instruction for the adoption of this system in Tasmanian schools in 1838 came from Lord John Russell on the basis of the success of the system in the Cape of Good Hope colony.<sup>12</sup>

Backhouse and Walker, however, had maintained a close relationship with both Governor Arthur and Governor Franklin. Governor Arthur had invited them to take tea with him and his family four days after their arrival in February 1832 and thereafter they were frequent visitors at Government House. This same cordiality was even more marked in their relations with Sir John and Lady Franklin. Walker recorded (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, pp.271-272) with some warmth of feeling an invitation to dinner at Government House on 22 April 1837 soon after Sir John Franklin's arrival in Tasmania. A reciprocal warmth is evident also from a letter written by Lady Jane Franklin seven years later, inviting Walker to the opening of the Lady Franklin Museum at Lenah Valley. Walker had by then returned from Africa to take up residence in Hobart. In this letter, dated 25 October 1843, Lady Franklin spoke appreciatively of Backhouse and Walker: "Indeed this whole colony is well aware how much science has been indebted to

---

12. Some doubt remains about any such specific instruction. With a communication in February 1839 (G O/33, page 202, T.S.A.) was enclosed a copy of Sir John Herschel's report on education in the Cape Colony. Sir John was impressed by the non-sectarian nature of the Cape education system and recommended "the perusal of Scripture as the fountain of moral instruction and the formation of orderly and moral habits." He approved of a basis of broad Christian principles and "an avoidance of everything calculated to perpetuate religious or civil distinctions between members of the same community" or "to foster a spirit of domination on the part of any religious sect." There was no direct reference to the B. & F.S.S., though the sentiments he expressed were in accord with the principles of the B. & F.S.S.

him and to you for the results of your visit to it. I have always deeply regretted that we have known you less as a Resident than we did as a Visitor, nevertheless we have never doubted your kindly feelings."<sup>13</sup>

The reports of Backhouse and Walker to Governor Arthur on the State of the Chain Gangs, on Penal Discipline in the Colony and on Spirituous Liquors were well received by him and mutual confidence was freely acknowledged by both parties. Governor Arthur had shown a keen interest in education and a sense of responsibility to "remove the convict taint" from the rising generation by encouraging the establishment of schools. Shortly before his recall in 1836 he had recommended to the Secretary of State for Colonies that four B. & F.S.S. trained teachers should be brought out to Van Diemen's Land to establish a system of teacher training which would provide an alternative system to the existing Anglican monopoly.<sup>14</sup>

Governor Franklin shared this same concern for education and believed that religious education should be available for all classes.

His Excellency will consider it a fundamental condition that whilst the Public Schools will henceforth be conducted as nearly as circumstances will permit upon the principles of the British and Foreign School Society, the reading of portions of the entire Scriptures shall be daily required in each.

*(Hobart Town Gazette, 10 May 1839)*

Further evidence for Backhouse and Walker's active campaigning for the B. & F.S.S. system came from their records of their first visit to New South Wales. From the time of their arrival in Sydney in

---

13. Lady Jane Franklin to G.W. Walker, 25 October 1843, T.U.A. and T.S.A. copy.

14. See Austin, A.G., 1961, p.74.

January 1835 they were deeply involved in the controversy. In August of the previous year a meeting had been called by two independent clergymen, Rev. W. Jarrett and Rev. W.P. Creek, to consider the formation of a Lancasterian School Society and from this meeting came the decision to call a public meeting on 19 January 1835 to adopt a constitution for an Australian School Society. Backhouse and Walker had already been given a warm invitation by Governor Bourke to visit him and on the 13 January the Governor's boat had been sent to row them back to Government House, Parramatta, fifteen miles up the river. Before leaving Government House Backhouse put into the hands of the Colonial Secretary "a volume of the Irish Books", which were text-books of a non-sectarian nature prepared for schools in Ireland, a manual of the B. & F.S.S. and lesson specimens in use in B. & F.S.S. schools.<sup>15</sup>

Governor Bourke, unlike Governors Arthur and Franklin, had apparently already made up his mind. He had had experience of the rival systems in Ireland. He had been patron of a school sponsored by the Kildare Place Society, which traced its origin back to 1811 to a meeting with Joseph Lancaster. Roman Catholic opposition to religious instruction on the Lancasterian model led finally to the setting up of an Irish National system,<sup>16</sup> based on a secular curriculum with a daily scripture reading taken from a restricted list of extracts approved by a Board of Commissioners on which the rival denominations were represented.

It has been suggested that Governor Bourke influenced Acting Chief Justice Dowling<sup>17</sup> to withdraw his acceptance of the chairmanship

---

15. See Backhouse, 1838, Vol.2, p.57.

16. See p. 14 above.

17. See Cloverly, 1969, p.40.



of the public meeting of 19 January. James Backhouse was then asked to take the chair. His own account (Backhouse, 1843) of the meeting was laconic: "A meeting was held for the organization of an Australian School Society, auxiliary to the British and Foreign School Society. Some opposition was exhibited, but ultimately this was over-ruled and measures were adopted for carrying the object into effect" (p.240). Backhouse made no reference to the fact that it was he who over-ruled the meeting from the chair and declared it to be, not a public meeting as the advertisement in the press indicated, but a meeting of an auxiliary branch of the B. & F.S.S. called to adopt a constitution for an Australian School Society. This was scarcely a promising beginning. A further entry (p.288) in his *Narrative* for 5 June recorded his attendance at a committee meeting of the Australian School Society and an announcement of the opening of its first school on 8 June 1835.

Walker took the chair at a meeting of the Australian School Society held in Sydney on 29 February 1836. The site for the Society's school for girls was the Friends' Meeting House, "which is thus usefully occupied on the days on which no meetings are held" (Backhouse, 1838, Vol ii, p.49). This co-operation was a demonstration of practical support by Sydney members of the Society of Friends. There is no record of Backhouse having visited this school, but an entry for 9 January 1837 (Backhouse, 1843) referred to his attendance at a further meeting of the Australian School Society, at which it was reported that the Government had granted a piece of land for a school-house, that the Girls' School was in a "prosperous state" and that the prospect for the Boys' School "was improving" (p.462).

The Australian School Society received stronger support from

Governor Gipps, Bourke's successor. Only one school had been founded on the Irish National system and the teachers sent out from England at the request of Governor Bourke turned out to be teachers who had been trained under the B. & F.S.S. system. In 1839 Governor Gipps set aside funds for the establishment of schools both according to this system and the Roman Catholic system, but the proposal was withdrawn because of the strength of Anglican opposition and the desire of the Catholics to gain support for their own schools.<sup>18</sup>

The strength of the forces advocating sectarian education was too formidable in New South Wales and in Tasmania in the forties for the B. & F.S.S. system to take root.

In Tasmania a Board of Education was set up in 1840 and in the first three years a total of twenty-five schools came under its jurisdiction. B. & F.S.S. books for use in the schools were reprinted in Hobart. Six married teachers, all trained in B. & F.S.S. schools in England, were brought out to Tasmania. James Bonwick, the best known of these because of his later writings as an historian, gave a lively and detailed account<sup>19</sup> of his B. & F.S.S. school at Old Boro. Road in London. Bonwick was appointed to take charge of the Model School in Hobart in 1841, but the crowded conditions in the school, which was set up in the residence of the local chaplain, had a serious effect on the health, first of his wife and then of himself, and he resigned. For a time he ran a school of his own. Bonwick (1902) recorded the violent opposition to the B. & F.S.S. schools which came from the Anglican Church, particularly from Bishop Nixon, who was alleged to have exclaimed: "As a father, rather than a child of mine were educated

---

18. See Nadel, 1957, pp.199-200.

19. See Bonwick, 1902, pp. 3-43.

in such a school, I would wish to see him dead at my feet first"  
(p.100).

Reports of the Board, however, indicated the importance attached to the principles of Lancaster. A typical report, such as the Annual Report of the Board of Education, 20 October 1843, recorded as a matter of routine that schools had been furnished so that they could do all "that is requisite to enable the master to observe the practices and disciplines of the B. & F.S.S." (p.2). Subsequent reports stressed that these practices covered the exclusion of all sectarian education, the importance of daily readings from the Scriptures without comment, the use of B. & F.S.S. textbooks together with some from the Irish system. The reports also stressed the lack of co-operation from the clergy. It was no wonder therefore that in the face of active opposition from the Anglican Church the Board of Education resigned in 1849.

A genuine attempt had been made to apply Lancaster's principles to public education. The B. & F.S.S. system and the controversy which arose around it did however help to pave the way for the introduction of a national system of elementary education.

Mr. Gladstone acknowledged that this was indeed the case in England. The B. & F.S.S., in its Sixty-sixth Report, 1871, p.2, claimed that Mr. Gladstone in a statement to the House of Commons in 1870 had said: "We have in this country a society which aims at undenominational and unsectarian education - we have the British and Foreign School Society, which has for sixty years sought this object and which has chosen the very path which the Government are now proposing to the Committee."

In Australia the sectarian bitterness aroused in the years

of controversy and the intransigence of the two major contenders, the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, led finally to the decision taken by governments that education should be free, compulsory and secular. The B. & F.S.S. system, although it provided a rallying point for those who were opposed to the sectarian education of the Anglicans and the Catholics, was itself opposed to a purely secular curriculum which appeared to deny that religion was the basis of moral training and hence of education.

While therefore it was an important part of the movement which culminated in the acceptance of a national system of elementary education in the seventies, it also provided the basis for criticism of public education in the late seventies and eighties, when those who believed that education should have a religious basis confessed to disillusion with public secular education. This disillusion was one of the contributing influences that led Friends to found a school which would provide sound moral training on principles akin to those of Lancaster's, but which would be free from the sectarian policies of the denominational schools. It was to be neither secular nor sectarian. It was indeed planned to provide a "guarded Christian education",<sup>20</sup> and thus satisfy a demand which fell between the extremes of secular public and private sectarian education.

The support given by non-Friends to the school had its origin in the community confidence which Backhouse and Walker had inspired. They had demonstrated that education was a matter of importance to Friends. In their final report (Backhouse, 1843, Appendix O), handed to Governor Bourke before leaving Sydney in March 1837, education was a

---

20. See below, p. 116.

major item. Six years in the Colonies had not only strengthened Backhouse's concern for education, but had also convinced him of its importance for the future of the colonies. Having spoken out strongly against the evils of immorality, drunkenness and gambling, he then gave his views on the education of the rising generation. What particularly disturbed him was that education was being discussed "in the spirit of party politics" (Appendix O, p.cxxvi). He made no secret of his own preference for the B. & F.S.S. system. Because of the lead given by Backhouse, Friends in the years that followed were identified with the cause of unsectarian, undenominational education.

Backhouse and Walker sought to unite with other Christians in what they conceived to be their Christian duty to promote the spread of the Gospel and the philanthropic cause of enlightenment of the masses. Fortunately for Friends their influence did not cease with their departure for Africa in 1838. Estimates of the extent and nature of this influence vary.

The early Tasmanian historian, John West, writing in 1852, twenty years after the arrival of Backhouse and Walker in Van Diemen's Land, drew on Backhouse's *Narrative*, published in 1843, for comments on aborigines, prison reform, migration and transportation. In the 1971 edition of West's *History* there are twenty-three page references in the index to "Messrs. Backhouse and Walker", who "travelled these colonies (1832 to 1838), chiefly engaged in religious labours and principally to admonish the prisoners" (p.425). John West then paid tribute to James Backhouse's skill as an accurate observer, man of science, lively writer and as one who combined vision and common sense. "He lifted up his heart to God: took his pocket compass" (p.425). On the other hand

there is the judgment made by Dr. Michael Roe. In referring to the influence of Protestant denominations (Roe, 1965) in Tasmania he mentioned the work of Backhouse and Walker and Walker's returning to settle in Hobart, and added: "Apart from his endeavours this creed made little impression" (p.126). Both estimates are valid. It is true that the "creed" of Quakerism appeared to make little headway in terms of growth of numbers or in formal corporate influence on public institutions during the nineteenth century.<sup>21</sup> Members of the Society tended to think of themselves as a 'peculiar' people, acting under a strict 'discipline', and hence appearing to stand apart from other religious groups, because of their views on worship in a silent meeting and on church government. Backhouse and Walker had sought and gained the support of a wide cross-section of the public in their work for prison reform, for aboriginal protection, for temperance and for education. Whatever subsequent influence they were to exert on the community in Tasmania and specifically on education in Tasmania came, however, from individual Friends acting, as they would put it, under a strong sense of personal concern.

When Backhouse went on home to England in 1840, Walker returned to Hobart. He had his reasons. His previous visits to Hobart had led to a desire to settle there and to set up a business. He had also reached an understanding with Sarah Benson Mather as early as 1834. Though nothing definite transpired, he admitted (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862) that he had the feeling that "affectionate interest was reciprocal" (p.192). His commitment to continue as travelling companion and secretary to Backhouse until their overseas mission was completed led

---

21. See Chapter 2, below.

him to discuss the situation with Backhouse and with another English Friend, Daniel Wheeler, who was visiting Hobart. He reported that "Both seem to think that it may be one of those providential over-rulings, by which my residence may be fixed in this land and the little church that has been gathered may be strengthened thereby" (pp.192-193). Walker returned to Hobart and redeemed his pledge.

The remaining years of Walker's life were to provide strong evidence for the wisdom of the "providential over-ruling". If Backhouse provided the initial drive and inspiration, Walker left more tangible marks on the institutions which he supported and in the public confidence which his community activities generated. Because of the lead given by him, Friends came to be thought of as having a "characteristic sympathy for the cause of education". These were words used by the writer of Walker's obituary in the *Hobart Town Advertiser* of 5 February 1859 to describe Walker's image in the community. He had given much of his time to the cause of public education in the colony. When a re-formed Board of Education was being set up at the end of 1856 to administer public elementary schools in the southern part of the island, Walker accepted an invitation from the Colonial Secretary to be a member. He approved of the non-denominational principles on which the schools were run, principles which were an echo of Lancaster.

He was also one of the original nine members of Council of the Hobart Town High School which was founded in 1850 on the same unsectarian principles that had been enunciated by Lancaster.

In the *Hobart Town Courier*, 18 September 1875, a critic of the high school's unsectarian education reacted to the school's advertisement, in which the three tenets of school policy concerning religious

education were stated - that the Scriptures were to be read in the school, that any parent who objected could seek release for his son from being present at the readings, that any denominational teaching would be scrupulously avoided. The critic, commenting on the first of these, said that "the reading of the unexplained Bible may be no better than fetish-worship." He also pointed out that the prohibition of denominational teaching would seriously limit the selection of competent teachers. These principles however were held by the founders to be the basis of the school's policy.

Walker's eldest son, James, in his reminiscences of Hobart, wrote:

Sectarian feeling ran high in those days and the clerical school (Hutchins) met with bitter hostility. The Scotch, led by the scholarly and able Dr. John Lillie, asserted their rights and supported not only by other denominations but by many Church of England people, opponents of the High Church Party, formed an association to found an unsectarian school. <sup>22</sup>

The inter-denominational nature of the Council is indicated by the fact that of the nine members, three were Episcopalian, two Presbyterian, two Independent Church, one Wesleyan and one Quaker.

Walker took an active part in obtaining subscribers to the cost of the new building, £5,000, which was raised by public subscription in £25 shares. He wrote even to Friends in England for support of an institution which he felt would be of great benefit to the colony. He considered that it would help

to give an additional impulse to education throughout the colony, perhaps create a little emulation among the upper and middle classes

---

22. J.B.W. Reminiscences of Hobart. Walker Papers, W9/3/6(1)  
T.U.A.



to obtain for their children the advantages of a liberal education which have not been held by many of these classes in sufficient estimation. 23

There was a dichotomy in Walker's ideas on education. He accepted a dual system of education, - one, public elementary education for the 'lower' classes; and another, a 'liberal',<sup>24</sup> for the middle and upper classes. This acceptance of a dual standard had been apparent early in his contact with schools in Tasmania. When he visited, in 1833, Ellenthorpe Hall, which he said had the reputation of being the largest boarding school in the island for young ladies, Walker (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862) commended the wife of George Carr Clarke, the owner, for her benevolence "in educating a number of children who have been deprived of the means of a liberal education but whose birth might have seemed to entitle them to it" (p.157). Walker's approval of this school and his comment on a ladies' school visited at Norfolk Plains a week previously reflected his assumption that the upper and lower classes of society needed different schools and different curricula. A liberal education was necessary to provide that refinement for which "the upper class of society in Tasmania is distinguished" (p.155).

Walker therefore at both elementary and secondary school levels identified the Society of Friends with active support of unsectarian education. In the late forties and fifties he, together with other Friends, was to be faced with the personal problem of educating his own growing children. He took the initiative in supporting a number of attempts to establish small schools for children of Friends.<sup>25</sup> His

---

23. G.W.W. to Geo.Bonington, 17 September 1847, Walker Papers, W9/1/1/4(2) T.U.A.

24. For a discussion of Walker's ideas on what constitutes a 'liberal' education, see pp. 51-52 below.

25. See pp. 63ff. below.

backing of moves to provide an unsectarian liberal education at the Hobart Town High School led other Friends to enrol their sons at the High School until such time as that school was incorporated in Christ College.<sup>26</sup> When Friends, thirty years after Walker's death, founded a school on unsectarian and liberal principles, they were giving expression to the ideas which Walker in his lifetime had communicated to them.

Walker's influence on the establishment of the Friends' School in 1887 was considerable, even if it was not immediate and direct. Without his physical presence and spiritual guidance in the two decades of 1840 and 1850 the Friends' Meeting, begun by Backhouse, would have lacked the cohesion to survive. Walker's involvement in the business and philanthropic life of the community<sup>27</sup> set a pattern for individual Friends to follow. At the same time the respect in which he was held by the community because of the breadth and quality of his service was the basis for the confidence the community showed in the Society of Friends, when Friends took the initiative to launch a school in 1887.

---

26. See p. 88 below.

27. Walker set up a Savings Bank in his shop as a practical encouragement to people to save money rather than spend it on rum. This was the beginning of the Hobart Savings Bank (now the Savings Bank of Tasmania). With James Bonwick he organized the Total Abstinence Society in 1843. He was a vice-president of the Auxiliary Bible Society, a member of the committee of the Mechanics' Institute and a Fellow and member of Council of the Royal Society. Walker's drapery shop became well-known as a centre for banking, for signing the pledge and for the distribution of bibles and tracts. In a letter to Geo. Benington Walker admitted that doing good brought compensations.

"I am of opinion the Savings Bank has done good in drawing custom to the shop, many of the depositors expressing thankfulness for the privilege afforded them for thus securing their earnings at a moderate rate of interest and giving the shop a measure of their custom. It is an indirect benefit in this way that we may fairly enjoy without scruple."

(G.W.W. to Geo. Benington, 17 June 1845,  
W9/1/1, T.U.A.)

## CHAPTER TWO

### A QUESTION OF SURVIVAL

Backhouse and Walker had laboured unceasingly during the years of their visit to the colonies, 1832-1837, to establish Quaker Meetings in centres of population. Before they left Hobart Town on 3 November 1837 they had the satisfaction of seeing Monthly Meetings<sup>1</sup> set up in Hobart, Launceston and Great Swanport, on the East Coast, and the Van Diemen's Land Yearly Meeting (representative of these Monthly Meetings) centred in Hobart.

In the two decades that followed this small group of Friends faced a struggle for survival. In the forties Friends were so pre-occupied with their own difficulties that no thought was given to education and no attempt was made to set up a school. In the fifties several attempts were made to set up small schools for the children of Friends, but another quarter of a century was to pass before a school was founded which would serve not only children of Friends, but the wider community of those who sought an unsectarian and undenominational education at both primary and secondary levels for their children.

Yet out of these very difficulties and the apparent fruitless attempts to set up a school came finally the discovery that the key to

- 
1. The terms 'monthly meeting' and 'yearly meeting' are used to denote not only the frequency of meeting but to specify a level of decision-making. In England small local meetings, called Preparative Meetings, gather together once a month in a Monthly Meeting for discussion of general business matters. A larger grouping of such Monthly Meetings covering a region or district is called a Quarterly Meeting and the final decision-making body is the Yearly Meeting, representative of the whole Society of Friends in that country.

survival lay in education. The loss of one of their most promising young members, James Backhouse Walker, from the service of the Meeting acted as a reinforcement of this discovery.

### Initial Difficulties

The prospects for the survival of the Society of Friends in Tasmania initially were far from bright. During the thirty years from the formation of the first Monthly Meeting in Hobart on 20 September 1833 the "little church" was so beset with internal difficulties that it appeared to have little time as a group to give to education or indeed to any matters of public importance.

This period also coincided with what one Quaker historian, Rufus Jones (1921), called "the darkest and saddest in the history of Quakerism" (Vol.I, p.488). He was referring to the twenty years, 1835-1855, which were critical for the Society of Friends in both England and in the United States of America. Bitter controversies over doctrine and discipline were splitting the Society and membership was suffering a marked decline in numbers. In Tasmania the little group of Friends was struggling to find and then to maintain an identity as a recognizable Friends' Meeting. Friends faced considerable difficulties.

First there was a dearth of members with any depth of understanding of Quaker ways or experience either in Quaker worship or in Quaker Meetings for Business and Discipline. When Backhouse and Walker met on 20 September 1833 to draw up a list of those "attached to the principles of Friends",<sup>2</sup> the only others meeting with them were a minor, Ann Pollard, registered as a birthright member of Devonshire House Meeting, London, and Thomas Squire, a member of Alban's Monthly Meeting,

---

2. Hobart M.M. Mins. 5 & 6, 20 September 1833.

England.<sup>3</sup> Apart from the first year of the Meeting's existence in Hobart, when his name appeared as one of the four or five regular attenders, Thomas Squire played little active part in the work of the Society and could therefore scarcely be regarded as a "pillar of the little church". He was disowned by Hobart Monthly Meeting in 1857<sup>4</sup> for his "neglect of so sacred and important a duty as that of publicly waiting upon and worshipping Almighty God." Of the thirteen others recorded at the first exploratory meeting as having shown interest either by attendance at meetings for worship or by contact with Backhouse and Walker in their travels throughout Tasmania, one was recognized as a member, but took no subsequent part in Meeting and finally was disowned for marrying outside the Society. Four others had been members in England, but had been disowned by their Meetings and hence had to re-apply if they wished to join the Society in Van Diemen's Land. One had been an attender in England, one the brother of a disowned member and at the time of the recording of his name, keeper of the gaol at New Norfolk. Six were prisoners of the Crown, of whom it was recorded (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862): "Some of the first to unite with them were convicts, from which class, we have already seen, there were raised up in Tasmania not a few witnesses to the power of Divine Grace" (p.71). Of these six prisoners three eventually applied for membership and were accepted, but these same three also were ultimately disowned, one "for indecent conduct", one for refusing to give up membership of a "secret"

---

3. Thomas Squire had come to Van Diemen's Land by way of Swan River in 1830. In 1834 he opened up a day-school for boys in Brisbane Street. When Frederick Mackie met him over twenty years later, on 1st December 1852, he rated Thomas Squire "an eccentric character".

4. Min. 3 of Hobart M.M., 3 December 1857.

5. Hobart M.M., Min. 10, 2 October 1834.

society, the Order of Rechabites,<sup>6</sup> and one for marrying outside the Society of Friends.

The lack of stability in the early membership of the Society was evident from the records of the minutes of the Hobart M.M. during its first year of existence. From 5 June 1834 to 5 June 1835 twenty-six names were recorded in the register of members. If the eight children of the one family are subtracted as being too young to play an effective role in the affairs of the Society, ten of the remaining eighteen were later disowned for conduct contrary to the rules of the Society. It was therefore not to be wondered at that Backhouse and Walker had misgivings about the future of the Meeting they had established. There was even a note of exasperation in Walker's entry (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862) in his diary for 5 March 1832:

We have received several visits from persons who have been connected with the Society of Friends but who have forfeited their membership. Some of these affect to be Friends and pass here under the name of Quakers, but would be a disgrace to any religious denomination.

(p.43)

In admitting applicants for membership special care was taken beforehand to visit the applicant and seek the reasons for his applying. The first applicant was a Crown prisoner, Abraham Charles Flower (alias, Richard Edwards, employed at Government House) who had met Backhouse and Walker on the prison-ship returning to Hobart from Macquarie Harbour. Hobart M.M., Min.4, 5 October 1833 recorded that he had joined with them in a Meeting for Worship and had become "decidedly attached to the principles of Friends". The admission of Crown prisoners however also brought problems within the Meeting, for five years later an applicant

---

6. Hobart M.M., Min 4, 7 October 1847.

objected to Abraham Flower, the ex-convict, being appointed by the Meeting as one of the two members to interview her.<sup>7</sup> Frequently the processing of applications dragged on through the Minutes of Monthly Meetings for years until the Meeting was satisfied that it was safe to admit or prudent to advise further delay or eventual 'discontinuance'.

While Backhouse and Walker were present and in effect guiding members in what was acceptable, there was some cohesion in the group, but when these two experienced Quakers were absent for periods on the mainland or on their extensive travels through Van Diemen's Land, the remnant more than once was heard to raise a Psalm-like cry of despair: "If it had not been the Lord who was on our side, we must have perished utterly."

A further difficulty was the scattered membership. Backhouse and Walker in their travels met with a surprisingly large number of people who had had some contact with Friends before leaving or being sent out from England, but unless such people could maintain continuing personal contact with Friends, they simply lost interest. One family however which maintained contact in spite of distance and provided, though isolated, a centre for Friends' activity was the Cotton family at Kelvedon, Great Swanport, on the East Coast. Backhouse and Walker had visited Kelvedon early in 1833. Francis Cotton had the distinction of being both a 'birthright' and a 'convinced' Friend. He was born in London in 1801 to Quaker parents and therefore registered as a member by right of birth. He had been educated at Friends' School, Ackworth, and afterwards returned to London and was apprenticed to a builder. He married Anna Maria Tilney, of Kelvedon, Essex, who was also a

---

7. See Hobart M.M., Min.2, 6 December 1838.

member. They left England in 1828 for health reasons. Both had been disowned by their separate Meetings,<sup>8</sup> but the visit of Backhouse and Walker to Kelvedon in 1833 led both to reapply for membership and thus to become 'convinced' members.

Monthly Meetings were held alternately in Hobart and Kelvedon and, when a Meeting was established at Launceston, alternately in Launceston and Kelvedon. Distance presented a formidable but not insurmountable obstacle, but difficulties of communication with isolated individual Friends and the consequent lack of pastoral care and encouragement tended to restrict numbers and to prevent growth. Friends have never been obsessed by the pursuit of numbers but in the answer given in much the same words year after year to the following query<sup>9</sup> a note of discouragement and even of resignation can be detected.

" Query 2 : Is there among you any growth in the truth?

Answer : We fear there is amongst us but little growth in the truth. "

There was a danger that restricted numbers could come to be accepted as inevitable by members of the group and interpreted as a policy of exclusiveness by others outside the group.

Initially Backhouse and Walker neither sought nor gave reason to be suspected of exclusiveness. They received close co-operation from church authorities, particularly from the Wesleyans and the Independents. When they first arrived in Hobart they were offered free use of the meeting-place of the Independents and of the Wesleyans. A

---

8. The reasons for disownment are not clear.

9. Meetings subjected their members periodically to a process of self-examination consisting of a set of queries to which the Meeting supplied agreed and written answers for forwarding to the parent Meeting, London Yearly Meeting, which had drawn up the queries.



Wesleyan couple, Thomas and Sarah Crouch,<sup>10</sup> provided them with their first lodgings. Meetings were held frequently with the Wesleyans and Walker wrote approvingly of their zeal:

The Methodists certainly succeed in drawing out the gifts of their members: and though their efforts may sometimes lead to a kind of zeal that needs to be tempered with prudence, I feel that some of us who have readily adopted this sentiment may have erred still wider from the mark, in our defect of zeal. This is truly applicable to myself.

(Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p.72)

A week later when Backhouse and Walker met for worship after the manner of Friends - and with no others present - Backhouse was moved to pray fervently that "we might be preserved from a sectarian spirit that would seek to gather to a peculiar fold rather than to the Universal church of Christ" (p.74). Both Backhouse and Walker spoke highly of help received from the Wesleyans and were on their guard lest they themselves showed anything of a sectarian spirit. Wesleyans were frequent attenders at Friends' Meetings. William Shoobridge, a Wesleyan local preacher, apparently spoke too long and too often at these Meetings and had to be eldred by Friends<sup>11</sup> "for expressing meditations designed rather for individual edification than to be communicated on behalf of others."<sup>12</sup> But by the end of 1834 there was evidence of a growing rift between Quakers and Wesleyans. Backhouse (1843) regretted "of late to see in some well-disposed persons a disposition to calumniate

---

10. Thomas Crouch was under-sheriff. His wife, Sarah, later became a member of the Society of Friends.

11. It was reported at the next meeting on 7 August by James Backhouse that William Shoobridge had received this eldreding 'agreeably'. Later he gave the Hobart Meeting land for a Friends' burial ground.

12. Hobart M.M., Min.3, 5 June 1834.

Friends and to try to make out that Quakerism is not in accord with the Gospel" (p.216). Daniel Wheeler (Wheeler, 1842), an English Friend who arrived in Van Diemen's Land in 1834, expressed this view. The Wesleyans, he said: "finding that of late some of their members have been convinced of Friends' principles, a marked shyness has begun to show itself: and several attempts have been made to prove that the principles which we profess are not fully supported by Scripture authority" (p.288). Wesleyans and Quakers (at least Quakers of the evangelical period of their history, particularly during the years 1835-1860) spoke practically the same theological language and showed the same evangelical fervour. The differences were ones of form rather than of belief. The Quakers became increasingly impatient with the Wesleyans for holding to a paid ministry. The Wesleyans found long periods of silence in Meetings for Worship too great a strain on their patience. Henceforth co-operation continued at the level of community "good works" but not within the meeting-house or chapel.

Family 'constellations' of Friends were a marked feature of the Quaker community in Van Diemen's Land. One of these families which was later to play an important part in the establishment of a Friends' School in Tasmania was the Mather family. Robert Mather arrived in Hobart on 10 September 1822 in the "Heroine" with his wife, Ann, and a young family. He was a staunch Wesleyan and married to the daughter of the Rev. Joseph Benson, a close colleague of John Wesley. The Mather family had responded to the urgings of the Rev. William Horton, Wesleyan minister in Hobart, to Wesleyan families to settle in Hobart and, with something of a missionary zeal, to help raise the moral tone of the community. The other reason for Robert Mather's decision to migrate

was his wife's delicate health, which incredibly survived a hazardous voyage and a confinement en route. Backhouse and Walker were frequent visitors to the Mather home in Lauderdale and as a result three members of Robert Mather's family joined the Society of Friends, his daughter, Sarah Benson Mather, and son, Robert Andrew Mather, in October 1834 and his eldest son, Joseph Benson Mather, a year later. Robert Mather's wife, Ann, died in 1831. Domestic and business worries may have been the reason for Robert Mather himself not applying for membership of the Society of Friends until 1837. The Wesleyans, perhaps understandably, did not look with favour on the loss of such a family to the Quakers.

The concentration of such a high proportion of the membership of the Tasmanian Meetings in a few families, the Walkers, Cottons, Mathers, was both a strength and a weakness; a strength because they provided a nucleus of stable and intensely devoted Friends on whom the Meeting could rely; a weakness, because by their strength they tended to dominate the Monthly Meeting and hence decision-making was likely to be concentrated within a narrow circle of members linked by marriage and business. These families also provided the continuity, without which Backhouse's labours to set up communities of Friends would have quickly come to nought. Like Paul, the Apostle, Backhouse established isolated communities and then nurtured these communities by personal visits and by letters of exhortation.

But Backhouse's presence could not be a permanent one. Having set up these Meetings of the Society of Friends, he had to move on and when he and Walker left Hobart towards the end of 1837 for South Africa, the scattered outposts were thrown on their own resources and

the burden of responsibility fell heavily on the families of Mathers and Cottons. For almost three years the 'little church' was left to itself and when Walker returned from Africa in December 1840 it must have been a relief to the embattled few to have this stalwart not only returning to help them but registering his intention to marry Sarah Benson Mather<sup>13</sup> and thus guaranteeing his continuing presence with them.

The year 1839 appeared to have been a year of drought as far as growth of numbers, interest and spiritual life were concerned. The Minutes of Monthly Meeting during the year 1839 recorded an average attendance of four. In 1840 five of the average of six Minutes per meeting recorded simply "The case of ... is continued." Decisions were being constantly shelved. Those decisions being awaited were mostly on matters of membership and disownment, not on matters of public concern. The Minutes of both Monthly Meetings and Yearly Meetings bore the signs not only of a group which had lost momentum, but of one which had little sense of purpose save that of self-preservation; it seemed bent unconsciously on promoting its own disappearance.

During the period of 1833 to 1863 the small group of Friends in Hobart reflected in outlook a rigidity and sense of separateness which was characteristic of the Society of Friends as a whole. Under the influence of the evangelical movement of the first half of the nineteenth century an influential section of Friends seemed to be in danger of leading the Society into backwaters of theological and behavioural dogmatism. The language of the epistles which were the currency of communication between the parent Yearly Meeting in London and the scattered Meetings in the Colonies was heavy with scriptural quotations and their

---

13. See Minutes of Hobart M.M., Min.11, 3 December 1840.

content was forbidding in its emphasis on theological doctrines such as those of the atonement and remission of sins. Coupled with this was the emphasis on rules of outward behaviour which stressed the separateness of Friends in such matters as those of dress and speech, referred to in Quaker language of the nineteenth century as "Dress and Address". James Backhouse (Backhouse, 1843) thought these matters to be of sufficient importance to draw up "A Concise Apology for the peculiarities of the Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, in their language, costume and manners" (Appendix B, pp. vi to xiv). While admitting that some of these testimonies might have lost their original 'raison d'etre', he felt that retaining the testimonies for 'dress and address' helped to preserve those members of the Society of "little religious strength" and "to protect its youth from contamination ... Experience has proved that, like their language", their distinctive Quaker garb had "a preserving effect upon their young and weak members" (p.xiii).

There was a fear of change, an unwillingness to abandon forms of behaviour, even though these had ceased to be relevant. James Backhouse (Backhouse, 1843), reflecting on a reading from William Penn's pamphlet *No Cross, No Crown*, which dealt with the testimony against the use of flattering titles, commented: "A strong apprehension has rested on my mind that if Friends should abandon these testimonies the Lord would soon take them away from being a people" (p.218). This sense of being a "people" was very strong amongst nineteenth century Friends. They saw themselves as a 'special people' led by God, as the Hebrews were led out of Egypt, and like the Hebrews they drew up their own Leviticus, called "Rules of Discipline and Advice" and collected together in a publication, *Rules of Discipline of the Religious Society of*

*Friends*, (1834). These were intended to be for a defence of those whose lot was "to live in an age of great dissipation, luxury and profaneness, when the genuine fruits of the spirit of Christianity are so rarely seen, that everything sacred and serious seems threatened to be overwhelmed by the torrent of vice and irreligion" (p.111).

If this was how the parent body, many thousands strong, saw their predicament, how much more beleaguered must the isolated, inexperienced and numerically weak 'little church' have felt in the outpost of Van Diemen's Land in a society whose existence and condition were a daily witness in Friends' eyes to the "torrent of vice and irreligion".

Conscious therefore of weakness within and threats from without, Friends took it upon themselves as a primary duty to administer faithfully to those of their members who attended Yearly and Monthly Meetings the set Queries sent out by London Yearly Meeting. The Monthly Meetings were aptly called 'Meetings for Discipline' and the drawing up of answers to the Queries, administered frequently, like periodic doses of quinine against the dangers of malaria, took up a disproportionate time at these Meetings. Detailed replies were faithfully written up and sent off to London as a record of the "State of the Society" in a far-distant colony. The replies reinforced the impression that Friends as a group were in danger of being more concerned with an introspective, self-conscious pursuit of personal salvation than with following the leadings of the Holy spirit or the promptings of the Inner Light.<sup>14</sup>

The strong Puritanical element in these Queries had a numbing

---

14. Reference to one set of answers (Hobart M.M., Min. 5, December 1851) is sufficient to indicate how stereotyped this periodic exercise had become. Whatever home truths may have been uttered within the Monthly Meeting, the written replies were uniformly dull, relieved only by the occasional admission of minor peccadilloes, as, for example, in the answer to Query One: "Unbecoming behaviour is generally avoided, excepting some instances of drowsiness."

effect on the spiritual vitality of the Society and seriously prejudiced the basic message of the Society. A Quaker historian, William C. Braithwaite (1961), said of this period of Quaker history: "It must be confessed that the tendency of Friends to combat worldliness by a legalism that laid stress on outward rules was turning the Church aside from its mission and from the deeper way of discipline that the First Publishers of Truth had known" (p.544).

The First Publishers of Truth, as the early Quakers of the Seventeenth Century were called, seemed far removed from the framers of these nineteenth century Queries, and the spirit of these Queries contrasted markedly with the spirit of the Advice first issued by a group of Publishers of Truth at Balby in 1656 and again three hundred years later prefacing modern editions of Quaker Advices.

Dearly beloved Friends, these things we do not lay upon you as a rule or form to walk by, but that all, with the measure of light which is pure and holy, may be guided: and so in the light walking and abiding, these things may be fulfilled in the Spirit, not from the letter, for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.

*(Christian Faith and Practice in the  
Experience of the Society of Friends,  
London, 1961, Introduction, p. iv)*

The observance of 'the letter' of the Queries was one of the reasons for the disenchantment of the young, who were birthright members of the Society by decision of their parents. They found the silence of the Meetings a strain, and much of the spoken ministry unintelligible because the thoughts expressed were obscured by Biblical phraseology. They saw no reason for maintaining plainness of speech, behaviour and apparel and they therefore found the rule irksome, particularly as the effect of a Quaker 'uniform' was to emphasize separateness. The

admonition to avoid "all vain sports and places of diversion" and the extension of things forbidden to include music, dancing and drama seemed to equate pleasure with sin.

However the Query which had the most devastating effect upon membership of the Society was Query thirteen, which brought 'disownment' as a penalty for members who married out of the Society. The statement of disownment recorded by the Meeting had all the overtones of a pronouncement of sentence by a judge in a criminal court.

To all whom this may concern, be it known that David Stead, formerly a member of Hobart Town Monthly Meeting of Friends,<sup>15</sup> having married in a manner contrary to the rules of our Religious Society and thereby cut himself from religious fellowship; and his deviation in this respect from the good order established amongst us having come under the cognizance of this Meeting and he, after being communicated with on this subject, having admitted that such was the case - this Meeting after weighty deliberation feels there is no other course open than to issue this testimony of disownment against him.

(Hobart M.M., Min.3, 2 January 1851)

There was in fact a legal basis for requiring both parties to a Quaker marriage to be members of the Society. Quakers first won the right to have Quaker marriages recognized as legal in 1753, but the condition of such recognition was that both parties should be members.<sup>16</sup> This recognition was reaffirmed by Acts of Parliament in 1837 and again in 1847 and 1848. Jones (1921) pointed out that by these Acts marriages

---

15. David Stead was one of the original members of Hobart M.M. 2 September 1833.

16. This point was recognized by J.B.Mather: "In bygone years the law of the land did not allow any marriages in the Society of Friends to take place excepting *both* were members. Now marriages may be solemnized in our Meetings, though neither of the contracting parties are members." (J.B.M. Ms. Account of the Rise of the Society of Friends in Tasmania, Hobart, 1883, p.186, F4/67, T.U.A.)



solemnized according to Quaker usage "were and are good in law to all intents and purposes whatsoever provided that the partners to such marriages were both Quakers" (Vol.I, p.190). By a policy of disownment however Quakers changed the emphasis. What was technically illegal was represented as immoral and sinful. The damaging effect of the Quaker rule against mixed marriages was the manner of the disownment and the seeking of scriptural justification for this unfriendly act. Arnold Lloyd (1950) claimed that Quakers based their attitude to marriages "out of the Society" on a quotation used by George Fox from the Book of Deuteronomy, Chapter Seven, verse three, to identify non-Quakers as "spiritual Hittites" (p.57). Hobart Friends, in a lengthy judgment delivered on the occasion of the disownment of Joseph Cooke for marrying out of the Society, went so far as to claim that "marriages between persons not united in religious sentiments are contrary to the order of the Gospel".<sup>17</sup> The Minute went on to claim that such marriages "introduce laxity in religious faith and practice and not infrequently domestic discord into families." Then followed the 'sentence' of disownment and the exhortation to seek forgiveness from God "in humility and self-abasement".

It was no wonder that such a rule and the manner of its proclamation had a damaging effect on membership of the Society both in England and in Tasmania. Statistics of membership in England were not kept until 1861. J.S. Rowntree (1859, pp.68-73) estimated that there were 60,000 Quakers in England and Wales in 1680, but by 1800, only 19,800 (p.87). Forty years later, according to Isichei (1970, p.112), the number had dropped to 16,227 and the first official returns of 1861

---

17. Hobart M.M., Min.6, 5 August 1841.

revealed a further decline to 13,859 in 1860. This was the lowest point in the graph. The decline was then arrested, due in part to the abandonment by London Yearly Meeting in 1859 of the policy of disownment for marrying out.

In Tasmania the effect of the marriage rule was even more devastating. In less than thirty years there were fifteen disownments for 'marrying out'. The very smallness of the number of Friends eligible for marriage placed what was felt to be an intolerable restriction on young Friends when choice of marriage partners was under consideration. Add to the smallness of numbers the isolation of families such as the Cottons<sup>18</sup> at Kelvedon and the reasons for the falling away of the second generation of Friends' families from membership become clear.<sup>19</sup> Disownment for 'marrying out' was attacked strongly by Friends such as J.S. Rowntree, who pointed out that five thousand Friends had been disowned in England for this reason in the first half of the nineteenth century. A direct move for change was initiated by the York Quarterly Meeting in 1856. Deliberation took a further three years before the London Yearly Meeting came to a decision in 1859. The lemming-like blindness of Friends on this and on a number of other rules, such as those of 'dress and address', was arrested just in time to avert what J.S. Rowntree (1859) saw as a "deliberate act of suicide on the part of a church" (p.156). "It is a paradox" he said, "that a church whose

---

18. Henry Cotton was disowned for marrying out - Hobart M.M., Min. 2, 7 February 1856. Thomas Cotton was disowned for marrying into "the Romish Church" - Hobart M.M., Min.5, 7 May 1857.

19. Alfred Wright (1895), an English Friend, a member of the delegation of three English Friends to the Colonies in 1874-5 confirmed this by the statement: "The choice was so limited that a young man must have often remained celibate all his life if he were not prepared to sacrifice his membership in the Society" (Vol.I, p.7).

polity was rooted in the ideal of freedom - the freedom of all to participate in decisions - exercised a degree of surveillance over the lives of its adherents for which there were few parallels in the Victorian denominational scene" (p.141).

The small group of Friends in Tasmania placed great weight on the observance of outward Quaker rules with respect to speech, dress and marriage and exercised strict surveillance of their members in these matters. The first evidence of relaxation of the previously strictly administered rule concerning marriage came in 1859 when one of the staunch members of the Hobart Monthly Meeting, Henry Propsting, married his second wife, who was then not a Friend, in a registry office. In so doing Henry Propsting was well aware that he was breaking a rule which he, as an elder of the Meeting, had been responsible for upholding against 'delinquents' and he expressly asked that the rule should not be relaxed on his account. The Meeting however did not disown him because, it recorded in Min. 3 of Hobart M.M., 3 March 1859, he had "aimed as far as he could under the circumstances to meet the views of the Society", presumably by at least marrying in a Registry Office, and not in a church.

Rigidity was being questioned and the climate of strict surveillance of members with respect to outward conformity was changing. 1859 was a year of change in London Yearly Meeting and this would have had some influence on attitudes in Tasmania, but change came more slowly at the distant outposts of the Society of Friends. For some Friends in Tasmania there was fear that any laxity in upholding rules for "Dress and Address" would result in general permissiveness and cause harm to the standing of the Society. Joseph Benson Mather,

the oldest son of Robert Mather and Clerk of Hobart Monthly Meeting for over fifty years, stoutly maintained in 1860 that "the supposed altered state of the Society could not relieve from the practice of what had been felt to be a religious duty. There was still a testimony to bear and a light to exhibit which I hoped all would endeavour faithfully to attend to." When he replied to the issue of new Queries sent out by London Yearly Meeting in 1860, though he was writing as Clerk on behalf of the Meeting, the personal nostalgia for past queries came through strongly:

We feel we are replying for the last time to enquiries which for many years have been attended with much interest and close searching of heart and we part with them as from old friends. Yet ... a belief has been felt and expressed that the Yearly Meeting has been guided by best wisdom in the alterations which have been resolved upon.

(J.B. Mather Papers, 31 October 1860)

In the concluding sentence of this paragraph there is a hint of a growing consensus that change was necessary if the future of the Society of Friends in Australia was to be secured.

By the end of the fifties members of Hobart Monthly Meeting, after two decades of dryness and minimum growth, had begun to look ahead and to realize that they were in danger of losing their young people by expecting them to conform to a rigid and outdated Quaker pattern of behaviour and outlook. Little effort had been made by parents to understand what their children felt and needed. Young Quakers found communication with their elders difficult and therefore tended to withdraw from active participation in the affairs of the Society of Friends. One such withdrawal, that of James Backhouse Walker, the eldest son of George Washington Walker, was particularly

significant and therefore merits a more detailed analysis.

James Walker recorded in his diaries and papers the alienating effect which the 'little church' in its struggle for survival had had upon its younger members. This honest appraisal by a young Friend of his failure to find the guidance he needed within the group of Friends in Hobart acted perhaps as a catalyst to precipitate in the Society of Friends in Tasmania a period of self-examination. The older members were now acutely aware, not only of their own aging, but of the prospect of continuing loss of their younger members, unless some provision was made for the education of these younger members in the principles and practices of the Society of Friends. James Walker held a mirror up to the Society of Friends and the reflection Friends saw therein was a disturbing one.

The Education - and Alienation - of a young Quaker

James Backhouse Walker, his name linking the two Quaker missionaries, Backhouse and Walker, embodied the hopes of George and Sarah Walker that their son would carry forward the work begun in Tasmania by Backhouse and Walker. The correspondence of father and son during the three years of James' absence at school in England gave expression to these hopes. George wrote to his son, James: "Thou has been secretly, yet sincerely, yea fervently dedicated to Him, as far as thy father is concerned, from the first day and hour of thy nativity."<sup>20</sup> On James' departure Robert Mather, his maternal grandfather, wrote, making no secret of the hopes cherished for James' future: "I should be delighted to see thee return a scholar, but much more a simple, devoted Friend."<sup>21</sup> George Walker tended to read into his son's actions even as a small boy a pre-disposition to uphold Friends' testimonies, such as, for example, the testimony on simplicity. When James lost one of his playthings he exclaimed to his father - in rather unchild-like language: "Why yes, father, I think it was for ornament rather than use." On another occasion, when provoked by his sister, he retaliated with the words, "A kiss for a blow",<sup>22</sup> a sure indication to the father that his son had a natural understanding of the Quaker Peace Testimony.

Moral education, in George Walker's view, began early for children of Friends, for they had to be taught "to dare to be singular,

---

20. G.W.W. to J.B.W., 4 April 1855, Walker Papers, W9/3/3(1), T.U.A.

21. Walker Papers, 1 November 1853, W9/3/1,5, T.U.A.

22. G.W.W. to Geo.Benington, 6 June 1846, Walker Papers, W9/1/1/4(3), T.U.A.

rather than to follow the multitude to do evil."<sup>23</sup> But Walker cautioned against attempting to force intellectual education upon a child too early. "Though our oldest knows his letters we have not commenced teaching him to read, though upwards of four years, inclining to the belief that it is better not to tax the intellect too early with formal instruction, whereby the mind is not infrequently weakened rather than substantially benefitted."<sup>24</sup>

With James growing up George Walker was faced with a difficult decision concerning his schooling. His "characteristic sympathy for the cause of education"<sup>25</sup> had been demonstrated by his espousal of the cause of public education in the colony.

As a member of the Council of the High School, he felt he should show his confidence in the venture by enrolling his son, though James, recalling the difficulty which his father must have had to overcome his ideas of "Friends' seclusion", commented: "I may be said to have taken my first plunge into the world."<sup>26</sup> The plunge brought with it a sense of shock at what he took to be the low moral tone of the school because of "blackguardism" and bad language. This experience of James' exposure underlined his father's basic problem of providing what Friends called a 'guarded' education for his children. He had already shielded James in his earlier years by providing private tuition for him at home, and had written: "We dare not trust

---

23. G.W.W. to Thomas Cotton, 10 April 1848, Walker Papers, W9/1/1/4(3), T.U.A.

24. G.W.W. to Geo. Benington, 6 February 1856, Walker Papers, W9/1/1/4(2), T.U.A.

25. *Hobart Town Advertiser*, G.W.W. Obituary, 5 February 1859, T.S.A.

26. J.B.W. Reminiscences, Walker Papers, W9/3/6, T.U.A.

him at present to any of the public schools where the mixture is such as to render it an undesirable exposure for the children of Friends."<sup>27</sup> Having taken the risk for two years at the High School, George Walker withdrew James and sent him to England to the Friends' School at Bootham, York, to complete his education under the head-mastership of John Ford. George Walker was not wealthy and this decision represented a real sacrifice to maintain James abroad for three years. He faced this possibility of separation when James was only five years old, and confessed to his friend, Geo. Benington: "I begin to look forward with some solicitude to the best means of educating our rising offspring and though I shrink from the idea of sending them to England, yet in many respects it would seem the more desirable way though it involves a sad estrangement from parents."<sup>28</sup>

There were three main reasons for the decision to send James to England, reasons which reflected George Walker's concept of education. The first reason was the immediate one of 'guarding' James against the undesirable influences of "forwardness and self-sufficiency too prevalent among the youth of this colony" (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p.530). The second was to give James the opportunity of a liberal education in a school which would also provide "wholesome moral discipline" (p.530). George Walker had very definite ideas of what he meant by a 'liberal' education. It meant proficiency in Latin and if possible, Greek, for he said: "I am of the opinion that the study of the classics is highly disciplinary and strengthening to the mind

---

27. Walker Papers, 22 June 1849, W9/1/1/4(4), T.U.A.

28. G.W.W. to Geo. Benington, 6 February 1846, Walker Papers, W9/1/1/4(2), T.U.A.



and well calculated to form habits of patient application and study habits that will be greatly needed in the acquisition of all the other branches of knowledge" (p.535). These words were addressed to James' Headmaster, John Ford, on James' entry to Bootham. They revealed a parent's expectations of what a 'liberal' education meant for his son. Classical studies were regarded as basic because of their mental disciplinary value, but Walker hastened to point out that he valued the classics for their content as well as for their mental discipline. The other components of a liberal education were listed as elementary scientific knowledge, an introduction to commerce, natural history and a systematic course of Scriptural instruction. This list represented a more comprehensive range of subjects than was usually understood by those who advocated a 'liberal' education. An introduction to commerce reflected the utilitarian trend increasingly apparent in Australian versions of a grammar-school curriculum. By 'natural history' Walker meant an inquiry into "natural creation" which supplied "an unfailing source of profitable contemplation, as well as of innocent and healthful recreation, tending to exclude lower and debasing pursuits by creating a distaste for them" (p.535). A systematic course of Scriptural instruction was regarded by him as a basis for an understanding of moral and religious principles.

There was also a third reason which George Walker had expressed to James before he left home. This was his hope that James might become a teacher.

I have long been of the opinion that to a rightly disposed conscientious mind, there is no occupation which is more acceptable to God or beneficial to man, than that of rearing or training the tender mind of youth; to teach it in

fact how to live for time and  
eternity.

(Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p.542)

In reminding James of this hope some time later, when the question of his future vocation was calling for a decision, George Walker added:

Unless thou thyself inclinest to the calling,  
believing that it will be congenial to thy  
tastes, dispositions and best feelings ...  
I would rather thou didst not engage in it.  
But with this there is no higher calling to  
which, in my estimation, as thy loving father,  
thou couldst possibly be promoted.

(pp.542-3)

For a year James lived with indecision. He knew how much his father desired him to become a teacher and how nothing would please his father more than to see him return eventually after further years of preparation to devote himself to Christian teaching. He sensed too that his father looked to him to assume his own mantle of concern for the small group of Friends in Tasmania and that teaching was seen by him to be the chosen means of exercising this concern. James Walker observed some years later that his father had sent him to Bootham out of a sense of loyalty to the Society. He confessed that it had "turned out not according to his wish but a priceless blessing to me."<sup>29</sup>

George Walker had great respect for John Ford of Bootham. Did James sense that his father saw him in a similar role in a future Bootham of the South? Across the top of a letter written by his father to him on 12 December 1855 James scrawled in pencil, "The letter which was the great means of inducing me to return and not to be a

---

29. Walker Papers, W9/3/6(5), T.U.A.

teacher."<sup>30</sup> In this letter his father rejoiced that James had been at Leeds Quarterly Meeting surrounded by "the excellent of the earth". His father pointed out that as only a few months remained before the end of the school year a decision had to be arrived at without further delay. Under the constant pressure of parental hopes and the feeling that his destiny was being decided for him rather than by him James rejected teaching.

Two practical matters made it easier for him to reach this decision and for his father to accept it. James had not found English winters easy to endure and his father felt that a repetition of winter chest complaints might be the means of "our Heavenly Father" indicating "clearly through this or some other medium what is his will concerning thee." The other factor was his father's health. Some two years previously a couple of severe epileptic-type seizures had caused alarm and this may have led George Walker to add to his letter the following words: "In the event of anything happening by which thy father was to be removed, thy presence in that case as the oldest and one on whom the rest would in some degree lean and who also could be the most useful to thy dear mother would seem especially desirable."

The decision was made to return. James felt that his sense of vocation was not strong enough to enable him to face further years of separation from his family and absence from the land to which he confessed a strong attachment. Though George Walker could not disguise his feelings of disappointment at this decision, made by James after discussion with his Headmaster, John Ford, he fully accepted what turned out to be a blessing, for within just over two years from the

---

30. G.W.W. to J.B.W., 14 December 1855, Walker Papers, W9/3/1(1), T.U.A.

time of James' return home George Walker died and the oldest son was faced with the responsibility foreshadowed in the above letter.

This responsibility was carried out to the full, but, contrary to what his father hoped would be his son's role in the Society of Friends, James Walker ceased to be active in the affairs of the Hobart Meeting.<sup>31</sup> The reasons for his departure from the way which his father had expected him to follow revealed why the Society of Friends had ceased to appeal to its younger members, why it had lost its momentum and why it needed a new direction if it was to survive.

James Walker's diaries and notes scribbled on odd scraps of paper together with letters written during the period of doubt and questioning gave a picture of an extraordinarily honest and mature person. Before he left for overseas he had found the sheltered life of a Quaker household and the protective shield thrown around himself and his brothers and sisters increasingly hard to accept. The children of only two or three neighbouring Quaker families were considered by his parents to be suitable as playmates. He had lacked the opportunity to have playmates at school, for until he went to the Hobart Town High School he was tutored at home or taken by a manservant to lessons, like any Roman schoolboy accompanied by his 'paedagogus'. Fairy stories and the imaginative tales of childhood were forbidden.

*Pilgrim's Progress*, "in a dingy ill-printed edition", was "the only

---

31. James Walker was recorded as attending the first three Monthly Meetings after his return, but not beyond February 1857. A minute of 'disassociation' was not recorded until 2 December 1891. He remained until then technically a member, but in practice his interests directed his activities elsewhere. The minutes of 'dis-association' included the explanation that "some of the friends mentioned therein not having met with us for some years and others having expressed a desire to have their names withdrawn from our list of members, this meeting concurs in their disassociation." (Hobart Monthly Meeting Minutes, 2 December 1881, T.U.A.)

glimpse into the realms of the imagination and I revelled in the dreamer Apollyon and the Valley of the Shadow of Death and Giant Despair haunted me ... but the favourite part was the exquisite beauty of the Celestial City."<sup>32</sup>

So much of life seemed shut out; so many seemingly innocent pleasures were forbidden as sinful. Beauty in literature, art or music was suspect. Sundays were observed in strict sabbatarian fashion. Family Bible reading sessions were conducted morning and night and hymns were learnt and repeated aloud each night. Meetings for Worship with long periods of silence punctuated by scriptural exhortations did not speak to his condition. He admitted shamming sickness to escape the ordeal and the hard seats. The first letter sent by his father to "my dear boy, my first-born son" away at school in England devoted more than half of its ten pages to scriptural quotation and exhortation. James knew that behind the language was a deep love, but the effect of incessant evangelical admonition was suffocating to a sensitive and lively-spirited boy.

James found the experience of the Quaker School in York in many ways a liberating one. The voyage itself, which he recorded faithfully day by day in a diary, symbolized a new beginning and a new freedom. At school he revelled in the new world of fiction that opened up for him in *The Arabian Nights*, in the novels of Thackeray and Dickens. He enjoyed what he called "the real teaching" given at Bootham, the stimulus of new interests, particularly in natural science, for he could be emotional about the beauties of nature without a sense of Quaker guilt. After his return to Tasmania he wrote to John Ford,

---

32. Walker Papers, W9/3/6(5), T.U.A.

his Headmaster, with whom he appeared to have had a very friendly and natural relationship: "The whole course pursued at York and the way in which we were thereby induced and led to inquire for ourselves as well as the express advice to that effect have been of the greatest value to me."<sup>33</sup>

His father's death in 1859 delayed a decision on problems he could not yet resolve, but when the decision was finally made, it was the result of deep searching and mature judgment. The decision was to move out from what he felt to be the narrow confines of Quakerism. He missed in the small and limited circle of Quakers the intellectual stimulus, the freedom to explore and the social companionship with a wider circle which he needed.

The publication in 1860 of a book, *Essays and Reviews*, was the catalyst which precipitated the change in his thinking and helped him to relate his religion to the challenges of science and of the new methods of Biblical scholarship. The 'Address to the Reader', which appeared on the opening page of *Essays and Reviews* could have been taken by James Walker as directed expressly to his own spiritual condition.

The Volume it is hoped will be received as an attempt to illustrate the advantage desirable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language and from traditional methods of treatment. <sup>34</sup>

In a letter to James Backhouse's sister, Elizabeth Backhouse, who had

---

33. J.B.W. to John Ford, 12 November 1859, Walker Papers, W9/3/2(1), T.U.A.

34. *Essays and Reviews* was first published by John W. Parker, London, 1860, and was republished by Gregg International, London, 1970.

provided motherly care for James Walker during his school holidays in England, James gave a full report of his experience and of the reasons for his moving out of what he felt to be a Quaker seclusion.

Some months ago while holding the doctrines on Religion which I had been taught with a cold acquiescence, or formal negative belief, although not unfrequently feeling doubts on many points, I had my curiosity excited by the talk about *Essays and Reviews* and the articles against it and I read the book.

As I read I felt that though there was much error and also exaggeration in the book yet that there was also much truth ... and much of the vital principles of Christianity seemed to receive a new life in my belief and a vital force and power which I had never felt before in them, when I held them just on authority.

And yet as might be expected with the truths I got from the book I got many errors, and having had overthrown the old system of beliefs which I had taken on trust from education, the new one which I had to work out for myself was not unlikely to have many serious errors in it at least at first.

Whilst in this state of mind and having become considerably tinctured with the rationalism of *Essays and Reviews* I was asked to go to hear a sermon to young men by Geo. Clarke, Independent minister. <sup>35</sup>

He found in George Clarke the intellectual companionship and spiritual reassurance that he needed. To Elizabeth Backhouse, who had questioned the wisdom of relying on 'human teaching' and not on the guidance of the Holy Spirit within each man, he replied: "We need often even human teaching to help us on."<sup>36</sup> He now had no need to conceal his doubts but could apply to his religion the same spirit of enquiry that he had discovered at Bootham in his exploration of

---

35. J.B.W. to Elizabeth Backhouse, 19 February 1863, Walker Papers, W9/3/2(1), T.U.A.

36. J.B.W. to E.B., 19 February 1863, Walker Papers, W9/3/2(1), T.U.A.

natural science. His accent on the adjective 'cold' in referring to his previous beliefs indicated that for him the Quaker message of the Light Within had been smothered beneath a cold outward formalism of belief and language. He recorded in his diary:

The modern Quaker of the evangelical school, the school of which J.J. Gurney was the high priest,<sup>37</sup> Quakerism degraded almost to the level of modern Wesleyanism, respectable and often rich and comfortable, and often only redeemed from contempt by its practical, if rather fuddishly overstrained philanthropy, is singularly unattractive and commonplace.<sup>38</sup>

This was James Walker's harshest judgment on the Quakerism of the eighteen-fifties. If he had remained in England a few years longer he would have discovered amongst a younger Group of Friends<sup>39</sup> there the same stirrings that *Essays and Reviews* had aroused in him, the same determination not to acquiesce in acceptance of traditional formulas, but to explore the truth in a spirit of tolerance. If he had felt himself free to doubt so that he might the better find the grounds for belief, if indeed he had had the opportunity to discuss

- 
37. The works of Joseph John Gurney, 1788-1847, were frequently recommended for reading by George Walker to his son. J.J. Gurney exercised considerable influence on the Society of Friends by his strong evangelical fervour and his upholding of scriptural authority. For an assessment of his influence, see Jones, 1922, Vol.I, pp. 492-540.
38. J.B.W. Diaries, Walker Papers, W9/3/6(5), T.U.A.
39. John Stephenson Rowntree, who had preceded James Walker at Bootham by a few years, wrote his paper "Quakerism Past and Present" in answer to a public invitation for essays on the decline of the Society of Friends. J.S. Rowntree won the prize of a hundred guineas for an essay which was to exert considerable influence on the Society of Friends' Attitude to its Discipline. Rowntree (1908) called on the Society to "break fettering bonds in its organization and abolish rules interfering with individual liberty; especially that it should cease to disown its members for marrying out of the Society, or for paying church-rates or tithes: in short that it should cease to enforce a rigid uniformity of faith and practice where no moral law was infringed: and that it should leave the individual conscience free"(p.11).



these doubts with members of the Hobart Meeting of Friends without feeling that he was being disloyal, he might well have found it unnecessary to look elsewhere for the sympathy and understanding he needed at this time of intellectual crisis.

James Walker's influence on education in Tasmania was considerable. He was a member of the Royal Society, an acknowledged authority on early Tasmanian History, a member of the Council of Education, a foundation member of the University Council and its Vice-Chancellor 1898-1899.<sup>40</sup> This contribution was made outside the Society of Friends, but James Walker, in spite of his swing away from Quakerism as an institution, nevertheless retained a close personal link with Friends. In one sense he did not leave Friends, for his sympathies with Friends and his respect for them remained unchanged. "At an early age," he wrote, "I burst the bonds and have strayed far and wide over the spreading fields of literature and fiction, but yet I hold those simple people in honour as men whose moral fibre was better."<sup>41</sup> Though he found his boyhood life restricted by his parents' rather rigid views on what was allowed in accordance with a strict Quaker upbringing and though he missed within the Quaker group the intellectual companionship he so much appreciated later with the Independent minister, George Clarke, and the Presbyterian minister at New Town, John Service, he was strong in his appreciation of the moral strength of individual Quakers, particularly of his father, who, he

---

40. In his diary he commented on the election: "Elected V.C. of the University of Tasmania in spite of my expressing a wish to withdraw my name as I considered office ought to be held by a graduate of the University." J.B.W. Diaries, 18 July 1898, Walker Papers, W9/3/3(34), T.U.A.

41. J.B.W. Diaries, Walker Papers, W9/3/6(5), T.U.A.

said, "seemed to live in the presence of God."<sup>42</sup> He recalled his father's "face of sweetness and kindly courtesy", his unselfishness, his "delicate consideration shown to the poorest and most degraded." "He could not think of God as less loving or forgiving than himself", but he saw his father's natural out-going dispositions restricted "by much of the domestic exclusiveness or separateness of Friends which in those days made them a mystery to the outside world."

The years 1833-1863 showed how failure to meet the needs of its young people threatened the survival of "the little church" in Tasmania. James Walker's frank appraisal of this failure was an indication of the need for the Society of Friends in Tasmania to re-examine the Society's responsibility to its younger members, and its own exclusiveness and narrowness of outlook.

---

42. J.B.W. Diaries, Walker Papers, W9/9/3/6(5), T.U.A.

### Education - A Key to Survival?

Minutes of the Hobart Monthly Meetings during the years 1833-1863 produced no evidence that education was yet seen as a possible key to the survival of the Society of Friends in Tasmania. There are oblique references to education in answers to two of the oft-considered Queries. In answering Query Four<sup>43</sup> Friends acknowledged their responsibility "by example and precept to train up their children, servants and those under their care in a religious life and conversation consistent with our Christian profession and in plainness of speech, behaviour and apparel." There was no reference here to any responsibility for schooling, but rather to the generalized responsibility of parents to see that their children, in common with servants of the household, were trained in Quaker 'religious life' and in Quaker habits of 'speech, behaviour and apparel'. The education referred to in Query Ten was limited to the schooling of the children of poorer members of the Society and the Query served as a reminder to members of the Meeting of their responsibility to see that such children were provided with schooling. This concern reflected the strong element of Christian benevolence which led many nineteenth century Friends in England to take an active part in the provision of schooling for the children of the poorer classes.

In the second half of this period however Friends had to face the practical problem of finding suitable schools for their children and as a result several attempts were made to set up schools for children of Friends, but without formal support from the Hobart Monthly Meeting. That such attempts were made was evidence of the growing

---

43. Hobart M.M., Min.5, 5 December 1851.

anxiety being felt privately by Friends for the education of their children.

The first reference to a Friends' School came from a letter received from an English Friend, Elinor Clifton, who came out to Australia, bringing her own meeting-house with her. In 1844 she settled in Australind, Western Australia, where, according to J.B. Mather (1883), she tried without success to make her meeting-house "a central educational station where all Friends in the Australias could send their children" (p.65).<sup>44</sup> Elinor Clifton's hope for "a central educational station" was later realized, but in Hobart, not in Western Australia.

The first attempt in Hobart was by a New Zealand Friend, Thomas Mason, who left New Zealand during the Maori Wars because he was out of sympathy with the way white people were treating the Maoris. He arrived in Hobart in 1847. For a time he helped George Walker as book-keeper in Walker's drapery shop. In a letter to James Backhouse, George Walker wrote:

I think Thomas Mason has an apprehension that it will be his religious duty to devote himself for a time to the task of imparting instruction to the children of Friends in this place ... I trust it will prove a blessing to our dear children.<sup>45</sup>

Thinking that he ought to do something useful Thomas Mason, with G.W. Walker's support, offered to start a small school for children of Friends in a building situated at the corner of Argyle and Burnett Streets. He started with ten children, all of whom came from the Friends' families of Walker, Propsting, Mather, Bell and his own family.

---

44. J.B.M.'s typed Ms.Account of the Rise of the Society of Friends in Tasmania is catalogued F4/67 at the T.U.A.

45. G.W.W. to J.B., 15 August 1859, Walker Papers, W9/1/1/4(1), T.U.A.

Thomas Mason's period of usefulness to Friends in Hobart was limited, for he returned with his family to the Hutt Valley in New Zealand on 6 March 1851. James Walker attended Thomas Mason's school for a short time, until his father entered him in the newly founded Hobart Town High School. James some years later suggested that the opening of the High School may have hastened Thomas Mason's decision to return to New Zealand.<sup>46</sup>

The second school, this time on meeting-house premises, lasted an even shorter time. George Bell, who arrived in Van Diemen's Land in 1839, was a schoolmaster at Bothwell and his wife Sarah Bell was postmistress. George Bell joined Friends in 1842 and Sarah Bell in 1845. On the death of her husband in 1852 Sarah had to support her family and sought help from the Hobart Monthly Meeting. When J. Francis Mather, son of J.B. Mather, wrote a brief history of early efforts to establish Friends' Schools in Hobart,<sup>47</sup> no mention was made of this brief effort of Sarah Bell who attempted to conduct a school, either with or without encouragement from the Meeting. Evidence for the school's existence came from family letters written to James Backhouse Walker, when he was at school in England.

Ann Benson Mather informed her cousin that she was leaving Jane Whittaker's school and "going to Sarah Bell's school tomorrow". J.B. Walker's sister, Elizabeth, also wrote by the same mail telling him that she had left Lucy Garrard's school and was going to Sarah Bell.<sup>48</sup> A letter from his mother dated 5 July 1854 confirmed that

---

46. Walker Papers, W9/3/6(5), T.U.A.

47. J.F.M. Copy sent to E.R., 18 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

48. Walker Papers, 9 April 1854, W9/3/1/5(2), T.U.A.

Elizabeth was at Sarah Bell's school. She shared with her son her worries about the education of his brothers and sisters. The two brothers, George and Robert, were at Alexander Cairnduff's school, "where I fear the balance is on the side of evil". But she admitted that such would be the case wherever the children went to school. The two younger children, Ridley and Sarah, were still therefore given instruction at home.<sup>49</sup> Sarah Bell's school did not appear to last beyond 1854. James Walker's younger brother, Robert, wrote on 31 March 1855 to say that his brother, Ridley, was now at W.R. Wade's school and that his sister, Elizabeth, was at a school conducted by W.R. Wade's sister, who had lately come from England.<sup>50</sup>

The meeting-house appeared to be available for what was to be the third attempt to conduct a school. Margaret Beale arrived in Tasmania early in 1855 with her young family of six children, her husband having come out with two older sons to seek his fortune in Australia after the Irish famine. The certificate of removal from Mountmellick, Ireland,<sup>51</sup> indicated that the original intention was to settle in Launceston, but in July she moved to Hobart for her family's education, her husband following in September to take a position as a clerk in the East Coast Navigation Company. She seized the opportunity which the vacant Meeting-house offered to open a school and thus support her family. There had been no obvious rationale behind the first two attempts to open a school. Thomas Mason undertook schoolmastering as a 'religious duty' during a period of temporary exile from

---

49. Sarah Walker to J.B.W., 5 July 1854, Walker Papers, W9/3/1/5(2), T.U.A.

50. Robert Walker to J.B.W., 31 March 1855, Walker Papers, W9/3/1(5)(2), T.U.A.

51. Hobart M.M., Min.4, 16 May 1855.

New Zealand. Sarah Bell had opened a school because she was destitute. Neither Thomas Mason nor Sarah Bell appeared to have worked out what subjects of instruction their schools should offer nor what educational methods should be employed. Margaret Beale, however, from earliest years had been given a taste for learning. There was strong support for education within her Quaker family. Her grandfather, Samuel Grubb, copied out by hand the multiplication tables he taught her in 1814.<sup>52</sup> Her reports from a Mrs. Checkley's school, Enniscorthy, gave her high ratings for all her subjects, Spelling, Reading, Arithmetic, History, Geography, Vocabulary, Composition and French.<sup>53</sup> She had not at this age of fourteen studied the classics, for which she acquired a love after leaving school. She used to read her New Testament in Greek and at her death she bequeathed a comprehensive classical library to her youngest son, Octavius Charles Beale. She educated her own family and wrote personal reading books to stimulate their reading.<sup>54</sup>

Margaret Beale was given permission by the Hobart Monthly Meeting to use the Meeting-house for her school. The Hobart Monthly Meeting Returns to the Legislative Council<sup>55</sup> gave official acknowledgment of this day school and stated that its average daily attendance

---

52. Society of Australian Genealogists, Sydney, Ref. 3/630.

53. S.A.G., Sydney Ref. 3/640.

54. The title page of one of these was "A Little Book for a little boy named Francis Beale, by his mother, Mountmellick, 1842". S.A.G. Sydney Ref. 3/640. Margaret Beale built up the reading material in this primer from Francis' own world of experience - a "place called Derrycappagh", a trip to Dublin, an excursion to the museum where he saw, "as if living" a Camelopard. The book was added to as Francis grew older. A poem on "The Hare", "a victim of man's cruel pleasure", combined Quaker testimony against blood sports with basic reading material.

55. Hobart M.M., Min. 4, 7 February 1856.

was thirteen girls.

The notice of commencement<sup>56</sup> identified the school as a "Select Day School" - "prepared to receive a few select pupils." The course of instruction comprised "English in all its branches, French, Latin, drawing and needlework."

Francis Mather<sup>57</sup> drew attention to two important points; first, that though pupils were mostly girls, there were some boys, and second that there were "some children of non-members, several of whom have since ranked amongst Hobart's chief men and women." Margaret Beale was an imaginative, cultured and capable teacher with a real understanding of children. Her school made a favourable impression in spite of its brief existence. Early in 1857 Margaret Beale transferred to Melbourne. She had not been happy living in what she regarded as a penal colony and her husband could not find suitable work in Hobart.

Friends were now beginning to face up to the problems of educating their children. Their apparent indifference to the needs of younger members of the Society was beginning to give way to real concern about their future and about the future of the Society. The mid-fifties brought gold-rushes to the mainland, rising prices, growing materialism and, according to George Walker, a "fearful" increase in "idleness, reckless prodigality and intemperance".<sup>58</sup> A fortnight later in a letter to James Backhouse he gave expression to the growing

---

56. *Courier*, 2 July 1855, T.S.A.

57. J.F.M. Copy to E.R.R., 18 June 1900, MS.Box 19, F.H.A.L.

58. G.W.W. to J.B.W., 29 June 1854, quoted in Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p. 536.



worries of Friends about the results of "the disjointed state of society" on the education of their children.

We are not satisfied with our means of education for our boys here. There are many drawbacks in the rearing of children in these Colonies, more particularly in the present disjointed state of society, consequent on the discovery of the gold-fields.

(Backhouse and Tyler, 1862)

The Yearly Meeting's Epistle to London Yearly Meeting in 1856 reflected this same growing anxiety. For the first time there was reference to the children of the Meeting, to their growing numbers and to the sense of responsibility which Friends' parents were now feeling for training their children and for shielding them from the contaminating influences of contemporary society. There was also a strong sense of the advancing years of the founding members of the Society in Hobart.

While the ranks of those advanced in years are thus being thinned our young people are numerous, causing some of us to feel increased responsibility .. that our precious offspring may be won to Christ and prepared to occupy posts of usefulness in the Militant Church, so that when our fathers and mothers are laid in the dust there may be a succession of faithful witnesses to the truth.

(Mather, 1883, p.101)

It was therefore with some thankfulness that shortly after Margaret Beale's departure for Melbourne, Friends welcomed Frederick and Rachel Mackie who came to Hobart "under a feeling of religious duty to the rising generation."<sup>59</sup> Frederick Mackie had come out to Australia in 1852 with Robert Lindsey on a religious visit to the Colonies. He had been trained as a teacher at Ayton, Yorkshire, and

---

59. J.F.M. Copy to E.R., 18 June 1900, MS.Box 19, F.H.A.L.

when he had completed his 'travels under concern' with Robert Lindsey, he, like George Walker, decided to return to Tasmania, but on the way he stopped in South Australia and married Rachel May. The Mackies came on to Hobart and stayed a month with the Walkers. George Walker, writing to his son on 11 October 1856 (Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p.548), said what a great satisfaction it was to have Frederick Mackie as instructor for sons of Friends. He also reported that Mackie had been conducting a school for boys in his own house in Bathurst Street. Probably the Meeting-house was not yet available because Margaret Beale was conducting her school there until the end of 1856. Margaret Beale's departure gave Mackie the opportunity to make his school co-educational. The Hobart Monthly Meeting<sup>60</sup> agreed to build on two extra rooms to the Meeting-house for use as school-rooms at a cost of £84.15.6. This Minute gave as the reason for this action the need to overcome the inconvenience to the Meeting of the Meeting-house itself being used as a school, as it had been when Margaret Beale had opened a school therein.<sup>61</sup> The Meeting asked for donations to defray the cost of the construction. Sydney Friends sent a donation and Joseph Barritt, a South Australian Friend, also generously supported the building fund.

George Walker had taken careful note of Frederick Mackie's habits during the Mackies' stay with them, but he clearly approved of Frederick Mackie's "circumspect conduct and watchful Christian frame of mind."<sup>62</sup> Walker regarded the school as being open primarily for the children of Friends. He went so far as to urge:

---

60. Hobart M.M., Mins. 5 March 1857.

61. J.B.M., 1883, p. 102.

62. G.W.W. to J.B.W., Walker Papers, W9/3/3(1), T.U.A.

whatever modifications the views of some may have undergone with respect to 'dress and address' I have found the way of the cross in these little things ... profitable and safe; and although they may involve some peculiarity and even singularity, I believe ... they would prove a safeguard and a salutary restraint upon the dear children.

(Backhouse and Tyler, 1862, p. 548)

He therefore proposed to send two of his sons, George, the second, and Ridley, the fourth, to Frederick Mackie, but not the third, Robert, because apparently Robert had been proving somewhat difficult to handle and was being sent off in 1856 as a boarder to Horton College to be "tamed". Walker admitted that Mackie might be compelled to take a few non-Friends' children "to render the occupation sufficiently remunerative to yield a bare living - otherwise both the parents and he would have preferred that the school should consist exclusively of those professing with Friends."<sup>63</sup>

Friends were therefore beginning to realize that a school run exclusively for children of Friends was not going to be a viable proposition in a community where the number of Friends' children was so limited. According to Francis Mather, who had been a pupil of Mackie's for a time, Frederick Mackie taught the older children and Rachel Mackie the junior classes. The curriculum covered what Francis Mather writing in *The Australian Friend*, 3 October 1891, called "the usual branches of English education and freehand drawing" (p.33). Latin was taught to the older boys and Scripture was given daily attention, consisting of the reading of a chapter of the Bible each morning by Frederick Mackie, a short period of silence and then the memorizing

---

63. G.W.W. to J.B.W., Walker Papers, W9/3/3(1), T.U.A.

by each pupil of a passage from the daily Scripture reading. What Francis Mather regarded as Frederick Mackie's major original contribution to educational practice was his half-day a week departure from text-book learning. Frederick Mackie's own intense love of nature made natural science an important subject in his education programme and nature walks the main method of teaching botany. Francis Mather recalled with evident pleasure the experiences he had enjoyed on these afternoon outings.

Sometimes we took a surveyor's chain and measured a field, the findings of the area being our next arithmetic lesson; sometimes it was a botany study, when some of the lads collected flowers to illustrate the various orders according to the Linnaean system; and occasionally there was a bush walk, which served an opportunity for a lecture upon trees. At other times the afternoon was occupied in a sketching lesson, which sometimes consisted in looking at Frederick Mackie while he did the work. After school hours the scholars had at times lessons in practical gardening, some of the boys being taught how to bud and graft; many of the boys have turned over the ground at the back of the Meeting House. All these lessons in every day matters were appreciated at the time and to many of the youths proved very useful afterwards.

(p.34)

Already at the beginning of 1859 Joseph Mather had arranged with Frederick Mackie to give his son, Francis, help with his studies after school in return for Francis assisting him as a monitor during the day, but this did not appear to work out satisfactorily, for a year later, after much anxiety and unwillingness to hurt Frederick Mackie's feelings, he decided to remove Francis from this school, "there being no other youth who were so much advanced, thus tending continually to retard and dishearten."<sup>64</sup>

---

64. J.B.M., Letters, 2 August 1860.

This problem revealed the difficulty which confronted those who endeavoured to provide a comprehensive range of subjects in a school with limited numbers. If there were only a few senior students the teacher found it hard to provide adequately for the needs of each student. Francis Mather was sent in 1860 to H.M. Pike's school and appeared to do well there in the December examinations, carrying off four prizes.

The ill-health of Rachel Mackie's father led to the Mackies' decision to return to South Australia early in 1861, and so for the fourth time continuity was broken and Friends had a school, but no teacher.

Lydia Wood, who had taught at Friends' School, Croydon, England, arrived in Tasmania with her husband and three children in September 1858, and in 1861, after the Mackies' departure, conducted a school in Liverpool Street, ostensibly for Friends. The school appeared to have little backing or open support from Friends. According to Francis Mather<sup>65</sup> the school was a "private venture, which attracted few children and did not last long." Lydia Wood was not a member of the Society of Friends, though her three children had been registered as members at Hertford M.M., England, and their membership transferred to Hobart in September 1858. The Walker family had helped them with accommodation on their arrival.<sup>66</sup> Records of Hobart Monthly Meeting

---

65. J.F.M. Copy to E.R., 18 June 1900, MS.Box 19, F.H.A.L.

66. James Walker had two frank comments on the Woods. In his entry of 7 April 1858 he recorded their arrival in the Monarch with the comment "rather a curious lot". He did not approve of the two boys, Alfred and Barclay, for the entry of 11 April 1858 stated bluntly: "I don't like them: they are rude and forward." J.B.W. Diaries, 7 April 1858, Walker Papers, W9/3/3(5), T.U.A.

made reference only to the transfer of membership of the three children and to their resignation.<sup>67</sup> The family therefore appeared to have minimum contact with Friends and the school little significance as far as Friends were concerned.

The five attempts in the mid-nineteenth century to conduct a school for children of Friends had been short-lived and apparent failures. They had been private ventures. Support, when given, had come from individual Friends, rather than from official backing by the Monthly Meeting. Yet these attempts provided glimpses of future possibilities and one at least made an impression which led to the inclusion of the following sentence in an epistle sent to South Australian Friends in 1886, the year before the opening of a Friends' School in Hobart. The epistle recalled the influences of Frederick and Rachel Mackie and particularly their concern that "children might grow up as true Friends". The epistle continued: "and though perhaps the results have not been fully realised yet we know that the influence of their tarriance amongst us has never passed away." From such seeds grew ultimately the conviction that education held the key to the survival of the Society of Friends in Australia.

---

67. Hobart M.M., Min. 4, 3 August 1865.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### MOVES TO ESTABLISH A FRIENDS' SCHOOL

1864 - 1886

During these years the establishment of a school became a firm concept. This was the result of the belief, which had developed in the two preceding decades, that education was the key to survival. Interest in the establishment of a Friends' School was evident in other Meetings as well as in Hobart. At first it was not clear where such a school should be located, whether there should be several scattered throughout the States, or one single school serving the whole Society of Friends in Australia.

Hobart could claim to be regarded as the 'parent' Monthly Meeting in Australia. It was the first to be established.<sup>1</sup> The formation of a Van Diemen's Land Yearly Meeting, linking Friends' communities in Launceston, Kelvedon, Hobart and from 1839 to 1842 Sydney, followed soon after.

In 1842 Sydney was recognized by the Van Diemen's Land Yearly Meeting as a 'Two Months Meeting' (V.D.L. Y.M. Minutes December 1842), but this Meeting lapsed and had to be re-formed in 1854. The instability of the Sydney Monthly Meeting in its early years meant that Sydney was an unlikely centre for the location of a Friends' School.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. See p. 30 above.

2. An epistle from Sydney to Hobart in 1877 (Hobart Annual Meeting Minutes, 31 May 1877) indicated a further period of discontinuity "We are sorry to say that Meetings for transacting the affairs of our little church have been discontinued from December 1875 until now. The root of bitterness hath often sprung up and troubled us at intervals from the very

(contd.)

During the years 1839 to 1841 a considerable number of Friends had emigrated to the 'free' colony of South Australia. Friends in South Australia, unlike those in Sydney, did not at first seek a direct link with the Van Diemen's Land Yearly Meeting. London Yearly Meeting sent separate epistles to South Australian Friends and to the Van Diemen's Land Yearly Meeting in 1843. It was not until 1848 that Hobart Friends made direct contact with Friends in South Australia and supported a concern by two of its members, George Storey and Thomas Mason, to visit South Australia. Minute 11 of the Yearly Meeting Minutes, 7 December 1849, recorded their report that they had "found the Society in a low religious state" and had "endeavoured to establish an efficient Meeting for Discipline." Hobart Friends then appointed two correspondents to maintain contact with South Australian Friends and to give encouragement to them. The Adelaide Meeting had a divided strength because of the settlement of some of its members at Mount Barker. At no time did any initiative for setting up a school come from South Australian Friends.

Though a Monthly Meeting was established in Melbourne in 1854 and acknowledged by the following Yearly Meeting of Van Diemen's Land,

---

beginning of our existence causing the honest-hearted much grief."

One such "root of bitterness" in the early years of the Sydney Meeting was John Tawell, who on return to England was tried for the poisoning of his wife and executed in 1845. Even by 1883 Sydney still had its difficulties. Charles Robey, of Sydney, wrote to Hobart Monthly Meeting (Hobart M.M. Mins., 7 November 1883) asking to be admitted as a member of Hobart Monthly Meeting because

"Sydney Meeting, I am informed, is but a branch of Hobart Meeting and is not recognized by the Society in England" and "the meetings for business in Sydney are not regularly held and but thinly attended."

This recognition by Yearly Meeting in England was not given until 1887 - *The Australian Friend*, 21 December 1891.



Meeting for Sufferings in London recognized in 1857 only Adelaide and Hobart as "Meetings for Discipline", not Melbourne and Sydney, because they had not been established long enough.<sup>2</sup> By 1865 however Melbourne had strengthened considerably and had requested Hobart to change the term "Yearly Meeting" to "Annual Meeting", thus signifying a relationship of equality between Hobart and Melbourne and other Australian Meetings. An epistle from Melbourne, recorded in Hobart M.M. Mins., 3 September 1865, described the satisfaction with which Hobart's agreement to Melbourne's request had been received. "We cannot but feel that by so doing you have cleared the way for a more cordial intercourse amongst the various meetings which are or may hereafter be established in the colonies on a basis of equality, yet involving the paternal duty of mutual help and counsel." It was from Melbourne and Hobart that initiatives and proposals eventually came for establishing a school.

In 1869 correspondence began between Melbourne Monthly Meeting and London Yearly Meeting concerning the establishing of a school for the children of Friends in the Australian colonies. The Epistle of the Annual Meeting in Melbourne, January 1869,<sup>3</sup> pressed English Friends to consider this as an urgent necessity. English Friends in reply asked Melbourne Friends why they did not seek help, which was then still available from the Government, with the capital expense of procuring land and erecting buildings.<sup>4</sup> Melbourne Friends replied<sup>5</sup>

---

2. J.B.M., 1883, p.108.

3. MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

4. Proceedings of London Y.M., 1870, p.39.

5. Letter, 13 November 1869, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

that they would decline any offer of help from the Government because "many Friends believe the State should not be given any excuse for using authority in matters of religion or religious education."

Therefore Melbourne Friends were quite clear that they would not accept State Aid. They were equally clear that they did not have the resources to start a school themselves and this was the reason for their expectation of help from England.

English Friends also asked for an estimate of the probable cost of establishing a school. Melbourne Friends' reply provided evidence of the type of school which they were contemplating. Capital costs were estimated at £6,000.

Land (four acres)	£ 1,500
Buildings	3,500
Furniture, equipment	1,000

Income was anticipated as follows:

20 boarders (10 girls, 10 boys) under 12 yrs. at £12.10.0 per quarter ..	£ 1,000
20 boarders (10 girls, 10 boys) over 12 yrs. at £17.10.0 per quarter ..	1,400
40 day scholars (20 girls, 20 boys) under 12 yrs. at £3.0.0 per quarter ..	480
40 day scholars (20 girls, 20 boys) over 12 yrs. at £4.0.0 per quarter ..	<u>640</u>
	£ 3,520

This income was expected to cover the expenses of salaries of teaching staff (a Headmaster, teacher and apprentice for boys, a Head Governess, teacher and apprentice for girls), house staff, repairs, rates, fuel and food and to provide a "balance in favour of the institution" of £255.

From this budget Melbourne Friends indicated that the school

was to be coeducational; it was to cover primary and secondary grades and it was intended to provide for a significant proportion of boarders, so that it could serve the needs of Australian Friends and not merely the local Meeting.

But both English and Australian Friends reacted with caution to the proposal. English Friends on the Continental Committee, which had been set up by Meeting for Sufferings<sup>6</sup> to make recommendations on matters affecting Friends on the continent of Europe and in the colonies, were of the opinion that a more modest proposal might be more practicable.<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile the Annual Meeting of Melbourne Friends had shelved any decision on a school for a further year, much to the disappointment of one of its members, William Rosche, who decided to write direct to the Clerk of London Yearly Meeting, Joseph Crosfield, and urge Friends in England to step in and act independently of the indecisive Australian Friends and, "suppose you had found a pious Friend who having a pious wife and well qualified to superintend and teach a school",<sup>8</sup> set up a school at once. William Rosche assumed that English Friends would accept financial responsibility for the capital expenditure involved, but it was significant that he mentioned the possibility of accepting non-Friends as students, even though the object of the

---

6. The "Meeting for Sufferings" was first convened in 1675 during the period of persecution of the Quakers. It soon became the equivalent of an executive committee of the Society of Friends, with responsibility initially for recording "suffering under persecution and also for seeking redress where practicable. Gradually it became the one body which could speak for the Society as a whole and as such it achieved a status and dignity which it still endeavours to maintain." Vipont, 1954, pl 99.

7. Proceedings of London Y.M., 1871, p. 63.

8. William Rosche to Joseph Crosfield, 27 January 1871, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

school primarily was to "guard" the education of children of Friends.

The Clerk of Melbourne Monthly Meeting however pointed out the difficulties of establishing a Friends' day-school of the sort set up by Frederick Mackie in Hobart. He thought English Friends had little idea of conditions in the colonies, or of distances; for example, his own residence, he said, was five miles from the Meeting-house by rail or omnibus. He strongly favoured a boarding-school of the Ackworth type, because "there is no lack of good day-schools in this colony."<sup>9</sup> A Minute of Melbourne Monthly Meeting of 14 May 1871 effectively postponed further immediate action by stating that the Melbourne Monthly Meeting could not take responsibility for setting up a school. Numbers of Friends in Melbourne likely to send their children to such a school were too few and the financial burden too forbidding to contemplate.<sup>10</sup>

In 1873 Melbourne Friends again expressed appreciation for the evidence of English Friends' desire to help, but indicated that changes had taken place in public education which meant that Friends could have access to schools at very moderate cost and therefore did not favour a separate school for children of Friends. They added:

Nevertheless we remain unaltered in our conviction that it is still very important that secular education, in conjunction with the dissemination of sound Christian teaching and training, in accordance with our religious principles should, where way opens, be provided for our children.

(Proceedings of London Y.M., 1873, p.41)

The result of this abortive attempt to establish a school in

---

9. MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

10. MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

Melbourne was to alert English Friends to the problems of the scattered groups of Friends in the Australian colonies and to the need to offer help if the future of Friends' work in Australia was to be secured. From the Yearly Meeting of 1874 came the decision to send out a deputation of three Friends, William Beck, J.J. Dymond and Alfred Wright, to visit the colonies and to recommend what action should be taken by English Friends to help Friends in the colonies. Members of what came to be known as the "Australian Deputation" sent back their initial reactions in letters to Edwin Ransome, who was a member of the Continental Committee, and these were the basis of an interim report to London Yearly Meeting of 1875. Already certain conclusions were being drawn.

Education was seen as the means of safeguarding the future of the Society of Friends in Australia.

The school question has much to do with the present state of things, and there are those who say a generation has been lost to the Society through one not having been established.

(Proceedings of London Y.M., 1875, p.50)

The Society of Friends needed a rallying-point in Australia and a school was seen as one way of meeting this need.

Friends in Australia were becoming more anxious concerning the results of the newly established secular State schools, where religion was excluded. William Beck, writing to Edwin Ransome, deplored the lack of religion in State schools and alleged that these were "frequented by larrikins".<sup>11</sup> Parents wanted a religious base for their children's education, but could not afford the expense of setting up a Friends' School. A possible solution to this problem

---

11. Wm.Beck to E.R., 27 January 1875, MS. Box 16 F.H.A.L.

was seen in such a school being at liberty to take in children of other denominations whose parents valued a Friends' influence on education. Friends claimed: "We have reason to believe that there exists in many places considerable openness on the part of the public to receive the principles we uphold."<sup>12</sup>

Younger members of the Society of Friends in Australia were held to be at a disadvantage compared with young English Friends who were able to make friendships at Friends' Schools in England. William Beck had taken note too of the loss of James Backhouse Walker to the Hobart Meeting for this possible reason. He commented that the effect of Bootham's education on James Backhouse Walker was "literary rather than religious", that young people were now beginning to think for themselves and that "the future of the group in Hobart Town gives some cause for anxiety."<sup>13</sup>

More initiative and stronger support were felt to be necessary on the part of Australian Friends if a Friends' School was to be established successfully. William Beck was critical of Australian Friends for their lack of faith and their inaction. "Our Friends have to my mind thought of themselves too much as Isaiah said of the Egyptians, 'Their Strength is to sit still'." In his first letter to Edwin Ransome after arrival by boat in Melbourne William Beck had already questioned the strength of Melbourne Friends' desire for a school. "Had they been in earnest," he wrote, "they would have offered to pay someone to come out as the Jews have done with the Rabbi on board."<sup>14</sup>

---

12. Report of Deputation to the Australian Colonies, MS. Box 16/5, F.H.A.L.

13. Wm. Beck to E.R.R., 20 March 1875, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

14. William Beck to E.R.R., 19 November 1874, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

It was realized however that financial as well as moral support would be needed from English Friends. Even before the full report had been received the Continental Committee recommended to Meeting for Sufferings that English Friends should guarantee a certain proportion of the initial expenses of the school, at least for a limited period of years. When the Deputation's report was presented on the 26 February 1876, the first recommendation made was that priority should be given to establishing a school for the children of Friends at Melbourne. Melbourne was chosen, because so far, in spite of doubts, Melbourne was where the possibility was still open and the Deputation had also noted that Melbourne had the largest attendance at Meetings for Worship of any of the Australian Meetings - an average twice that of Hobart. Without waiting for the report in its final form the Continental Committee had already gone ahead and circulated to Monthly Meetings a request that they make known the Committee's decision to assist with the establishment of a school in Melbourne and to seek a suitable Friend and wife for service in this school. "It should prove an additional qualification for usefulness in this service if any such Friend should have shown himself to be entrusted with a gift in the ministry."<sup>15</sup> The school was seen as a missionary as well as an educational enterprise.

For almost a decade there was no positive follow-up of this move for a school in Melbourne. This was due to lack of initiative in Australia and not to any discouragement from English Friends. Victorian Friends reported to London Yearly Meeting in 1876 that they were of the opinion that their Meeting was "not at present in a position

---

15. Circular: 'For Monthly Meetings, &c.' 'School for children of Friends in the Australian Colonies', 1 July 1876, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

to assume pecuniary responsibility in addition to endeavouring to provide funds for the erection of a meeting-house at Ballarat."<sup>16</sup>

In 1877 the Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting contained the brief comment about Melbourne Friends: "Nothing further has occurred in respect of the establishment of a school for their children, but they still feel it desirable and again commend it to the continued care of their Friends at home" (p.42). The subject of a school was being kept on the agenda by Australian Friends but not carried to the point of decision.

In 1885 Friends in Hobart suddenly took the initiative and appointed a committee to investigate the possibility of setting up a school in Hobart. During the previous twenty years epistles exchanged with other Australian Meetings had indicated that education of the younger generation was the matter uppermost in their minds, but until 1885 this concern was directed to religious training in the home, rather than to schooling. Thus the epistle of 1880 from the Annual Meeting of Melbourne Friends had raised the subject of concern for instruction of the children:

The subject of interesting the children and instructing them in our principles has claimed a large share of our serious attention and a unanimous feeling exists among us that we must do something more in this direction: various proposals have come before us and a social gathering has been fixed on."

Hobart Annual Meeting (called 'Annual' and not 'Yearly' since 1865) in reply expressed pleasure that attention was being given to the religious instruction of children, but stressed the need for example and "the potent, though it may be unconscious influence of a consistent

---

16. Proceedings of London Y.M., 1876, p.47.



life, of the atmosphere of a well-guarded home."<sup>17</sup> As early as 1859 Joseph Mather had made the education of the young people of the Meeting in the testimonies of the Society a personal responsibility<sup>18</sup> and he now became the central figure in the move to establish a school. As Clerk of the Hobart Monthly Meeting over a period of nearly fifty-three years he gave outstanding and devoted service to the Society in Tasmania. He had left school at the age of thirteen to help his father, Robert Mather, in his drapery business. In 1874, when his son, Francis Mather, entered into business partnership with him, he was able to give more of his time to benevolent causes. He became secretary of the Bible Society, started a Night School for boys and himself taught there twice a week, was on the Board of Management of the Ragged School and was appointed by the Government to be the Honorary Secretary of the Board of Management of the Boys' Training School, set up at the Cascades for training young delinquents in useful occupations. Brown (1972) noted that when he died in 1890 the Boys' Training School recorded: "The Institution has lost one who took a deep and sincere interest in its welfare... His visits were frequent and his natural advice and counsel were at all times available and acceptable" (p.86). The writer of his obituary, James Backhouse Walker, noted however in *The Mercury*, 19 May 1890, that his special contribution to education was the setting up of a school for the "superior education of the children belonging to his own religious community on the wide and liberal basis for which the higher schools of the Society of Friends in the Home County are so distinguished." At his funeral three educational institutions were represented - by boys from the Training School and from

---

17. Minutes of Hobart A.M., Min. 19, 8 March 1880.

18. J.B.M., 1883, pp. 120, 144, 156, F4/67, T.U.A.

the Friends' High School and by children from the Ragged School, who sang a closing hymn.

When compared with the long and protracted negotiations between Melbourne Friends and London Yearly Meeting, plans for a school in Hobart moved along speedily and this was due in large measure to Joseph Mather's determination and leadership. The ground had been prepared in England during the period of the Melbourne negotiations. The "Australian Deputation" had also confirmed the need for a school in the colonies. English Meetings had already been alerted to the need to find a Friend teacher and his wife for service in the colonies, though it was still not clear whether the proposed school would eventuate and where - in Melbourne or possibly Hobart.

A Friend teacher, Septimus Martin, had written on the advice of a mutual friend to Joseph Mather enquiring about the likelihood of a school being set up in Hobart. The reading of this letter at Hobart Annual Meeting on 9 March 1885 precipitated the decision to appoint a committee of six<sup>19</sup> to examine the possibility of starting a school in Hobart. The epistle from this Meeting relayed this move to London Yearly Meeting, where it was taken up without delay by the Continental Committee.

The Clerk of the Continental Committee for a period of thirty-three years was Edwin R. Ransome. He was born in Colchester in 1823. Though he came of Quaker ancestry, he was not born 'inside' the Society of Friends, his father having lost his membership through marrying outside the Society. Several of his boyhood years were spent on the

---

19. The six members appointed were J.B.Mather, H.Propsting, W.L.Wells, Robert Mather, John Pierce and N.H.Propsting.

Continent in Belgium, Holland and Germany, until he was sent to a Friends' School at Ipswich. He joined the Society of Friends at the age of seventeen years while he was still an apprentice. After working in his uncle's foundry at Ipswich he and a cousin started a hardware business in London. He retired from business in 1887, perhaps a timely retirement as far as the school in Hobart was concerned, for this was to absorb much of his time until his death in 1910. His early experience on the Continent led him to take a special interest in the work of Friends outside England. He was a keen naturalist and collector of fossils, geological specimens and wild ferns.

Edwin Ransome might well be regarded, with Joseph Mather, as one of the founders of the School, even though he never crossed the Equator to see it. Almost up until the time of his death in 1910 he maintained a deep personal interest in the school. By means of massive personal correspondence with Friends in Hobart he provided invaluable help and encouragement to them not only during the initial setting-up of the school, but particularly during the crises which the school had to face during the early years of its history. He laboured unceasingly to find suitable English Friends for the staff of the school in Hobart. He championed the cause of the school whenever questions, sometimes critical, were asked by English Friends in Yearly Meeting or in Meeting for Sufferings. He was instrumental in raising considerable financial help from English Friends so that the struggling new venture might be given a chance to take root. And he was able to establish a sense of partnership between Hobart Friends and the small committee in London, so that Hobart Friends, while being assured of continuing support, knew quite clearly that the success of the venture depended

primarily on the effort that they themselves were prepared to make.

A letter written by Edwin Ransome to J. Francis Mather, the secretary of the School Committee in Hobart, at the close of the school's first year expressed the spirit of this partnership:

I not unfrequently think of the title of one of Dr. Smile's excellent books, *Self-help*. When this needful quality shows itself as an active agent, how much more likely is it to attract the practical sympathy (both philanthropic and metallic) of others.

I love to dwell on the thought that you over yonder, and we at this end, are all one family with united aim of serving our one Lord and Master, not for our individual or collective glorification but as faithful stewards striving to fulfil his will in promoting the spiritual welfare of all his children and if *His* children, 'par consequence' our brethren, of whatever clime or colour.

Well now, dear friend, although unknown to thee, as to the flesh, I have felt it in my heart thus to open out to thee with a desire to bid thee and others, brethren beloved amongst you, to be of good cheer. 20

There were two additional factors which might have helped to precipitate the decision of Hobart Friends in 1885 to establish a school at this particular time. The first of these was mentioned in Joseph Mather's letter of the 24 July 1885. He indicated that the Government was proposing to bring in a Militia Bill which would involve all school children being drilled as cadets. Joseph Mather had waited upon the Minister of Defence and made it clear that Friends could not agree on principle to their children being prepared for war. The Minister, Joseph Mather alleged, replied that "they could find substitutes". Joseph Mather had been uncompromising in his attitude to war

---

20. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 1 December 1887, F4/1, T.U.A.

to the point of suffering loss of business<sup>21</sup> and attracting public criticism for his views. He had repeatedly endeavoured to educate young members of the Society in Friends' testimony against war. In 1885 he saw that one of the functions of a school would be to give such moral and religious guidance and this was why he underlined the importance of the Committee in England choosing a man and his wife "who would not only be efficient teachers but at the same time thorough Friends - in whom implicit reliance could be placed as to their religious care of the children."<sup>22</sup>

The second factor, though not explicitly mentioned in correspondence, concerned the type of school which was intended. Originally the school was seen as an elementary school catering for about twenty children of Friends. The unknown quantity was the degree of support which could be expected from non-Friends. Joseph Mather in his letter to William Beck, 10 July 1885, said that though Hobart was well provided with private schools he foresaw the possibility of some parents of other denominations sending their children "to a well-conducted Friends' School." This possibility might have been prompted by the considerable public controversy and newspaper correspondence in 1885 concerning what some people regarded as a "take-over" of the Hobart Town High School by Christ College in that year. Friends had had some share in the founding of the school through George Walker, who was one of the members of the original Council of the High School (see p. 26 above),

---

21. J.B.M. recorded in his diary, 21 January 1860: "This evening I was applied to for a tender to supply uniforms to the Volunteer Artillery Corps. The offer having been made to me in kindness by the individual I expressed my thanks - at the same time I declined interference therein."

22. J.B.M. to Wm. Beck, 10 July 1885, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

and a number of Friend parents had sent their sons to High School for their education. James Backhouse Walker had continued his father's interest in the school and was a member of the Council at the time of the negotiations with Christ College. In a letter to *The Mercury*, 18 July 1885, he defended the action of the Council, pointing out that the school had, in effect, been a proprietary school run by the Headmaster, the Rev. Poulet-Harris, since 1865 and that the Headmaster because of age could no longer continue. The Council had therefore agreed, he said, to Christ College taking a seven-year lease of the buildings on the express understanding that Christ College continued to run the school on the unsectarian principles which had been the original reason for the school's foundation. Opponents of the "take-over" however pointed out that there was a basic contradiction in the principles of the two institutions, because one of the stated objects of Christ College was to teach the doctrines of the Established Church.

It was likely therefore that a number of parents who were unhappy about this merger might welcome an alternative High School. The Friends, known for their strong support for education which was unsectarian but firmly based on a non-dogmatic approach to the Scriptures, were therefore likely to be trusted to provide an education which was neither secular nor sectarian. There is no evidence to determine how extensive were promises of non-Friend support, but it is significant that there was a definite change of plan for the type of school planned by Friends. Friends would have been unlikely to undertake the much more ambitious programme of a school which covered the whole range of primary and secondary education without some assurance that such a school would gain support. Further there was a significant change of

name in the first two years of the school's existence. The adjective 'High' was not used in early advertisements for the Friends' School, but when the school changed its site from Warwick Street to Hobartville, Commercial Road, at the beginning of 1889, the name was changed to the Friends' High School. Successive advertisements in the *Australian Friend* of 8 December 1888 and 28 March 1889 pinpointed this change. The first of these two advertisements was for the Friends' School, the second for the Friends' High School. There was no precedent for the use of the term 'High' to describe a Friends' School which was to cater for primary as well as secondary grades. The term 'High' was retained until 25 March 1930, when the original title of the Friends' School was restored.

The fact that the Friends' School in its first year attracted such an unexpected number of children of non-Friends in its senior classes was an indication that this school appeared to gain the approval of those who wanted neither the sectarian education of Anglican and Catholic Schools, nor the new secular education provided in the public schools.

Letters exchanged between Edwin Ransome and Joseph Mather sketched in outline the characteristics of the school that Friends wanted to establish in Hobart. They were insistent that the selection of the Headmaster should be in the hands of the Continental Committee in England, that his wife should also play an important role in the school and that these two should be able not only "to impart a sound scholastic education but capable also of inculcating the principles of the New Testament as professed by Friends."<sup>23</sup> Hobart Friends, while

---

23. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 24 July 1885, Ms. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

admitting that they were "in struggling circumstances", promised to do all that they could to help. In answer to Edwin Ransome's query about likely numbers, Joseph Mather estimated the initial number of Friends' children at twenty, though the possibility was anticipated of some non-Friends enrolling their children once they had seen - and approved - of the headmaster.

The Continental Committee took advantage of the presence in England in the latter part of 1885 of a number of Australian Friends. A conference was called to discuss with these the problems of the scattered Friends' Meetings and the likelihood of a school providing a means of drawing these scattered communities together. This meeting was held on 2 October 1885 and was attended by William Beck, who had been a member of the Australian Deputation in 1875, Edwin Ransome, Isaac Sharp and J.B. Braithwaite, representing the Continental Committee, Walter Robson, an English Friend who had resided for some time in Sydney, and four Victorian Friends, John Horsfall, Clerk of Melbourne Monthly Meeting, William Benson, son-in-law of Joseph Mather, Edward Sayce, who had conducted most of the earlier negotiations with London Yearly Meeting concerning the possibility of a school in Melbourne, and Octavius Beale, son of Margaret Beale. With such a weighting of Victorian Friends it might have been expected that an attempt would have been made to swing a decision in favour of Melbourne rather than Hobart, whose bid for a school was now known. The report of the meeting in *The Friend* (1885) stressed, first, "the heterogenous nature of the Colonists, like pebbles on a gravel-bed", and then the crucial importance of education in bringing together the separate Meetings and preventing the drift of young people away from the Society (25, 288-289).



There was apparently no bargaining. Indeed there must have been an honest appraisal of the situation, with Melbourne Friends acknowledging the claims of Hobart, if Hobart was really prepared to take the responsibility. John Horsfall's view was that Hobart was the right choice because there was "the nucleus of a day-school in the city" and because of the number of families "well-disposed towards our religious community".<sup>24</sup>

A year later, when a circular was sent out to the Australian Friends by the Hobart Committee concerning the establishment of the school in Hobart, the "disinterested labours" of the Melbourne Friends were praised. The circular expressed both regret that the school would be limited to Hobart and a hope that similar schools would be established eventually in the other States and in New Zealand. In the meantime Hobart Friends promised to do their best to help interstate boarders.<sup>25</sup> The school was seen therefore as a centre of Australian Quakerism. It was realized however that if it was to fulfil this expectation, it must be a boarding-school as well as a day-school. English Friends were particularly keen to see the Australian school become a boarding-school, not only because the English Friends' schools were mostly boarding schools, but because one of the reasons for giving support to an Australian school was that such a school by taking boarders would extend its influence through the children to all Australian Meetings.<sup>26</sup>

The first task of the Continental Committee was to find a

---

24. *The Mercury*, 7 January 1933, T.S.A.

25. Circular received by E.R.R., 16 November 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

26. E.R.R., to J.B.M., Ms. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

Friend teacher and wife who could be recommended to the Hobart Committee as suitable to superintend the establishment of a school. The Committees both in England and in Tasmania knew that the future of the school depended on the right choice being made. One name had already come forward to the Committee in Hobart, that of Septimus Martin, who had enquired about the possibilities in a letter to Joseph Mather at the end of 1884.<sup>27</sup> However he withdrew his tentative application in 1885, took up engineering and emigrated to the United States of America.

On 6 October 1885 Edwin Ransome received an enquiry from Samuel Clemes<sup>28</sup> who let it be known that he was interested in going out to Australia to open a school if the opportunity arose.<sup>29</sup> He had first heard of Australia during his period of teacher training at the Flounders Institute. He had married in 1873 and gone with his wife, Susannah, as a missionary to Madagascar under the sponsorship of the Friends Foreign Mission Association. In his letter to Edwin Ransome

---

27. Septimus Martin had been a scholar at Friends' School, Ackworth, 1865-1869, attended Flounders' Institute for training as a teacher 1873-1875, was an apprentice teacher at the Friends' Schools of Bootham 1870-1871 and Ackworth 1871-1876 and then taught at Weston-super-Mare and Stoke Newington.

28. S.C. to E.R.R., 6 October 1885, Ms. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

29. Samuel Clemes was born on 25 December 1845, a birthright Friend, son of Samuel and Jane Willis Clemes, both of whom were teachers at Ackworth School. Both parents died when Samuel was five years old and he was brought up by his grandfather and uncle at St. Austell. He was a boarder at Sidcot Friends' School July 1857 to December 1859, spent the next ten years in the drapery business, but an interest in teaching and in mission work led to his acceptance by the Friends Foreign Mission Association and to training as a teacher at the Flounders Institute 1870-1871. Here he met Susannah Hall, who was teaching at Ackworth nearby. After serving a year's apprenticeship as a teacher at Rawdon Friends' School, he married Susannah Hall.

he said that he and his wife had had in their minds the possibility of going out to Australia after a period of service in Madagascar and he inferred that his acceptance of a position at Friends' School, Wigton, was only until such time as the opportunity to go to Australia presented itself. In Madagascar he had been visited in 1880 by Isaac Sharp and Joseph Neave, Friends who were on their way to the Australian Colonies, and at Yearly Meetings in 1885 he again talked with Isaac Sharp about his concern for education in the colonies, hoping that there might be some decisive news about a school during the sessions of London Yearly Meeting. He had written too to Joseph Neave, then in Australia, and heard about the difficulties at the Australian end. Two Australian Friends, John Horsfall and William Benson, met with him during their visit to England.

Clemes felt strongly therefore what contemporaries would have described as a call to missionary service in the Australian Colonies. Much of the initiative from the beginning of the negotiations appeared to lie with Samuel Clemes, who, with Joseph Mather and Edwin Ransome, became the third founder, contributing suggestions and ideas, even though he had not been appointed and indeed no school as yet existed.

In a letter to J.B. Braithwaite, a member of the Continental Committee,<sup>30</sup> he made the following recommendations:

English Friends should provide some guarantee of finance to ensure the viability of the school for the first three or four years.

A Committee of Australian Friends should be responsible to provide accommodation and furnish the school, manage the

---

30. S.C. to J.B.B, 19 October 1885, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

financial affairs of the school, assist in obtaining scholars, but leave educational matters to the master appointed.

The master appointed should be a convinced Friend, not simply a birthright Friend.

Initially the number of boarders should be limited to six because of the capital outlay involved.

Co-education was to be taken for granted.

The master should be responsible for training apprentice teachers at the school. It was expected that young Australian Friends would be interested in such training.

Fees should be kept at a moderate level in view of the availability of free State education, and the fees should be inclusive, except for laboratory dues and books.

Australian Friends should be the 'prime movers', English Friends the 'helpers'.

Clear and agreed arrangements should be made right at the outset to meet the difficult situation of the master appointed not proving acceptable to the Committee, or the Committee's arrangements not being acceptable to the master.

Subsequent decisions followed almost without modification these guidelines set down by Clemes. The one exception was the last of these. Failure to follow up this recommendation was to be the cause at the end of the nineteenth century of the school's most serious crisis.

Samuel Clemes was interviewed by the Continental Committee,

to which were added two Australian Friends who were in London at that time, John Horsfall and William Benson. A sub-committee of the Continental Committee was then appointed to report to Hobart Friends and to make recommendations concerning the appointment of staff. The sub-committee forwarded with their recommendation of the appointment of Samuel Clemes a brief *curriculum vitae* both of Samuel Clemes and his wife, Margaret Hall Clemes.<sup>31</sup>

The sub-committee pointed out that Clemes was an experienced lecturer on scientific subjects. It was thought that this accomplishment might serve to attract non-Friend parents and encourage them to send their children to the school. It was also noted that Margaret Clemes had spent some time living in Europe and that she was well qualified to teach French and German.

There had been one further point of discussion at the interview with Clemes. He had made it clear to the Committee that he did not

---

31. Margaret Hall, sister of Samuel Clemes' first wife, Susannah Hall, had also been a teacher at Ackworth 1877-1878 and was governess in charge of girls at Wigton Friends' School when Samuel and Susannah Clemes returned from Madagascar in 1882. Susannah Clemes' ill-health had been the reason for the family's return to England and she died shortly afterwards. A minute of the Wigton School Committee recorded a consequent decision:

"It is now arranged for the next six months that Margaret Hall be at liberty to devote a portion of her time to the children of Samuel Clemes - which has now been defined to the satisfaction of the Committee as the best that can be done under the circumstances."

(Minutes of Wigton School Committee, 14 June 1882, Wigton, Cumberland.)

Margaret Hall resigned from the position of governess in March 1883. (*Ibid.*, 7 March 1883) and married Samuel Clemes at Neuchatel in Switzerland on 14 July, 1884. The marriage took place outside England, because of the law forbidding marriage of a widower with his deceased wife's sister. An attempt to repeal the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Act was narrowly defeated in 1883 and the issue was therefore a live one at the time of Samuel Clemes' decision to marry Margaret Hall. The Act was not repealed until 1907.

favour a proprietary school, run by himself and given only a general blessing and token support by Friends. He strongly urged that it should be a Society of Friends' School under the management of a committee of Friends. The Committee agreed with this view.

The sub-committee's report to Hobart Friends closed with a definite commitment. If Hobart Friends agreed to start the school and provide accommodation and furnishings, the London Yearly Meeting would pay passage money for Clemes and his family and share with Australian Friends in guaranteeing current expenses for the first three years.

Clemes notified the Continental Committee before the end of the year that he was willing to go out to Hobart, but that he could not leave Wigton School before June 1886. It was to be another four months before he was to be assured that Hobart Friends had committed themselves to the school and to him. In March 1886 there was still no definite word from Hobart, but Clemes agreed that the Wigton School Committee should make an appointment to replace him. Even though there was still no firm invitation from Hobart, he declared he was prepared to "put himself unreservedly" in the hands of the Continental Committee.<sup>32</sup> He said that if the Hobart school did not eventuate he intended going on to Cambridge to take a science degree.

Individual Friends in Hobart had in the meantime written to Clemes sharing quite frankly some of the difficulties they foresaw with the launching of a school - the alarming prospects of financial commitment which had daunted Melbourne Friends and which now faced Hobart Friends, the problem of Friends' parents having to pay fees when free

---

32. S.C. to E.R.R., 24 April 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

State education was available, and the likelihood that Friends in other States would not be able to give support.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless Clemes was not daunted by what might have been taken for faint-heartedness. He confessed to Edwin Ransome that the caution of Hobart Friends impressed him as an indication that they had looked carefully at the project and would carry it through to a successful conclusion.

The estimate of prospective scholars still remained at twenty. Francis Mather, son of Joseph Mather, felt it his duty as Secretary of the Hobart Committee to ensure that Samuel Clemes was not under any illusions about the nature of the task that would confront him. Yet he believed that a Friends' School had a special role to play in the colony. "Higher class" schools tended, in his view, to look after the brighter scholars and "leave the ruck to put up with the consequences of their ineptitude".<sup>34</sup> "Second class" schools catered for those who wanted to earn a living and the State schools, though improving, were below the standard of Victorian and South Australian schools.

The decisive commitment of London Yearly Meeting came in a Minute of Meeting for Sufferings, to which the Yearly Meeting had given responsibility for reaching a conclusion about negotiations with Hobart Friends.

In carrying out the directions of Yearly Meeting it is understood that the liability of this Meeting is limited to the payment of passage money of Samuel Clemes and wife and for the purchase of school appliances and the payment for three years of £120 per annum to be handed to the Hobart Committee as the contribution of Yearly Meeting towards the current expenses. A cheque for £250 is drawn in

---

33. W.L. Wells to S.C., 10 January 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

34. J.F. M. to S.C., 7 March 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

respect of the above-named requirements  
and handed to Edwin Ransome.<sup>35</sup>

When Ransome conveyed this decision to the Hobart Committee he included some "suggestions". This word was underlined. The choice of this word stressed Ransome's view that the role of English Friends was to support, not to direct the school.

The object of the school as he saw it was to "secure a superior guarded and religious education for the children of Friends and others in accordance with the Christian principles of the Society of Friends." Control was to be vested in a Committee of Friends appointed by Hobart Monthly Meeting, this committee being required to furnish annual reports of the school's progress both to the Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends in Hobart and to Meeting for Sufferings or its Committee in London. "The admission of non-Friends was not to prejudice the character of the school as a Friends' school." Ransome announced that Clemes had accepted the position of Principal at a salary of £200 per annum "for his own and wife's services, exclusive of house rent for himself and family". Hobart Friends were asked to undertake to provide £100 per annum for three years to complement Meeting for Sufferings' contribution of £120 per annum for three years to guarantee running expenses.

Clemes, before sailing with his family from Plymouth on the

35. Min. 4 of Meeting for Sufferings, 4 June 1886, quoted by E.R.R., in letter to J.B.M., 17 June 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

The amount of £250 was to cover -  
Passage money £120  
extra freight and baggage 50  
purchase of school appliances 80.



S.S. Tainui on 12 August 1886, had already been planning for the opening of the school, first by conducting a personal canvass amongst his own family and friends for donations to add to the eighty pounds allotted for equipment from the Yearly Meeting grant and then by seeking the help of Edwin Ransome and Isaac Sharp in the selection of scientific apparatus and lantern slides. He had already indicated his own strong interest in science, and his intention that the teaching of science should become one of the main features of the curriculum which the new school was to offer. To the eighty pounds allotted by Yearly Meeting were added forty pounds in donations collected by Isaac Sharp and fifty-three pounds collected by Clemes himself. Ransome added a further twenty-five pounds for magic lantern and slides.<sup>36</sup>

With the prospect of giving lectures as a means of creating interest in the school amongst the wider community Clemes enlisted the help of Ransome and assembled a lantern-slide collection which again was weighted considerably in favour of scientific subjects. Of a total of 243 slides purchased 44 were zoological, 36 geological and 33 astronomical. Another 96 were scriptural for use in religious education. With public showings in mind Clemes included two slides of royalty (the Queen and the Prince of Wales), one 'welcome' and one 'goodnight' and three novelty slides, perhaps to capture children's wandering

---

36. A list of some of the more expensive items included:

spectroscope and fittings	..	f7. 0.0
induction coil	..	3. 6.0
whirling table with adjuncts	.	6. 6.0
Pascal's apparatus	..	2. 2.0
Tates double action air pump		
and extra fittings	..	5.15.6
Fletcher's lecture and experi-		
mental furnace	..	1.10.0

A sum of money was reserved to buy chemicals in Australia.

attention.<sup>37</sup>

Clemes went out to Tasmania with the support and encouragement of English Friends and with a very strong sense of personal mission, not unlike that felt by Backhouse some fifty-five years earlier.

In Hobart preparations were made to welcome the Clemes family. Hospitality was arranged for them with Friends' families until a small house, "Flintham Villa", was rented temporarily for them in Lansdowne Crescent (Shoobridge, 1933, p.11). In the few months from September to December 1886 Samuel and Margaret Clemes set up school in their house for their own children and for a few children of their friends. Samuel Clemes reported<sup>38</sup> that he was giving lessons daily to a prospective young Friend teacher, a move foreshadowed by him in his statement of intentions.<sup>39</sup> He said that he was pleased to be able to announce that premises for the school had been leased in Warwick Street, which would provide two school rooms as well as accommodation for the family. A laboratory was being constructed to Clemes' design by the landlord at the rear of the building.

The unknown factor was still the extent of non-Friend support for the school. Francis Mather had already implied that the school would have to make its own special appeal if it were to compete with existing "higher" class, "second" class and State schools. The first public advertisement provided an indication of what the Committee felt

---

37. The latest in novelty slides was the 'chromotrope', "consisting of two superposed circular glasses, brilliantly coloured, one of which rotates in front of the other". Two of these were included and one "Puss-in-boots with eyes moving". Two maps, one waterspout and eighteen views of London completed the collection. Invoice, 20 September 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

38. S.C. to E.R.R, 27 September 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

39. See p. 95 above.

would constitute such special appeal. This advertisement, labelled "preliminary", appeared in a prominent position on the front page of *The Mercury* on 28 September 1886 and again on the 5 October, announcing the intention of the Society of Friends to open a co-educational school at the beginning of 1887. Emphasis was placed on the Christian basis of what Friends called a "guarded" education and on the curriculum which would be based on the model of that used in the most advanced English Friends' schools and with particular attention being given to the physical sciences "in which it will be the endeavour to create and foster an intelligent interest by providing a laboratory and varied scientific apparatus, with the latest improvements." Suitable staff were being appointed "in correspondence with English Friends" and the public was informed that the Headmaster was already on his way out. His experience as Head of an English Friends' School<sup>40</sup> was mentioned and also the fact of his wife being a "Trained Teacher".

---

40. Some confusion arose in the Committee about Samuel Clemes' actual position at Wigton. Various terms had been used in the nineteenth century to describe positions of responsibility in Friends' schools. At Wigton, founded in 1815, the positions of Superintendent and Headmaster were at first separate. The Superintendent, a Friend, acting in a voluntary capacity, managed the school on behalf of the Friends' Meeting and had general oversight of the institution. The teaching, however, was in the hands of a Headmaster, or Head Teacher, on the boys' side and of a Governess on the girls' side. In 1845 the positions of Superintendent and Headmaster were combined. (Reed, 1954, pp. 45 and 51)

When Samuel Clemes was appointed to Wigton in 1882, Martin Liddbetter was Superintendent and Headmaster and Samuel Clemes' position was that of Head Teacher, responsible for the supervision of teaching of boys and girls, because co-education was introduced also in 1882 at the time of Samuel Clemes' appointment. In Reed's Wigton records Samuel Clemes is listed as a 'master' (p. 323), not as Headmaster. In Hobart however his role was clearly meant to be that of Superintendent and Headmaster and the term 'Principal' was employed to cover this double function.

After the arrival of Samuel Clemes a more specific advertisement appeared on 3 November and then at fortnightly intervals in *The Mercury* indicating that the Committee of Management was now prepared to give parents information about curriculum, fees and the "mode of conducting the institution". The experience of both Samuel and Margaret Clemes was again stressed. The teaching of physics and chemistry was to be "thoroughly practical" and all students were to be given the opportunity to learn chemical analysis.

The hand of Samuel Clemes was to be seen in the sentence: "As a rule no home lessons will be given, it being desired that all studies shall be under the supervision of the teacher." Clemes' declared opposition to homework marked him out as a radical. The statement caused some public controversy but Friends in Hobart were impressed by Clemes' arguments.

Some persons are rather sceptical about it but Samuel Clemes has assured them that such a course is not only practical but it is a necessity that no child should be expected to study more than five to six hours a day. Any extra strain is seriously injurious and must result in mischief sooner or later. The reasonableness of his argument has thus far been effectual. 41

They also believed that Clemes' views would be "hailed with gladness by many parents". Clemes had made early allies among Hobart Friends in his campaign for educational reform.

The Committee of Hobart Monthly Meeting, appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1885, laid down its concern, now that Samuel Clemes and family had arrived, and Hobart Monthly Meeting<sup>42</sup> recommended to the

---

41. J.B.M. to E.R.R., 9 November 1886, MS. Box 22/1, F.H.A.L.

42. Hobart M.M., Min.5, 1 September 1886, S1/11, T.U.A.

following Meeting that a School Committee should be appointed "to assist the teachers in the establishment of the school and to be entrusted with its general management and oversight." A Committee, described by one of its members, William May, "as a choice lot of tradesmen and an old farmer",<sup>43</sup> was named: Henry Propsting, N.H. Propsting, John Pierce, William May, Francis Mather, Robert Mather, Thomas B. Mather and Joseph Benson Mather. The name of William Benson was added later.<sup>44</sup>

The foundations for public confidence in the school had been laid in the previous fifty years. One of the members of the Deputation of English Friends to Australia in 1874-1875, Alfred Wright, traced the comparative strength of the Hobart group of Friends back to the influence of Backhouse and Walker.

The Hobart Friends were a very interesting body and sound in the faith: (and the same might be said of all those in the Island who might be regarded as the fruits of James Backhouse and G.W. Walker's ministry), and had much influence in the city, being greatly respected by the inhabitants generally, by whom their 'yea' was known to be 'yea' and their 'nay' to be 'nay'.<sup>45</sup>

George Walker was remembered for his service to the community and for what was described in his obituary in the *Hobart Town Advertiser*, 5 February 1859, as his "characteristic sympathy for the cause of education". This same sympathy led other Friends to follow his example and to identify themselves with the causes of education and philanthropy. The Mather families were particularly noteworthy for their

---

43. Wm. May to C.J.H., 17 October 1902, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

44. Hobart M.M., Min. 2, 1 February 1888.

45. Alfred Wright: *Stones of Memorial*, MS. Vol.1, p.70, S347, F.H.A.L.

self-denying labours in a number of philanthropic causes which had links with education, but the significant characteristic of Friends such as Joseph Mather and his son, Francis Mather, was their total involvement in the establishment and development of a school, for which they received no material recompense. For them it was a service which arose from their deep commitment to a Quaker way of life and from a desire that children should be instructed not only "in useful learning to fit them for the business of life" but also trained "in their knowledge of their duty to God and to each other."<sup>46</sup> They looked to Samuel Clemes to supply the educational leadership and the spiritual guidance of their children. Their own ideas of the nature of the school, of aims, of curriculum, of educational methods, were as yet vague and unformed. None of the members of the original committee in Hobart had been to a Friends' School in England. Their concept of a Friends' School was still influenced by what they remembered of the success of Frederick and Rachel Mackie's brief venture. They realized that a school limited to Friends' children would not be economically viable, but they were not clear what concessions and compromise might be expected of them if "the useful and guarded" education which they offered proved to be attractive to non-Friends. Some Friends were still inclined to be imprisoned within the limited outlook which had been characteristic of the period 1837 to 1863. Though in their public and philanthropic life individual Friends had won community confidence and esteem, a school, established by the Hobart Monthly Meeting, was to test the extent to which Friends as a group were prepared to move out of the self-imposed isolation caused by their regarding themselves as a "separate people".

---

46. Hobart M.M., Min.8, 10 November 1886.

P A R T   T W O

---

EARLY DEVELOPMENT : 1887-1900

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CURRICULUM AND METHODS

#### Curriculum: "A useful and guarded education".

When The Friends' School opened in Warwick Street, Hobart, on 31 January 1887 its founders based the school's theory and practice of education on the experience and traditions of Friends' schools which had been operating in England in a variety of forms for more than two hundred years. Two epithets, "useful" and "guarded", were in frequent use by Friends to describe what they conceived to be the purpose of education. Hobart Friends used these two epithets in their first statements about the curriculum proposed to be offered in the new school.

The term "useful" was employed by George Fox when he recommended in 1667 that two boarding schools should be set up, one for boys and one for girls, for the purpose of instructing them "in all things civil and useful in creation".<sup>1</sup> The term appeared again in William Penn's letter to his wife on the education of their children, written as he was leaving England in 1682 for the American Colonies.

For their learning to be liberal.... but let it be useful knowledge, such as is consistent with Truth and Godliness, not cherishing a vain conversation or idle mind, but ingenuity mixed with industry is good for the body and mind too. I recommend the useful part of mathematics as building houses or ships, measuring, surveying, dialling, navigation; but agriculture is especially in my eye; let my children be husbandmen and housewives...

---

1. *Christian Faith and Practice in the Experience of the Society of Friends*, London 1961, Extract No. 438.



This leads to consider the works of  
God and nature, of things that are good,  
and diverts the mind from being taken up  
with vain arts and inventions of a  
luxurious world.

(Janney, 1876, p.199)

The term "useful" had two connotations. Friends believed that God spoke direct to each individual through "that of God" within each one. They denied that an ordained priesthood was necessary to monitor this direct communion between God and man or that special higher education was a prerequisite for man to listen to "that of God" within.

Subjects in the curriculum were evaluated therefore in terms of the basic criteria - did they contribute to this knowledge of "that of God within every man"; were they consistent with "the pursuit of Truth and Godliness"; were they in fact "useful" for moral and religious purposes?

The second meaning of "useful" was implied in William Penn's injunction - "let my children be husbandmen and housewives". This was the more common meaning of "utilitarian", that is, useful for the business of living, for the earning of a livelihood. The criterion of "usefulness" was applied by Friends in England to the selection of subjects which were taught in their schools.

Friends in Hobart set out the main features of the curriculum of their school in a basic advertisement.

# F R I E N D S '   S C H O O L

For Boys and Girls,

W A R W I C K   S T R E E T,   H O B A R T

Under the care of a Committee of Hobart Monthly Meeting.

S. Clemes, Principal.

---

The object of the Institution is to give a guarded Christian education, with a course of instruction leading up to the examinations under the Council of Education. Special attention will be given to a study of the Natural Sciences by means of a Laboratory and varied scientific apparatus.

The situation of the School premises is elevated, open and healthy, and within five minutes walk of the Friends' Meeting, which the scholars will attend unless otherwise desired by their parents.

#### THE CURRICULUM

Will include the usual English subjects, together with Algebra, Geometry, Latin, French, Freehand Drawing, Physics and Chemistry (with Laboratory practice). Other subjects can be taught, but must be specially arranged for.

In Chemistry and Physics the lessons will be thoroughly practical, and every scholar in the upper classes will have an opportunity of learning Chemical Analysis.

The girls will be taught plain needlework during the time devoted to Latin by the boys. <sup>2</sup>

Though The Friends' School Hobart covered the range of primary and secondary schooling, the advertisement was pitched almost exclusively at the level of secondary education, for this was where it needed to attract support. Emphasis was placed on English as the first of the 'usual' subjects, including English grammar and literature, geography and history under the one umbrella term 'English'. In the first half of the nineteenth century English Friends' schools had made the study of the vernacular, rather than the classics, the basis of the curriculum, with the emphasis on reading, writing and grammar. By 1887 however a study of selected English literary texts was an acceptable part of the curriculum and there was no barrier for the school in Hobart to undertake the studies required by the English syllabus

---

2. Advertisement in *The Australian Friend*, Vol.I, No.1, 8 July 1887, p.20.

of the Senior Public Examinations, which were first held in 1891 in Hobart. Three out of the eighteen names of those on the Credit and Pass lists of this first examination were from The Friends' School.

Algebra and geometry were the two branches of mathematics specified in the advertisement, the study of arithmetic possibly being assumed as not needing to be singled out for special notice. Mathematics was accepted as meeting the criterion of 'usefulness'.

It is a language of symbols, which is not misleading as words so often are. It is a key to much practical control as in applied mathematics. It is at the foundation of trade. In its more abstract expression there is yet a discipline. If it gives aesthetic pleasure there is something of austerity in it, and its range has limits, its actions are of the intellect. It is less dangerous and turbulent than the arts.

(Stewart, 1953, p.147)

French was established from the outset more for reasons of tradition than of usefulness in the Australian setting. In English Friends' schools it met this criterion because it was held to facilitate business transactions with the Continent, a sufficiently powerful argument with the relatively large proportion of Friends engaged in commerce.

Latin's claim for inclusion was more controversial. Samuel Clemes made no secret of his view that the traditional emphasis on the classics was outdated. He countered the 'mental discipline' argument for Latin with the contention that mental discipline could be provided much more effectively by study of the mother tongue.<sup>3</sup> He also put the study of science much higher on the scale of priorities

---

3. *The Australian Friend*, 21 December 1891, 2, 55.

than the study of the classics. In an article in *The Australian Friend*, 26 September 1892, on "Physical Science as a means of education" he used the illustration of the defence of the body by the white corpuscles to draw a vivid comparison with the classics.

What interest can you get up with the struggles round the walls of Troy at all comparable to the interest this should inspire you with. ... and it is all pure, which is more than you can say for the classics or for the modern works of the imagination. Who would spend his time over Horace's cynicism and sensuality or Virgil's frank heathenism and superstition, to say nothing of the filth of the modern French novel, if he only knew what delightful things Science would have to say to him, if he had but learned to listen to her.

(2, 55)

This outburst against the classics owed something to the traditional Quaker attitude to the classics, which were suspected of being 'heathenish' and therefore potentially dangerous to growing and tender minds. During the nineteenth century however the classics were somewhat grudgingly admitted to a degree of acceptability because they were seen to be 'useful', at least for the few, as a key to unlock knowledge of the languages in which the Scriptures were originally written. Latin was also regarded as having a possible empirical value, as an international language. For teaching Latin grammar, however, examples were drawn from specially prepared 'Quaker' sentences, not from the classical authors. Latin was introduced at Wigton as early as 1829 for those who showed capacity for it and who intended to prepare for apprenticeship in teaching or to proceed to higher education. When Latin was introduced at the end of the seventies into the curriculum and thus given curricular status, it was regarded as a subject to be studied by boys and an alternative of sewing was

programmed for girls. In Hobart Clemes followed this same differentiation of courses as he had seen at Wigton and announced that girls were to be taught "plain needlework during the time devoted to Latin by the boys".<sup>4</sup> In 1894 Wigton offered shorthand as an alternative to Latin, apparently as the result of a growing body of opinion amongst Friends that Latin was not a 'useful' subject (Stewart, 1953, p.120). Clemes was perhaps influenced by Wigton's example when he was reported by *The Mercury*, 21 June 1894, as having announced at the School Speech Day that shorthand was being offered as an alternative to Latin. While Clemes retained the traditional Quaker suspicion of the classics,<sup>5</sup> the established status of the classics in the traditional grammar-schools of the colony and in the public examinations held by the University of Tasmania demanded that Latin should at least be given a place in the curriculum.

The importance which Clemes attached to the teaching of science came directly from his own interest in chemistry and from his experience at Wigton. His knowledge of science had been acquired independently of study at a university, though one of the plans he had had in mind, if there had been delay in the opening of a school in Hobart, was to go to Cambridge to take a degree in Science. In 1878 Wigton School had been urged by a concerned Friend to build a laboratory, but it was the arrival of an enthusiast for science, Samuel Clemes, in

---

4. See Advertisement, pp. 108 and 109, above.

5. The Quaker politician, John Bright, an old scholar of Ackworth, absorbed from his education at this school something of this same suspicion. When Frederick Andrews, headmaster of Ackworth for forty-three years, was speaking at the unveiling of a statue of John Bright at Rochdale in 1924, he referred to John Bright's attendance at Ackworth School "where he escaped what he himself styled the disadvantage of a classical education." (Wallis, 1924, p.153).

1882 which led to the opening of a laboratory in 1884. This laboratory became one of the features of the school and chemistry "one of the most important subjects on the timetable, especially for the first class who had four lessons per week, including one hour of practical work" (Reed, 1954, p.60). Similarly in Hobart the emphasis on the practical and experimental rather than the text-book approach was regarded - and advertised - as an attractive and significant feature of the new school's curriculum and as one calculated to impress by comparison with established schools following a more traditional grammar-school curriculum.

Chemistry was the favoured science and though physics was also advertised as being taught, J.F. Mather felt it necessary to ask in October 1900 (after Clemes had resigned) that physics should be added to the science curriculum.<sup>6</sup> Clemes established a reputation as a lecturer on chemistry and geology and his series of lectures on chemistry in the Friends' Meeting House and on geology at the Technical School were popular with the public. It was reported in *The Mercury*, 23 May 1893, that he spoke in language, "which could not fail to be understood of the people."

Clemes had been most active in gathering equipment for his science teaching before he left England for Tasmania. That the school laboratory was well-equipped in these early days of science teaching was indicated by the fact that when the first of the University Extension Lectures was being delivered in the Hobart Town Hall in 1893 the apparatus for demonstration by the lecturer was borrowed from The Friends' School.<sup>7</sup> Clemes championed the cause of science as a basic subject

6. J.F.M. to E.R.R, 13 October 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

7. Reported in the School magazine, *School Echoes*, April 1893, p.163.

in the curriculum and felt that in the "freer conditions of colonial life" (*The Mercury*, 22 June 1893), science had more chance of being given recognition than it had in the English Universities which favoured the classics. Friends in Hobart regarded the weight given to science as evidence that the school was leading the way in "modern methods of education which, whilst not ignoring the classics and modern languages, views with more favour an acquaintance with the natural sciences and technical instruction."<sup>8</sup>

Clemes was also in advance of contemporary educational practice in the importance he attached to practical skills and manual training. In his report to parents in 1892 Francis Mather, the Chairman of the School Committee, underlined the importance that Samuel Clemes attached to technical education.

In establishing the school our aims further widened through having as principal one who strongly believes that school culture should also extend to technical matters, which give the means of training not only the hand, eye and ear, but also the judgment and the imagination.<sup>9</sup>

Clemes believed that some formal manual training should be part of everyone's education. He favoured what was called the Sloyd system because it placed the emphasis on the educational, not the occupational value of training in the skills of hand and eye. He deprecated the commonly accepted reason for the interest taken in technical education in England towards the end of the nineteenth century. Manufacturers and industrialists, he alleged, supported technical education because they believed that people would thus be trained for the work-force.

---

8. Report of Friends' School, Hobart, in Proceedings of London Y.M., 1888, p. 304.

9. J.F.M., address to Parents, December 1892, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

In Clemes' view a "true" educationist desired "to train not plumbers and carpenters but the science that underlay the art that was to be learned in the workshop" (*The Mercury*, 11 September 1906). He held manual skill and toil in honour for their moral value in the training of character and pointed to the carpenter of Nazareth as his exemplar. Technical subjects qualified for inclusion in the curriculum because they were "useful" in both the utilitarian and moral sense defined above (p.108).

Clemes' views on technical education attracted comment. Dr. Benjafield<sup>10</sup> made no secret of his support. He contended "that the lessons gained in building a frame-house were more suitable for the inhabitants of these colonies than an education based chiefly on Latin and Greek" (*School Echoes*, Vol.I, No.3, November 1890). The announcement in 1889 that carpentry would be offered to those boys "whose parents desired it" (*The Australian Friend*, 28 March 1889, 2, 157) was one of the few additions made to the original advertisement.

Freehand drawing was taught because it was useful for scale and model-drawing and for illustrating specimens collected by members of

- 
10. Dr. H. Benjafield, M.B., M.S. (Edinburgh) came to Tasmania in 1873 and became a prominent Hobart doctor with the reputation of being something of an innovator. He introduced into the State the practice of providing vaccination from calf-lymph direct from calf to patient. He was keen on homoepathic medicine and established a homoepathic hospital for treating his patients. A keen experimenter in apple and pear growing, he pioneered Tasmanian fruit export to London markets. He was a prominent Baptist and was one of the founders of the Baptist Tabernacle in Elizabeth Street, Hobart. At the time of the offer of a loan by the Baptist Church to The Friends' School in 1888 (see p.149 below) Dr. Benjafield was a trustee of the Baptist Church Fund and president of the Baptist Union. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the school, both as a parent and as medical officer for its students. After retirement he lived at Glenorchy. He died of a heart attack on 13 June 1917.



the Natural History Societies which found such favour in Friends' schools.<sup>11</sup> Art, as a product of the distrusted imagination, did not find favour in Friends' schools until the twentieth century.

More emphasis was laid on physical training for both boys and girls through drill and gymnastics than on competitive games. Two gymnasias received high priority for inclusion in the first building programme for the school when it transferred to Hobartville and these were completed in 1891. In his report for June 1893 Clemes stressed the importance of "gymnastics" as a regular part of the school curriculum and expressed the hope that the time would come "when proficiency in the gymnasium will count for class places side by side with grammar and history, mathematics and science. It would be so if all who cry out for the 'mens sana in sano corpore' meant what they said" (*The Australian Friend*, 24 June 1893, 2, 197). Gymnastic displays by both boys and girls formed a popular part of the programme of end-of-term functions.

The second epithet, 'guarded', influenced both positively and negatively the choice of subjects for inclusion in a Friends' School curriculum. In the last sentence of William Penn's instructions<sup>12</sup> his children were to be 'guarded' from the diversions of "vain arts and inventions of a luxurious world". Friends tended to see man's innate goodness and spiritual growth threatened by a conspiracy of evil which sought to divert man from his true purpose. Education therefore had as one of its primary aims the "guarding" of the child in its most vulnerable years against these dangers of a corrupt and dissolute

---

11. See pp. 122 ff. below.

12. See. p. 107 above.

world, so that the "Light Within" might be nurtured as a guide to right conduct.<sup>13</sup> Hobart Friends used the term "guarded" to convey what they felt to be the main thrust of their advertisement: "The object of the Institution is to give a guarded Christian education." When these Friends used 'guarded' to describe the education the school would offer to non-Friends they gave it a wider connotation than simply a 'guarded Friends' education'. They meant a "guarded Christian education".

Unsectarian religious instruction was to be one of the means used to promote the aim of developing the moral character of the child. This was a reassurance also to those who were disenchanted with the secularism of the State School system. In 1892 in response to inquiries from English Friends, Francis Mather made this subject the main feature of the Committee's annual report. He pointed out that scriptural instruction formed part of the daily programme of each class. This appeared to take the form of daily readings from the Bible, without comment, very much in the tradition established earlier in the century in schools following the methods of the British and Foreign School Society. Clemes was responsible for one period per week of scriptural

---

13. There were some surprising implications of this view of "guarded" education. Thus when Ackworth was established in 1777 as a boarding-school for children of Friends who were not affluent, one of the reasons given for the decision to establish a boarding-school and not a number of day-schools was that children "might be kept from bad company and from seeing the bad things which children are exposed to at home" (Ford, 1871, p.57). Added to the traditional English "Public School" distrust of parents by schoolmasters was this doubtful Quaker theory that boarding schools supplied an element of "moral Chemistry". "Society may do much to help the parent but there is a part in the moral chemistry of man which it (i.e., the home) alone can not supply" (p.60).

instruction in each class. It was made quite clear, when the school began, that scriptural instruction was the responsibility of the Principal. Mather said this explicitly in an address to the teachers at the school in 1887. "With respect to the exposition of Scriptural truth or of matters concerning Christian doctrine, it is our decided wish that this be left to the Principal" (*The Australian Friend*, 8 July 1887, 1, 9). Christian teaching by other teachers was to be 'incidental' in the form of the daily example given by them in and out of school. He reinforced this idea in his report for the year 1892.

As the end of all religious teaching is the practical application of it in the daily concerns of life; brotherly supervision of the scholars out of school hours, if free from obtusion, gives opportunity for teaching how difficulties in social intercourse can be met and overcome.<sup>14</sup>

School games had a place because of their moral as well as their physical value. Hence Mather felt it important to have "a master or mistress near at hand to come to the rescue when truth and righteousness are in danger of being trampled on."<sup>15</sup>

More specific Quaker teaching was given in the boarding-house. Each evening boarders had to learn biblical texts. They attended Meetings for Worship on Wednesday evenings and Sunday mornings, the Wednesday evening meeting being preceded by a half-hour of reading from the Bible and from Quaker works. On Sunday mornings and afternoons there was an hour each time devoted to Bible study and Quaker literature. Mather made it clear to English Friends<sup>16</sup> that the Committee did not

---

14. J.F.M. *Letterbook I*, p. 125, F4/5, T.U.A.

15. J.F.M. Report on the Friends' School 1895, *Letterbook I*, p. 179, F4/5, T.U.A.

16. *Ibid.*, p.97.

feel it could compel boarders to attend these meetings. He admitted that while most boarders attended the Sunday meeting without compulsion, few showed any inclination for the midweek meeting.

His emphasis was on the force of example rather than on compulsion to attend meetings. However in a special report on Religious Instruction made to English Friends in 1895 he stated that attendance by all students was expected at scripture lessons in the day school.

Therefore so far as we can further it, we desire that there shall be the practical application of Christian principles: well knowing that when this is present oral religious teaching will not be wanting: so that the Committee has not made any rule how often or in what manner the pupils shall receive religious instruction, whether it be scriptural or denominational: but it has insisted that non-members shall not absent themselves when that instruction is given.<sup>17</sup>

The term "guarded" also operated negatively to exclude certain subjects such as music and drama. Friends considered that these subjects exposed tender minds to "corrupting" influences. Music was regarded as frivolous and time-consuming and therefore likely to divert man from the study of the more serious things of life. In the mid-nineteenth century a well-known Quaker educator, Samuel Tuke, in describing a school at Thirsk, referred to the master as previously "greatly addicted to music" (Ford, 1871, p.72). The laying aside of his violin was regarded as the necessary condition of being acceptable as a Quaker teacher. Even by 1900 this attitude was still common amongst Friends. When Edmund Gower, Samuel Clemes' successor as principal of The Friends' School, Hobart, was being considered for this position, Ransome thought it right to raise with him the question

---

17. *Ibid.*, p.49.

of music, in which Gower had a strong interest.

This particular taste or accomplishment carries with it a string of satellites whose mind and aim it would be difficult to class among those things which pertain to the Kingdom of Heaven; and this being so, it has seemed to me to be one of those things, pleasant though in some respects, which must be subordinate to our main object on earth, viz., that of preparing for heaven. Even good music seems more of an agreeable emotional sensation than as a help forward in spiritual things. 18

Gower replied:

To me a piece of good music speaks as unmistakeably of the love and power of God as a beautiful landscape or a noble poem; and there can be nothing radically or inherently vicious in any of the three. Still I take your warning in the spirit in which it is given and will look to it that my pleasure in what I take to be one of the most glorious of God's gifts is pure and wholesome. 19

One of the results of the acceptance of an increasing number of children of non-Friends in Friends' schools was the mounting pressure from parents for their daughters to take pianoforte lessons. Friends' schools agreed with reluctance to admit teachers of the piano into the schools. Thus Sidcot School, threatened with the withdrawal of a promising girl, opened the door to reform by permitting music teaching in the school in 1875.

Some schools from the sixties onwards permitted hymns to be sung, but discussions continued at school committee meetings and at Friends' education conferences about the admission of music as a subject into the schools. At such a conference in 1879 there was still

---

18. E.R.R.to Edmund Gower, 8 September 1900, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

19. Edmund Gower to E.R.R., 10 September 1900, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

strong opposition to the introduction of music and the view was advanced that the time devoted by other schools to music and singing was employed in Friends' schools to much better advantage on more useful subjects.<sup>20</sup> At Wigton hymns were learnt by heart to be recited, but not sung. No piano was admitted to the school until 1894 (Reed, 1954, p.84).

Samuel Clemes was not long in seeking some modifications of Friends' attitude to music when he came to Hobart. At the Annual Meeting of Friends in Hobart in 1887 he suggested to Friends that "if they were to compete successfully with the other churches (as far as schools were concerned) they would have to consider whether a little departure from the old lines as respects the singing of hymns might not be advantageous" (*The Australian Friend*, 8 July 1887, p.7). Music generally however was subject to the prevailing winds of Quaker distrust. The first evidence of its admissibility as a means of innocent social enjoyment appeared in one brief reference in the Minutes of the Natural History and Essay Society<sup>21</sup> of 10 May 1890 where it was recorded that "the girls sang a piece". Thereafter there were more frequent reports of musical items at school socials and on speech days. In *School Echoes*, September 1891, a singing class was reported to have sung "Forty Years On" (p.78). In the same issue there is the report of the purchase of a new piano. By the end of the century music tuition in piano and violin was well established. The October 1900 edition of *School Echoes* published a list of twenty-three successes by students of the school in the music examinations conducted by

---

20. See *Report of Education Conference of the Society of Friends*, London, 1879, p.27.

21. A Natural History and Essay Society was formed on 3 November 1888. The name was changed to The Hobartville Association in 1892 - see pp. 123, 124 and 125 below.

Trinity College, London.

There had been a similar distrust of drama at Friends' schools. Arthur L. Dixon, a scholar at Wigton during Samuel Clemes' period of teaching there, recalled:

Any reference whatever to anything connected with a stage play was absolutely taboo, so much so that at each Annual Meeting examination a curious situation arose. We were prepared beforehand by one of the masters in the passages we were to read to Friends assembled in the dining-room; and in the case of an extract from, say, Charles Lamb or Addison, we were instructed to commence with the title of the passage and then give the author's name. But if the passage was 'Friends, Romans, countrymen ...' another course was to be followed. Shakespeare was the writer of stage plays and therefore inadmissible, so our instructions were to omit both title and author's name and to start right off with the selection itself. Was this casuistry?

(Reed, 1954, pp. 84-5)

The minutes of meetings of the Natural History and Essay Society at The Friends' School, Hobart, even when it broadened its range of interests in 1892 and was renamed the Hobartville Association, contained no record in the period 1887-1899 of any dramatic presentation at the school. There were two exceptions. Two girls presented an excerpt from *The Rivals* at a meeting on 4 June 1896 and seven boys and girls gave a scene from *The Merchant of Venice* on 15 October 1897. Both these presentations however were recorded as "recitations" not as play-readings, but at least the authors were acknowledged.

The third way in which the concept of a "guarded" education influenced a Friends' school curriculum was in the encouragement of a study of Natural History and this was a positive gain. Friends' Schools were quick to encourage an interest in Natural History as a

regular feature of what might be called their informal curriculum. In their view the study of the natural order of the universe led the mind on to praise of the God who established that order. It also "guarded" the young by furnishing "an object of interest for the leisure of young men that would withdraw them from scenes of great temptation."<sup>22</sup> The first Natural History Society of any Friends' school in England was begun at Bootham in 1834. Boys were encouraged to explore the countryside and report on their discoveries and on their collections of such things as plants, shells, rocks, fossils. By 1850 the interests widened to include astronomy. Bootham was one of the first schools to build an observatory. Such pursuits were particularly relevant to leisure-time at boarding-schools, for Friends considered that leisure exposed children to the temptations of idleness. All Friends' schools shared in a positive response to this problem by making "education for leisure" a cornerstone of their boarding-school curriculum.

Clemes made "education for leisure" a distinctive feature of the school's educational programme for its boarders, though meetings were open also to day-students. The first meeting of the Natural History and Essay Society was on 3 November 1888. Meetings were held on the evenings of the first Saturday of each month and drew a regular attendance of twenty-five to forty, with teachers and boarders forming the nucleus of the Society's strength. Though the positions of President and Secretary were at first held by members of staff, with Samuel Clemes president and George Clark (the first assistant

---

22. John Bright, speaking at a meeting of the Friends' Education Society and reported in proceedings of the F.E.S. 1837 - 45, 1845, p.9.



recently arrived from England) secretary, the Society was the means of bringing staff and students together. A spirit of mutual respect and a new attitude to student-staff co-operation developed from the sharing of interests and discoveries. From the Society's meetings came initiatives which did much to shape the development of the school.

One of the Society's main aims was to foster the study of all branches of natural history.<sup>23</sup> At the opening meeting of the Society "curators" (following a Wigtonian model) were appointed for five departments of natural history - Botany (three curators), Conchology (two), Entomology, Geology and Ornithology (one each). At a later meeting curators were also appointed for astronomy and meteorology. The inclusion of a "workshop curator" indicated the Society's intention to encourage other spare-time activities as well as those labelled "natural history". Exploration and discovery motivated boarders' outings and picnics. One girl boarder reported that picnics were "specially enjoyed when some excursionists are bent on getting specimens of natural history."<sup>24</sup> One of the main reasons for appointing curators and requiring periodic reports from them was to stimulate the interest of other students in the variety of subjects which came under the heading of "Natural History". The Society had the educative function of arousing students' curiosity about the world around them and of encouraging the desire to explore, discover and communicate.

The inclusion of the term 'Essay' in the name of 'The Natural History and Essay Society' reflected the aim of encouraging the ability to communicate by means of the written and spoken word, for essays

---

23. Interest in Natural History had been one of the key features of Francis Mackie's school - see p. 71 above.

24. *Essay 1888*, Vol. I, p.311, F4/33 T.U.A.

were read at meetings of the Society and were the subject of questions and discussion. Originally in Friends' schools the writing of essays was part of the 'informal' 'extra-curricular' curriculum, because the emphasis in English lessons was placed on the formal elements of English - grammar, spelling, reading and calligraphy. While the reading of essays remained the core of the Society's programmes at meetings and provided a means of developing the ability to speak clearly, attempts were also made to encourage the ability to speak extempore in discussion and debate. All essays had to be written for presentation as a permanent record of the proceedings and these were often accompanied by photographs, sketches and illustrations and then bound in impressive volumes. These volumes provided a lively record of life in the closing decade of the nineteenth century as seen by a group of amateur naturalists, historians, geographers and photographers.

In the first seven meetings eighty-seven papers were read on a variety of subjects. The majority of these were descriptive of persons or places, particularly Tasmanian places. There was a strong emphasis on the importance of exploring the immediate neighbourhood. Reports of excursions to such places as Mount Wellington (a two a.m. start being necessary if the summit was the objective), Mount Rumney, Kangaroo Point, Ralph's Bay, Forest Hills (the home of the Quaker conchologist, William May) did much to stimulate members' awareness of their environment.

The change of name of the Society in 1892 to "The Hobartville Association" itself signified that a wider range of interests was covered than natural history alone. Rhyming and imaginative writing had already crept in as acceptable variations of the monthly programmes.

Perhaps the best summary of aims of the Society was given by the secretary, George Clark, in his verse report of the first year's activities with which the second volume of the Society's bound records commences.

Once in each month the Essay-meeting night  
Comes round, and then is seen a pleasant sight,  
For all the boarders meet at Hobartville,  
To hear some papers written with great skill.  
Fables or poetry may find a place,  
Essays adorned with every pleasing grace,  
Numbers of questions hard are then proposed,  
Of which the answers are to be disclosed;  
The naturalist, impressed with what he's found  
That walks or creeps or flies above the ground,  
Reports his observations or displays  
Some curious objects which the rest amaze.  
Then in conclusion a debate or speech  
Completes the programme and affords to each  
An opportunity to show his skill  
In shaping thought and sentences at will.  
Thus in our young society we find  
The use of talents must improve the mind  
If only every member does his best.  
Ah! now you're tired, so my Muse shall rest.<sup>25</sup>

One of the major initiatives to come from the Natural History and Essay Society was the decision to establish a school magazine *School Echoes* in 1890. Monthly reports of school news had been a regular feature of the Society's meetings. *School Echoes* which has maintained an uninterrupted record of school affairs down to the present day offered a further means of self-expression to students and gave them a sense of participation in the life of the school community. It became also the means of communication between past and present students.

Parents and friends were encouraged to attend the annual meetings of the Natural History and Essay Society. Thirty members of the Society of Friends accepted invitations to the first anniversary

meeting on 10 September 1889 and after tea in the school dining-room

guests listened to a normal programme of essays and discussion and

were invited to inspect the special exhibition of collections of

shells, plants, fossils, birds, coins, etc. The second anniversary

meeting on the 6 October 1890 was a much more ambitious project. It

was attended by one hundred and eighty people and was held in the

Temperance Hall in Hobart. On this occasion Dr. Benjafield was in the

chair and in addition to the regular programme of essays and recitations

he, together with Samuel Clemes, Francis Mather and W.E. Shoobridge,

contributed to a symposium on the sort of education "suited to our

present needs in these lands".<sup>26</sup> Those present were then invited to

inspect a much expanded "leisure-time" exhibition which included not

only the collections, but also items of cookery, needlework, carpentry,

paintings and drawings.

A second initiative was the establishment of a museum. In this

the Society received enthusiastic support from Edwin Ransome, who was

a particularly keen geologist. Four cases of rocks and fossils were

sent out to be the nucleus of a museum. "A ton of stone", represent-

ing over 2,000 geological specimens, was unloaded from the "Doric" on

28th April 1893.<sup>27</sup> With these were included some antiquities from

Camulodunum, some dried English plants and a microscope. A letter

followed from Ransome: "The museum will now stand a chance of suitable

entry into the world ... One result of this teaching may be to help

to keep young fellows out of mischief as they grow older. Such tastes

had that practical effect in my case."<sup>28</sup> The museum also attracted

26. Mins. of Natural History and Essay Society, 1888-1900, Min. (11) of Meeting held 6 October 1890.

27. From a report in *Natural History Journal*, 1893, London, p.102.

28. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 22 September 1893, F4/1. T.U.A.

the attention of local donors, such as Lieut.-Colonel Beddome, who gave a collection of 665 named species of marine and inland shells.

The exhibitions initiated by the Society were on display at the half-yearly and end-of-year gatherings and drew favourable comments from parents and from the local press. The guest speaker at the speech-day at the end of the year 1898, Professor Williams, underlined the educational significance of the Society's activities

It is in this wise and beneficent encouragement of interests and pursuits, outside and beyond the ordinary school curriculum - the magazine, museum, the various school activities - that a healthy tone is given. Tone is like the air we breathe, impalpable, but most effectual in its operation for evil or for good.

(*School Echoes*, December 1898, F.S.H.L.)

The informal curriculum represented by the activities of the Society played a major role in producing what Professor Williams called "a healthy tone". The teacher-student relationship developed at The Friends' School was unusual in schools of that era and was itself one of the main factors producing such a tone. In meetings of the Society, and in the excursions, the formalities and limits imposed by a classroom situation were no longer operative. Samuel Clemes participated fully and was a much appreciated lecturer at the Society's meetings, but he also contributed his talents as a parodist,<sup>29</sup> and commented in verse on staff and student personalities and on contemporary school events. This lightness of touch and sense of fun did much to bring staff and students together and to create that family spirit for which the school became noted. A reporter in *Tasmanian*

---

29. Samuel Clemes had already gained a reputation as a parodist at Wigton. One old scholar of Wigton recalled one of the "delightful parodies" celebrating the winter "slide", a diversion welcomed amongst the dull routine of a boarder's life. (Reed, 1954, p.82)

News<sup>30</sup> commented:

In forming a proper estimate of a school, the first thing to be noted is the tone of the institution. We have on public and social occasions watched with keen appreciation the relations between teachers and taught at Hobartville, and a more stimulating atmosphere we have never observed in any seminary of its size. Frankness without undue familiarity, healthy curiosity and thoroughness of purpose constitute the chief elements in the Friends' High School.

One of Samuel Clemes' major contributions to education in Tasmania was his ability to create a sense of community in the school. He felt that the informal curriculum as expressed in learning situations outside the classroom was just as important as that which was taught in the class room and that both leisure-time and lesson-time had claims on the educator's attention.

---

30. Quoted in *The Friends' School 1887-1961: The Seventy-Fifth Anniversary*, Pubd. by The Friends' School Hobart, 1961, p.14.

Methods: Tradition or Reform?

Some of the ideas, which were 'traditional' in English Friends' schools, such as the emphasis on leisure-time education, were 'new' to the Tasmanian scene. Hence the application of Friends' educational practices to the school in Hobart was in itself sufficient to gain for Samuel Clemes the reputation of being an educational reformer.

Friends were active in promoting this image of Clemes and in supporting the 'modern' methods which he introduced. They realized that if the school was to make an impact on the community of Hobart it had to offer something distinctive to attract the attention of those who appreciated a 'modern' approach to education. This was admitted by Hobart Friends in their epistle sent to London from their Annual Meeting in 1890. They thanked English Friends for their continuing financial assistance which made possible the establishment of a school

sufficiently advanced to attract the attention of Christians of other denominations who desire for their children a guarded and religious education, yet wide enough in scope to meet all the requirements of modern thought and the Committee saw from the first that it was on the support of such non-members that the success of the school would in large measure depend. <sup>31</sup>

In their prospectus and in other publicity they endeavoured to assure the parents of prospective students not only that the curriculum was in line with the best traditions of the English Friends' schools, but also that new and modern methods were to be employed. Thus French was to be taught not merely from textbooks but by conversational methods. Chemistry was to be based on practical experiments

---

31. Mins. of Hobart Y.M., 1890, S1/14(2), T.U.A.

in a laboratory. Carpentry was to be taught by the latest Sloyd system. Oral instruction, including lectures, was to replace learning by rote. No home lessons, as a rule, were to be given, "it being desired that all studies shall be under the supervision of the teacher", an announcement which a *Mercury* reporter on 3 November 1886, considered would be a "cause for rejoicing in many distracted households".

Clemes, however, made it clear that he was not simply following the traditions of English Friends' schools. He had ideas of his own, and he also was quick to realize that conditions in the colony made it necessary to re-shape and develop his ideas, particularly any he might have acquired during his four years at Wigton School. In a statement made to parents at the mid-year gathering in 1893 and reported in *The Mercury*, 22 June 1893, he stressed the point that "education suited for the condition of life in these colonies should not be modelled too closely on the lines to which we have gradually been accustomed in the older countries."

This view had motivated his opposition to the supremacy of the classics in the curriculum and his advocacy of the introduction of practical subjects. He was adamant too that the dominance of the public competitive examination was a growing threat to real education, because schools would tend to teach what examinations dictated. In short, as *School Echoes*, November 1890, summed it up, "he believed in a more rational method of education which would develop character, not cram the mind with undigested knowledge." Any methods therefore which hindered rather than promoted the development of character, of goodness, of wholeness were attacked by him.

But this broad general aim of character-training was to be



combined, according to the advertisement,<sup>32</sup> "with a course of instruction leading up to the examinations under the Council of Education."<sup>33</sup> This combination of the general and the specific in a statement of aims was likely to reassure those who were not clear about the school's attitude to such 'useful' and practical issues as the passing of public examinations but it was also for Samuel Clemes the basis for what was to be a nagging conflict of aims.

The nature of this conflict was seen most clearly in relation to examinations. Clemes was not 'examination-minded'. This attitude was conditioned by his own experience in the preceding four years at Wigton Friends' School, Cumberland. The Wigton School was a boarding-school serving a mostly rural population. Those students who wished to proceed beyond elementary and junior secondary standards left to attend the York Schools of Bootham and The Mount. At Wigton Clemes found examinations playing a minor role. It was the custom in Friends' schools for members of the Meeting which sponsored a particular school to be appointed to visit that school annually, to conduct oral examinations of the classes and to report back to their Meeting on the progress of the students. Written school examinations were first introduced at Wigton in 1861. In Clemes' time at Wigton external examinations were taken by only a few students in isolated subjects such as drawing, chemistry and mathematics, on papers set by the South

---

32. See p. 109 above.

33. The Tasmanian Council of Examinations conducted examinations until 1891 as a basis for the award of two exhibitions. When the University of Tasmania was founded, public examinations became the responsibility of the University and the Junior Public and Senior Public Examinations were established under the jurisdiction of the University from 1891.

Kensington Science and Art Departments, but it was not until 1898 that the more comprehensive examinations conducted by the College of Preceptors were introduced to the school.

Clemes seized the opportunity in his first public report in June 1888 to lay it down quite clearly that public examinations were not to be the determining influence on either curriculum or methods.

If we consider the main purpose of education to be a cramming into the mind of a child of a certain number of facts, which facts are to be elicited by appropriate questioning periodically, then we shall consider these results all important, and count that those who came out top in each list are the successful ones, and those near the bottom will be reckoned as failures. But if we consider education rather as a training in the best possible use of the faculties with which our Heavenly Father has gifted us, and training in the use of self-education, if we recognize that schooldays are only part of education, then we shall form a very different estimate. We shall not attempt a comparison as between our own children and others so much, as we shall be anxious that they shall, each according to his measure, be doing honest work, and learning above everything to glorify God by the diligent and prayerful use of all the means He has placed at their disposal.

*(The Australian Friend, 8 July 1888, 1, 84)*

It was against this background that he had to face up to the public assumptions and expectations that the new school in Tasmania would follow the accepted pattern of preparing students for public examinations, particularly at this time when these examinations were to be the means of entry to the University of Tasmania, which was due to open early in the nineties. In this same report of 1888 there were the seeds of compromise and evidence of a willingness to make some concessions. Clemes admitted that examinations could be made to serve useful purposes, both for the student in enabling him to find out gaps

in knowledge and for the teacher in revealing weak spots in instruction. Under pressure he went further and agreed to present candidates for the Senior Public examinations in 1891 and for both Senior and Junior Public in 1892. In 1892 both senior candidates passed but only one out of the six who sat for the Junior Public passed. One of the unsuccessful candidates, reporting in *School Echoes* (October 1892, p.140), on his experience, appeared somewhat disconcerted by the paper in elementary science. "When we got the papers it was mostly Elementary Mechanics - which we had not been taught - so we were rather at sea." It was therefore not surprising that only one out of the six candidates was successful in passing the Junior Public in that year. This experience of students of "being at sea" must have led to discussions among parents and at school committee meetings, for Francis Mather in an address to parents at the end-of-year gathering in 1892 felt it important to stress that a concession was being made to "prevailing feeling" with respect to competitive examinations.

The principal in working towards his ideals must carry the parents along with him; for though he will be the first to bear testimony to the confidence that parents have constantly manifested, yet experience has shown that nowhere can one travel very quickly away from the beaten track. For instance, in respect to competitive examinations, he has been obliged in some measure to conform to the prevailing feeling, though he has been careful not to take away any teaching power from the general classes to push on those scholars likely to do him credit.<sup>34</sup>

In 1895 Clemes returned to the arena with something of the prophet in him as he denounced the false gods of education. "What future headmasters may do here I cannot say, but as long as I can have

---

34. J.F.M. Address to Parents, December 1892, M.S. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

my way, the old idols of marks, prizes and cramming shall be no more set up" (*The Mercury*, 20 June 1895). But Elijah had to come down to the market-place and admit that the school did prepare students for examinations. He claimed however that the school could take examinations in its stride: "We do not go *out* of our way for them, but take them *in* our way" (*School Echoes*, 15 February 1895, F.S.L.H.). He also affirmed that the many would not be neglected for the few and that there was no thought of letting "examination requirements repress the frequent following of interesting and useful by-paths of knowledge."

The mounting success of The Friends' School in public examinations led to something in the nature of 'une crise de conscience' in Clemes. This came to a head in 1897 when the school had outstanding results. At the June break-up function Mather had taken some satisfaction in recording that the nine senior and eleven juniors presented for the examinations had all reached the required standards and that seven of the nine seniors had matriculated, two of these being in the first class, three in the second class. One had passed with credit in all eleven of his subjects and received the mathematical scholarship of the value of £50 for three years.

Clemes, while bowing to the prevailing winds of public acclaim for this success with a sotto voce prayer - "The Lord pardon Thy servant in this thing" (*The Mercury*, 17 June 1897) - stoutly re-asserted his opposition to the "rampant craze for public examinations". At this same function the Chairman, Dr. Benjafield, congratulated Clemes on being the Principal of the "first" school in Tasmania in its public examination results. The writer of the leader in *The Mercury* of the following morning was quick to point out the ambivalence of attitude.

The report of the Principal of The Friends' High School has at least one merit, an outspoken denunciation of the 'rampant craze for public and competitive examinations'. It is rather funny however to notice that the Chairman congratulated the school on the success it had achieved in this direction.

(*The Mercury*, 18 June 1897)

The writer agreed nevertheless with Clemes that true education did not lie in examination success. For Clemes the development of character by means of a "guarded Christian education" was the more important aim - and success in this subject was not examinable.

He was outspoken also about the false lure of prizes and marks and any other evidence of the competitive motive at work in the classroom. He had the faith - some thought the naive faith - that students would pursue learning for its own sake and that they did not need the stimulus of marks and prizes.

Benjamin Le Tall, who had come out from Bootham Friends' School in 1893,<sup>35</sup> recorded his reactions as a new member of staff to Clemes' ideas on marks. He saw some of the difficulties facing the teacher if the marks system were abandoned. He thought less work would be done, that more effort and "vivacity" were called for from the teacher and that Australian children were probably more in need of a "spur to industry" than others. He confessed however that "the marks system

---

35. Benjamin Le Tall was educated at three Friends' Schools, Penketh, Ackworth and Bootham, spent the years 1873-75 at the Flounders' Institute, was junior master at Bootham 1875-78, took out his B.A. degree at the University of London in 1879 and then with a three years' Friends' scholarship studied for his M.A., graduating in 1882. From 1883 to 1892 he was teaching at Bootham. He was held in high esteem as a teacher by students and colleagues. He travelled widely, was very well-read and was a keen botanist. Before leaving for Hobart he was one of the editors of the *Natural History Journal* and continued to contribute to it when he was in Hobart.

educated splendidly for a course of selfish money-grubbing" and hence he agreed with his principal in his policy of discontinuing the system.<sup>36</sup> Clemes was confident that the abolition of marks had contributed to the development of a good moral tone in the school. He made this claim in a letter to Ransome in 1895 and added: "There is no temptation to cheat or over-reach one another and the rivalry is perfectly friendly."<sup>37</sup>

Clemes did not however entirely discard prizes. While he rejected them as rewards for school-work he admitted them as legitimate means for encouraging students to take up leisure-time hobbies and pursuits. Money prizes rewarded the place-getters in the leisure-time exhibitions,<sup>38</sup> but presentation was delayed until the recipient left school. On the occasion of the leaver's last public gathering the accumulated winnings during his school career were presented in the form of a book-prize. Money prizes were also given for winners in school athletic sports - two shillings for the open sprint, two shillings and sixpence for the half-mile and the winner of the mile earned the greatest reward of three shillings.

In his policy of awarding no prizes for schoolwork Clemes was attacking one of the most firmly-rooted educational practices of his day. His policy on prizes was consistent however with the practice

---

36. *The Natural History Journal*, March 1894, p.20, F.H.A.L.

37. S.C. to E.R.R., 7 April 1895, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

38. In commenting on prizes gained at exhibitions, Le Tall worked out that the boys at one exhibition had taken about thirty shillings or two shillings and twopence per competitor, while the girls had amassed three pounds, fourteen shillings, or two shillings and tenpence each. He therefore concluded that "it would apparently pay the boys to leave barrows and beetles and take to buttonholes and tarts" (*Natural History Journal*, 15 September 1894, p.91, F.H.A.L.).

in English Friends' schools. During the second half of the nineteenth century Friend teachers had been debating whether rewards had a legitimate place in Friends' schools. At a conference of Friend teachers in 1848 a distinction had been drawn between "emulation" which "excites", and "rivalry" which "irritates". Nevertheless Friends remained wary of rewards which were considered "as indulging a competitive spirit lacking in true humility" (Stewart, 1953, p.213). Clemes' policy was 'traditional' for Friends' schools, but in the Tasmanian setting it bore the stamp of reform.

The introduction of co-education was one of the major departures from traditional methods of schooling, particularly at secondary level and in a boarding-school setting. Contrary to popular assumptions co-education was not a generally accepted tradition in Friends' schools. George Fox had insisted on the importance of girls receiving instruction as well as boys, but separate schools were established for boys and girls to give effect to this injunction. One of the oldest and best-known of the Friends' schools, Ackworth, was founded for boys and girls but these were housed and taught separately.<sup>39</sup> Ackworth did not abandon this dual system until 1947. Bootham and The Mount have remained separate boys' and girls' schools. Leighton Park School is still for boys only, though in September 1975 girls were admitted to the Sixth

---

39. The area of ground between the boys' "side" and the girls' "side" at Ackworth was called "The Flags" and on Sunday afternoons boys and girls were permitted to meet there under watchful care if they were related as brothers, sisters or cousins. This "guarded" companionship drew the following apt critical comment:

"The best of Quaker schools are intimately co-educational not like the two-winged separatist Ackworth which I knew as a boy, where one felt all the disturbances of propinquity without the compensating disillusionments of contact" (Lester, 1931, 88, 400).

Form. Towards the end of the nineteenth century the small Friends' schools were moving towards a limited form of co-education, not for educational reasons so much as for economic ones. Co-instruction provided a more economic use of staff where numbers in classes were small. Penketh tried mixed classes in 1831 but abandoned them when numbers increased. They resumed co-instruction however in 1881 but did not allow boys and girls to sit together at table until 1901. Ayton introduced co-instruction in 1886 - but kept boys and girls separate in class by means of an aisle. When Wigton introduced co-instruction in 1882, it followed the example of Sidcot School which had brought in co-instruction in 1880, but only as a by-product of another reform, that of "departmental teaching", by which teachers were given an opportunity to specialize and concentrate on teaching one or two subjects to a variety of classes. The reason given for this change at Wigton was that co-education was "peculiarly fitted to make the most of the educational possibilities of a school of this size" (Reed, 1954, p.82).

If Friends had been as thorough-going in their application of their central belief in the Inner Light to education as they had been in its application to other areas of social reform, they would have been less cautious in recognizing the importance of educating boys and girls together so that equal educational opportunity might be assured. It was only at the end of the nineteenth century that Friends began to advocate co-education for positive educational reasons and not simply to introduce co-instruction for economic reasons and regard this as the limit of safety in the development of the right relationship between the sexes.



Clemes had had four years' experience of the Wigton interpretation of co-education. In a small and intimate boarding-school community like Wigton co-education in practice meant more than just teaching boys and girls together in class. They joined together in some at least of the out-of-school activities. One old scholar, reminiscing about these days, recalled:

Friendly rivalry was strong in those early days of co-education, and the girls were anxious not to be behind the boys, whether it was a question of scaling Skiddaw and Catlands on those delightful school excursions, or recording the first appearance of spring flowers, of plucking up courage to sail down the big slide on the boys' field or to send a representative to the Committee Room to ask Martin Lidbetter for an extra half-holiday.

(Reed, 1954, p.62)

Clemes had no doubts whatever about co-education. His own strong faith in the rightness of educating boys and girls together was necessary if he was to convince some members of his committee that co-education was more than what they called "the mixed class system". Mather tended to be on the defensive about co-education. He was sensitive to public willingness to believe the worst. In one letter to Ransome he spoke of "outsiders being on the watch for dis-organization". And he added as a rider: "We cannot be too particular to keep down any familiarity in manner."<sup>40</sup> He was careful to explain to applicants for teaching positions that though boys and girls were taught together they did not sit together and out of school they were "apart altogether". Playgrounds were separate and the boarder boys and girls had separate sitting-rooms.<sup>41</sup> When Mather

40. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 30 July 1892, p.111, F4/5, T.U.A.

41. J.F.M. to Walter Bell, 1 December 1891, p.66, F4/5, T.U.A.

was briefing Ransome about requirements in relation to teachers being interviewed in England for appointment in Hobart he continually underlined the importance of a teacher being able to control mixed classes and maintain discipline. "It is popularly supposed," he said, "that in mixed schools the manners of girls are apt to become rough and this makes it all the more necessary that in our institution no laxity of discipline shall confirm this impression."<sup>42</sup>

William Benson, a member of the School Committee, had expressed some reservations about the effect of co-education on the manners of girls, but ten years after the school opened, when his own daughter was enrolled as a boarder, the family then living in Melbourne, he confessed his doubts unfounded. His earlier fears that there might be a "want of refinement" had given place to satisfaction with the results of a few months' experience - "her manners are gentler than we expected."<sup>43</sup>

Another who had to be convinced of the value of co-education was Le Tall. As Bootham was for boys only, Mather had thought it advisable to send warning to him through Ransome of the dangers of being lenient with girls or of "verging towards pleasantry with them".<sup>44</sup> Two years later Le Tall, in a lengthy report on his impressions of Friends' School, Hobart, written for the *Natural History Journal*, confessed being won over to agreement with co-education as "the natural system". He felt that it improved manners, lessened flirtation and made for less nonsense than he had been used to in a class of boys only. He

---

42. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 4 February 1890, F4/5, T.U.A.

43. William Benson to E.R.R., 11 July 1897, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

44. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 30 July 1892, F4/5, T.U.A.

concluded with the hope that segregated Friends' schools in England would follow Hobart's example. "Conservative English Friends," he said, "may 'lift up their hands'; but I do not doubt that ere so long Ackworth will, to use one of my correspondent's phrases 'fold her wings', and Bootham and the Mount be rolled into one" (*Natural History Journal*, March 1894, p.20).

The picture of school life given in *School Echoes*, *Essays* and reports of meetings of the Hobartville Association did not bear out the accuracy of Mather's statement<sup>45</sup> that boys and girls were kept apart altogether out of school.

Clemes followed the Wigton practice of seating girls and boys separately in class and of allotting well-defined separate areas for boarding accommodation, but he appeared to develop a much more relaxed attitude to the mixing of the sexes in the community of the boarding-house. Here he and Margaret Clemes fostered a real sense of family spirit. Opportunities for boys and girls to mix were provided by the meetings of the various school societies and by the excursions, which became such a feature of boarding-school life. A society to foster good reading habits was first open only to boy boarders, but it quickly altered its constitution to allow for the participation of girls. Mixed socials were organized on special occasions by the senior girls. The programme did not include dancing, but musical items, skits and charades seemed to make these memorable occasions for fun together.

A school survey was taken in 1897 by the editor of *School Echoes* to find out what the boys and girls of the Second Class, equivalent

---

45. See p. 140 above.

to a grade IX, thought about co-education. The survey revealed "a wonderful consensus of opinion in favour of the mixed system" (*School Echoes*, August 1897, p.80). Students appreciated that co-education meant a variety of men and women teachers; they believed that this was a good thing because men teachers in a boys' school were too strict, women teachers in a girls' school too easy and that therefore there was a much happier mean in a co-educational school. They felt also that there was a better balance in a mixed class, even to the extent of a better balance of faults, boys being inattentive and girls too talkative. The report concluded with the observation that co-education was a "very good plan; it makes the boys behave themselves like gentlemen but when the boys are by themselves they don't care how they behave."

One of the demonstrable advantages of co-education was the greater educational opportunity it gave to girls. While initially there was some carry-over of Wigton practices, such as providing Latin for boys and the alternative of sewing for girls, this distinction soon ceased to operate. Girls proved themselves eager to accept, for example, the opportunity to take the new science courses; a girl from The Friends' School, Amy Elliott, was among the first science graduates of the University of Tasmania.

That this greater educational opportunity was appreciated was shown by the steady demand for places for girls. For the first thirteen years of the school's existence girls represented forty-five per cent of the total enrolments. In most years there were approximately equal numbers of boys and girls, but in the two depression years of 1893-4 the numbers of new enrolments of girls dropped sharply,

due presumably to the assumption that, when finance was not readily available, girls were more expendable than boys as far as higher education was concerned.

Clemes' contribution was to establish a tradition of co-education which went beyond the contemporary limits of co-instruction as practised in English Friends' schools. In the Hobart setting his ideas of co-education represented a major reform, particularly as far as boarding-schools were concerned. While a greater degree of segregation of the sexes was maintained than would be tolerated in a modern co-educational school, Clemes was well in advance of his times.

His own confidence in co-education generated a like confidence in those who might have been at first sceptical. Thus Dr. Benjafield admitted to some initial doubts, but came out firmly in support.

The mixing of boys and girls together in the classes at first looked rather incongruous but I have now nothing but good to say of it. It gives the girls a confidence and a natural behaviour in the presence of the opposite sex which to me is far better than the simpering affectation of the boarding-school miss. Some argue that mixing with boys makes them rough and brusque, but I have yet to see the school which turns out a better type of girl. The effect of this on the boys is good beyond question. In manners they must needs be gentlemen before young ladies and in class the boy who thinks himself a lord of creation comes down several pegs when he gets badly beaten by the girls. 46

The successful trial of co-education at The Friends' School did not necessarily mean that other schools wanted to follow this lead, though it is interesting to speculate whether in one case, that of Queen's College, there might have been some unacknowledged

---

46. The Friends' High School, Hobart - an article written by Dr. Benjafield and received by E.R.R., 20 January 1900, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

influence. Advance press notices of the opening of Queen's College on 10 July 1893 contained two separate advertisements, one for Queen's College boys and a second announcement that a "Mr. Ireland, assisted by the Misses Ireland, will conduct classes for young ladies in the main building" (*The Mercury*, 5 July 1893). The main advertisement had named Mrs. Ireland as being in charge of the boys' boarding-house. It seems that this double establishment was unsuccessful as there was no reference to the "young ladies" in the report of the Queen's College Speech Night at the end of the year. However, two years later, the Headmaster, Mr. A.A. Stephens, announced that Queen's College was to become co-educational, thus adopting, he said, a method of education which was followed in the United States and in some parts of England. He claimed that Queen's College was admirably suited to a school of this kind because of its separate playgrounds for boys and girls. Predictably no specific mention was made of The Friends' School, but it was unlikely that Queen's College would have introduced such a change, limited though it was,<sup>47</sup> if the experiment at The Friends' School had met with public disapproval. The real measure of Clemes' successful introduction of co-education was the extent of acceptance by the community of a method which for many at that time represented a step that invited disaster.

---

47. Mr. Stephens made it quite clear to parents that the limit of co-education was "mixed classes". Outside class there was to be strict segregation and particular care was to be exercised in choosing suitable boys and girls for such proximity as was allowed. (*The Mercury*, 19 June 1895.) Eighteen months later, the Headmaster of Queen's College announced at his speech night that "the reception of girls was proving a very satisfactory innovation. The system had many advantages for both boys and girls and he did not in the least regret the step taken." (*The Mercury*, 19 December 1896.)

## CHAPTER FIVE

### PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPMENT

#### ACCOMMODATION, FINANCE AND STAFFING.

The Friends' School opened in leased premises in Warwick Street, Hobart, on 31 January 1887 with an attendance of thirty three. Joseph Mather, Chairman of the Hobart School Committee, posted off to Edwin Ransome on the following day an enthusiastic account of the opening morning "when there was quite an excitement, mothers and fathers bringing their children and the neighbours astonished to see such a number trooping along."<sup>1</sup> By the close of the first year numbers had increased to seventy-five. The school had doubled its numbers and outgrown its premises in the first year of its existence.

The problem of boarding accommodation was particularly acute. Boarders could not be accepted until the second quarter and they were limited to three in number because they had to lodge with the Clemes family in the school premises in Warwick Street. Samuel Clemes was paid thirty pounds per annum for each boarder to cover the cost of food, laundry and supervision, the Committee providing furnishings and gas, but Clemes was to be responsible for all "firing".<sup>2</sup> The birth of a son to the Clemes family in mid-year made it clear that it was necessary to acquire a second house in August to accommodate boarders.

---

1. J.B.M. to E.R.R, 1 February 1887, MS. Box 22(2), F.H.A.L.

2. J.F.M. *Letterbook*, Vol.1, p.3, F4/5, T.U.A.

It was realized, however, that inability to accept more than a handful of boarders would be interpreted by Friends as a breach of faith on the part of the Hobart Committee. One country Friend in Tasmania before six months had passed wrote to Francis Mather claiming that the school was an utter failure because distant Friends could not share in it. Mather was also conscious that in gaining English Friends' support for a day-school, attended by a predominant proportion of non-Friends, he had argued that this was the only way a school could be made viable under conditions operating in Tasmania. Friends in distant parts of Australia would be unlikely, he said, to send their children to a school in Hobart just because it was a Friends' school. The school had to provide a quality product in day-school education to make a boarding-school possible. Now that the day-school was established and meeting with a response beyond their expectations the boarding-school had to become more than simply a promise.

Hobart Friends were then faced with the formidable task of finding an alternative to the Warwick Street premises which could meet the steadily growing demand to accept day-school students and the mounting pressure to accommodate boarders from Friends' families living outside Hobart and in the other States.

The first hint of the availability of a suitable site came in a letter from Mather to Ransome on 3 April 1888 wherein he mentioned a new property they were considering which was notable for the six hundred feet of brick wall on its western boundary. This was the property known as Hobartville, situated on the eastern side of Commercial Road, North Hobart.<sup>3</sup> The five-acre estate had on it a spacious

---

3. Hobartville was built by Captain William Wilson in the early eighteen-thirties. The date of the construction must have  
(contd.)



house that had been unoccupied for some time. Some years later Mather recalled in a letter to Ransome the reasons why attempts to auction it as a private dwelling had been unsuccessful.

Thou wilt remember that when we set to work at getting the 'ancestral' dwelling-place fit for occupation by the Friends' High School I told thee that it had not been occupied for years except by rats; and that even when it had been inhabited by human beings there had evidently been no repairs for many years.<sup>4</sup>

Someone had drawn Mather's attention to the property as a possible site for a school. By August 1888 William Benson, acting on behalf of the School Committee, was able to write to Ransome announcing what he called a "bold stroke". "I have today purchased for the School an estate of five acres."<sup>5</sup> He explained the advantages of the new property, its spaciousness for playgrounds, the suitability of its buildings for conversion into classrooms and boarding accommodation, its healthy situation overlooking the city and its closeness to the city. Some objections however were raised to the move on the grounds that the school would lose students because of the distance of the school from the city - one mile! Benson was elated at the price negotiated which he alleged was based on the assumption that the land alone, not the building on it, had value. He felt therefore that it was a sound investment, for in the event of a collapse of the school - a not infrequent occurrence amongst Hobart schools in those days - the value of the

---

been before 1834, because a drawing of the building appears as the fifth of the freehand drawings which preface the 1834 edition of Melville's V.D.L. Almanac. The drawing is inscribed:

"The Residence of W. Wilson, Esq., J.P."  
Captain Wilson married Grace, the second daughter of David Lord. Their son, James, bought the property in 1852 and lived there until the early eighties.

4. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 12 January 1895, F4/5, T.U.A.

5. W. Benson to E.R.R., 13 August 1888, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

land itself would cover the investment.

Benson also mentioned to Ransome the possibility of raising a mortgage with Friends in England to finance the purchase. He added however that he was not hopeful about a response to his suggestion, for "English investors don't like so much salt-water between them and their investments."

It said much for Ransome that he did not join the ranks of those English Friends who considered that Hobart Friends had "gone beyond their tether". Mather bluntly told those who held this view that it was entirely on account of distant Friends and the School's responsibility to provide a centre of Friends' education for their children that a group of Friends in Hobart had taken this decision. Distance from England, the time needed to explain by letter, to enlist help and to raise a considerable amount of money among English Friends, added to the comparatively short time the school had had to demonstrate its viability, were all factors that led the Hobart Committee to seek sources of finance nearer at hand.

The Baptist Church had already given practical help to the School by making its hall at the rear of the Baptist Tabernacle available for school examinations and when the school's difficulties in financing a transfer from Warwick Street to Hobartville became known, the Baptists offered a loan, if other means of finance were not immediately available. The purchase price of Hobartville was £3,150 in cash. It was estimated that the amount needed to cover the necessary alterations and repairs together with the purchase price, would be £4,500. The Baptists offered £4,000, a private investor, E. Ray, £200 and the remainder was to be found by taking an overdraft at the Bank of

Van Diemen's Land. An interest rate of 6½% was payable on both loans.

The main figure in these negotiations was the treasurer of the Baptist Union, Dr. Benjafield,<sup>6</sup> who had three children at the Friends' School and was one of the school's staunchest supporters.

It was no wonder that this successful outcome to what had at first appeared to be an insuperable problem was hailed by William Benson as the result of Divine Guidance. It was in any case a remarkable and unexpected demonstration of confidence in the newly established school by the Baptist Church. The school started with no financial backing other than an annual grant of £120 for four years from London Yearly Meeting and pledges of support from a few local Friends of very moderate means. Its founders were now to embark on a major project and to invest a large sum of money in its future. The loan was negotiated on the personal guarantee of nine Friends, who constituted the local committee.<sup>7</sup> These nine Friends were the trustees who were personally liable for any debts the school contracted.

This we did upon the security of the committee's guarantee. None of us can afford to lose the amount, but the property seemed likely to improve rather than deteriorate in price; and *we had*<sup>8</sup> *faith in the ultimate success of the school.*

The school therefore was able to move forward because of the confidence which non-Friends showed in the Society of Friends and particularly in the integrity of the nine Friends who personally guaranteed the school.

---

6. See p. 115 above.

7. See p. 104 above.

8. J.F.M.'s underlining in a letter to Foster Green, 20 December 1890, F4/5, T.U.A.

The other important factor in the school's development was the continuing substantial support of English Friends, a support both moral and "metallic", as Ransome called it when he was explaining to Mather how he had written to over a hundred Friends in England asking them for their "metallic sympathy".<sup>9</sup> Without that help Hobart Friends would not have been able to carry out any building program on the new site in Commercial Road. The transfer had been effected in time for the opening of school in 1889 and Mather soon realized that a considerable building program was necessary. He confided to Ransome his own concept of that program and asked him to explore the possibility of attracting help from English Friends with capital expenditure. He emphasized that the school was seeking help not with current expenses but with capital development. He pointed out however that if arrangements could be made for English Friends to take over the mortgage, there would be a considerable saving to the school in interest payments. This would then enable more substantial reductions to be given to children of Friends.

In 1891 a committee of ten influential members of London Yearly Meeting issued a three-page appeal to the Society of Friends in England seeking substantial financial support for the school. The school was commended in the appeal for being self-supporting in the matter of current expenses, and for its influence both on Friends as the "Ackworth of Australasia" and on the community "far beyond the borders of our

---

9. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 11 June 1891, F4/5, T.U.A.

10. The Balance Sheet for 1890 - set out in full on page 52 of J.F.M. *Letterbook*, Vol.I, F4/5, T.U.A. - showed that interest at the rate of six and a quarter per cent was being paid on mortgage and eight per cent on overdraft.

Society".<sup>11</sup> Accompanying extracts from the letters of four Friends who had visited the school also testified to this influence.

There were two specific objectives for the appeal, first to raise an amount of £1,500 to £2,000 to finance an immediate building program, which would provide for two gymnasia, a sanatorium, class rooms and boarding amenities; second to put it into the heart of "some dear Friend blessed with wealth and a desire to use it for the good of others and the Master's glory" to offer to take over the mortgage held by the Baptist Union. There was even the slightest hint of a twinge of conscience here that the Baptists had had to come to the rescue. In spite of one Friend turning down the appeal with the explanation, "We feel just a little jealous of money being drawn out of our poor country for educational purposes when our own institutions need it so much", the response was most heartening. Over £1,500 came from English and Irish Friends, and about £50 from Friends in Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart.

It was also encouraging for Mather to have a visit from Dr. Benjafield who offered an additional loan of £500 to the school without further security. The immediate problem of finding money for an urgent building program had thus been solved by the combined support of English Friends, Australian Friends and non-Friends.

In the meantime the search for an English Friend to take over the mortgage from the Baptists continued. The offer was not long in coming. Charles Holdsworth, Ransome's mainstay on the Continental

---

11. Special Appeal on Behalf of Friends' School Hobart, Tasmania, May 1891, London, F.H.A.L.

12. Henry T. Mennell, to E.R.R, 12 December 1890, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

Committee and his successor eventually as correspondent with Mather, wrote to Mather to tell him that his uncle, James Smith Holdsworth, then travelling in America, was willing to make available £4,500 at four and a half per cent, interest payable half-yearly, free of colonial taxes, to enable the school to pay off the Baptist Union. Apparently Holdsworth had some difficulty persuading his uncle that this was a satisfactory investment for, he said, "a mortgage on a school at the other side of the world is not a thing to run after much at four and a half per cent interest."<sup>13</sup>

Two other unexpected amounts became available. In the previous year a school founded by James Backhouse in the Cape Colony was sold and the proceeds of approximately £400 were invested in the Hobart School by the English trustees. Ransome was again the prime mover in recommending to the trustees that Hobart was the appropriate beneficiary in view of James Backhouse's link with the foundation of the Hobart Meeting in 1833.<sup>14</sup> The annual interest of twelve pounds was refunded each year through Ransome as a contribution to the school's science equipment and library. The second amount came in the form of a legacy from a Hobart resident, R. Corsnip Smith, previously unknown to the school, except for his reputation as a "Hobart miser". Mather then discovered that he lived on the route that Friends' boarders took to attend Meeting at the Meeting-house in Murray Street and that they had been in the habit of passing on a friendly greeting to him. Mather acknowledged this unsought legacy "from one in no way connected with our Society" as "evidence of a very good feeling towards the

---

13. C.J.H. to J.F.M., 23 February 1893, F/2, T.U.A.

14. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 7 April 1892, F4/1, T.U.A.

institution."<sup>15</sup> The extent of help received from English Friends was revealed in a summary made by Mather of loans and donations up to the end of 1900 (see Appendix 1). The major part of this help was a loan of £5,000, named the Australasian Fund. This loan was initiated by a gift to the Fund of £1,400 in 1898 by an English Friend, Hannah Priscilla Peckover, and a further gift of £1,000 made a year later by her to raise the total of the Fund to £5,000. On the 1 December 1899 the trustees of the Australasian Fund offered this amount as a loan to the school at an interest rate of three and a half per cent per annum. On the 31 December 1899 the Holdsworth mortgage was paid off, and on 24 March 1900 the remaining small mortgage of £500 from the Stevens' estates was discharged.

The school benefited in two ways. The marked reduction in interest charges brought an immediate reduction in the school's recurrent expenditure. The interest paid by the school to the Fund was then channelled back to the school to be used to help parents of Friends who wanted their children to attend the school as boarders. Two methods of assistance were offered. Travelling expenses from home to school and return once a year were met from the Fund, and help was available for those Friends who needed a reduction of fees to make it possible for their children to attend. Applications for such reductions were to be directed to the trustees of the Fund. Any surplus accruing

---

15. J.F.M., Annual Report of Friends' School 1893, *Letterbook*, Vol.I, p.142 F4/5, T.U.A.

The value of the legacy was much reduced because a proportion of the shares was in the Bank of Van Diemen's Land, which failed in the depression of 1892. R. Corsnip Smith had meant to leave the school £1,500, but ultimately the legacy was worth only just over £200, the interest on this amount being allocated to an annual bursary.

to the Fund after meeting these expenses was returned to the school by the trustees to help with sundry unexpected items of school expenditure.

By the end of the century the school was in a sound financial position. Not only had it acquired a valuable property, carried out extensive alterations and additions to buildings, improved the standard of boarding and staff accommodation, but with the help of the Australasian Fund it had paid off the mortgages by which this decade of development had been financed. (For summary of buildings, income and expenditure, see Appendix 2.) It had also weathered the storms of a severe financial depression and maintained a steady enrolment of students in spite of such hazards as epidemics. The annual balance sheet provided proof to Friends in England that the school could make income and expenditure tally closely and that it was not therefore likely to be a drain on Yearly Meeting funds. The confidence of the non-Friend community in the school had also been demonstrated and the Australasian Fund represented an endowment which enabled the school to serve more effectively the needs of the scattered community of Friends in Australia and New Zealand.

The most serious difficulties facing the school came from problems of staffing. The rapid growth in numbers in the first two years of the school's existence caught the school committee unprepared and soon brought home to Friends the practical difficulty of relying upon English Friends to supply Friend teachers at short notice from halfway around the globe.

The original members of the teaching staff were Samuel Clemes and Margaret Irvine, the former appointed on the recommendation of



the English sub-committee of the Continental Committee of London Yearly Meeting, the latter a local Tasmanian teacher. Margaret Irvine's letter of appointment was dated 11 January 1887 and signed by Francis Mather. Her salary was to be forty pounds a year with an assurance that the committee would grant an increase as soon as the school was in a position to do so.<sup>16</sup> Henrietta Pierce, a daughter of a member of the school committee, John Pierce, was engaged as an apprentice teacher to help Margaret Irvine with the younger pupils. By the second term of 1887 numbers had almost doubled and an additional teacher was required immediately. A.G. Mason was appointed and began duties on 5 May, but he was soon the subject of a formal complaint from the committee to the principal. Francis Mather asked Samuel Clemes to enquire into two matters causing disquiet and to report back to the following meeting of the committee.<sup>17</sup> The first complaint was that A.G. Mason had not followed instructions that formal religious teaching should be the responsibility of the principal<sup>18</sup> and that on two occasions he had departed from the subject-matter of his lessons, first to give an account of the sayings and doings of the Salvation Army and second to discuss spiritualist seances with his class. A further complaint was that he could not maintain order and discipline in his classes. A.G. Mason left at the end of the year. This experience emphasized the committee's problem of recruitment of suitable staff.

---

16. J.F.M. to Margaret Irvine, 11 January 1887, F4/5, T.U.A.

Margaret Irvine remained on the school staff for thirty-eight years until her retirement from teaching in 1925. She died in Launceston on 8 October 1932. See also p. 226 below.

17. J.F.M. to S.C., 28 July 1887, F4/5, T.U.A.

18. See p. 118 above.

For the solution Mather looked first to help from English Friends. The procedures followed in the appointment of the first assistant-teacher to come out from England, George Clark, illustrated the difficulties inherent in the expectation that the Friends' School Hobart could be satisfactorily staffed from a distance of 13,000 miles combined with a communication lag of six to eight weeks by letter. Clemes wrote to Ransome on 11 October 1887<sup>19</sup> notifying him that the school was growing so fast that staffing could not keep pace with growth. The Chairman of the School committee, Joseph Mather, followed this up by seeking the help of Edwin Ransome in finding a suitable young Friend as a teacher for the Hobart school. On 5 January 1888 Edwin Ransome advised Joseph Mather that in answer to an advertisement placed in *The English Friend* a young Manchester Friend, George Clark, had asked for information. In reply to him Ransome had made it quite clear where responsibility for appointment of staff lay - in Hobart, not in London: "I told him all I could and advised him to write either to Samuel Clemes or to the secretary of your committee, informing him that the school was entirely under your care and management ... If there is anything we can do in the matter, let us know and we will do our best."<sup>20</sup>

In the meantime Clark's enquiry had reached Hobart and Francis Mather's request to Ransome to interview George Clark on the Hobart committee's behalf<sup>21</sup> had crossed with Ransome's letter of 5 January 1888. Clemes had expressed satisfaction with Clark's testimonials and Ransome was now asked to arrange to interview Clark and if everything

---

19. S.C. to E.R.R., 11 October 1887, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

20. E.R.R. to J.B.M., 5 January 1888, MS. Box 22(2), F.H.A.L.

21. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 4 February 1888, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

was in order an engagement was to be finalised. The salary was to be ninety pounds per annum but Ransome had discretionary power to raise this to one hundred pounds. Clark was to find his own passage money but this would be refunded if he remained two years at the School. Ransome confirmed that the sub-committee consisting of Isaac Sharp, Joseph Braithwaite and himself had interviewed Clark and been favourably impressed, but that Clark's date of departure would depend on an early release from a commitment he had made to tutoring a "young gentleman" for matriculation at Harrow.<sup>22</sup> Clark left for Tasmania on 7 May 1888 and was therefore able to commence teaching at the beginning of the second half-year. This arrival was timely, for the teacher, R. Hogan, who had been engaged locally to replace A.G. Mason, went to Melbourne at the end of the second term on vacation and left a message to say he would not be returning. The time taken from the initiation of negotiations to the actual commencement of duties was approximately nine months, even though this was a straightforward case with only one applicant and no obstacles raised at either end of the long line of communication.

Clark's background was typical for a young Friend teacher in the latter half of the nineteenth century. He had himself been a student at Sidcot Friends' School from 1873 to 1877, was apprenticed as a teacher at the same school from 1879 to 1881. He transferred to the Flounders' Institute near Ackworth at York to train as a teacher for two years and then returned to teach at Sidcot from 1883 to 1885. He left again to take his Bachelor of Arts degree at London University in 1887, and after a few months filling in time as a tutor, accepted

---

22. E.R.R., to J.F.M. 11 April 1888, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

an appointment in Hobart.<sup>23</sup> What was not typical was Clark's reason for being interested in a position in Hobart. He was a grandson of the Robert Lindsey who had travelled "under concern" to the Australian colonies in the fifties with Frederick Mackie.

Clark's 'curriculum vitae' was typical too of what was considered to be at that time the normal preparation for the teaching profession among Friends. The basic training was through apprenticeship, generally at the school where the apprentice had been a student. In 1845 Benjamin Flounders established a Trust Fund<sup>24</sup> to train Friends as teachers. The first course was offered in 1848. The content of the courses was academic rather than professional and students were encouraged to prepare for London matriculation examinations. It was usual for students to spend at least one year at the Flounders' Institute and if possible one or two further years there, not necessarily consecutively. In the years 1870-1898 no less than eleven of the Friend teachers who came out to teach in Hobart had been students at the Flounders' Institute, five of them being future headmasters of The Friends' School Hobart.<sup>25</sup>

---

23. George Clark remained on the staff of Friends' School Hobart longer than any of his English contemporaries. He resigned in 1901 to become principal of Wagga Grammar School. He left Wagga after thirteen years, taught in a number of Victorian schools and then undertook private tutoring. He died in Melbourne in 1944.

24. James Backhouse was one of the nine trustees who signed the trust deed on 25 November 1845.

25. The list of Flounders' scholars, later teaching in Hobart, was as follows: (headmasters marked with x)  
1870 x Samuel Clemes (his father had been a foundation scholar of the Institute in 1848).

1873	Benjamin Le Tall	1886 x	Edmund Innes Gower
1877	John William Dixon	1887	George Frederick Linney
1881	George Eddington Clark	1890 x	John Edgar Smith
1884	John Francis Hills	1898 x	Ernest Ewart Unwin
1885	Charles Sowden	1898 x	Godfrey John Williams

English Friend teachers themselves, in the Annual Conference of the Friends' Guild of Teachers in 1901, reviewed the three different components of teacher-preparation - apprenticeship, institute professional courses, university degrees. They strongly supported the apprenticeship system as being the most important. They stated that it was just as essential a part of a headmaster's work to train apprentices as to teach children.

Clemes was clear that this was one of his responsibilities. He had expressed the hope that the school ultimately would be able to build up its own staff from young Australian Friends trained under an apprenticeship scheme in the Hobart school. In 1887 he had engaged Henrietta Pierce as an apprentice teacher and she remained on the staff for eleven years until she left in 1897 to teach in her aunt's school in Colchester, England. In 1889 Clemes accepted two more young Friends as apprentices, Mary Robson from South Australia and Alfred Propsting from Tasmania. Neither remained beyond a few months, because of unsuitability for teaching. Special concessions of free tuition were made in the case of Mary Robson, because the committee felt her presence would encourage Adelaide Friends to take an interest in the school, but Alfred Propsting left after a few months' trial as a part-time teacher because his father could not afford to pay for a further half-year's fees.

Mather initially had a high expectation of English Friend teachers trained along the lines indicated above in the case of Clark. A degree was not considered the most important qualification, though it was given added weight as the school continued to attract senior students and became more deeply involved in preparation for public

examinations. Indeed Mather was critical of one of the English Friend teachers, who though he had done his work well in the school and was a good disciplinarian, hence satisfying one of Mather's main criteria of a good teacher, was not sympathetic to higher education and, according to Mather, made no effort to improve himself by further studies. "As far as education is concerned," Mather wrote, " he acts as one who has made his fortune and retired."<sup>26</sup> By 1896 academic qualifications of staff had become an important feature of school advertising in the local press. Clemes, however, had no degree, but at no time did Hobart Friends express any regrets at this, because they held him in such high esteem for his qualities of character, his strength as a Friend and his practical experience as a teacher. When Mather was writing to ask Ransome for further help he indicated that someone with at least Clark's academic credentials was needed to cope with senior classes.

Two requirements were constantly emphasized by Mather. A teacher coming from England had to be a good disciplinarian and a loyal Friend. An incompetent teacher would only become a burden on the committee. He admitted that salaries offered in Tasmania would not be likely to attract Friends who were being paid better salaries in the English Friends' schools, but he added:

Quite other considerations have influenced those Friends who have already undertaken the work. If there has not been with each one something of the nature of a religious concern, there has been the desire to benefit the Society of Friends by helping to build up a system of education more in accordance with the instincts of the Society of Friends than has been attainable here; and to forward the work of education generally, by striking out in directions which have

---

26. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 10 March 1894, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

hitherto been closed by the traditions of men - the free air of the colonies making easy in this respect that which is at present well-nigh impossible in England ... To the young and strong whose earnest desire is the benefit of their fellow-man, reward such as this is beyond monetary inducement. <sup>27</sup>

Ability to maintain discipline was repeatedly stressed by Mather, particularly when he was briefing Ransome concerning the sort of woman teacher needed to deal with "colonial children".

Thou hast already been made aware that our woman teacher will have to instruct both boys and girls; and I may also add that colonial children have the character of being more difficult to manage than their English compeers. Therefore however good the attainments, unless a young woman is possessed of an enduring patience, a readiness of manner and a kind yet firm demeanour, there is no chance of her being successful in Hobart Friends' School.<sup>28</sup>

Mather pinned his hopes for the future of the Society of Friends in Australia on the success of The Friends' School Hobart. The success of this school was to be measured in terms of the embodiment in its life of the principles of the Society of Friends, and depended primarily in his view on the quality and witness of the Friend teachers chosen in England for the Hobart school. This was the reason why Mather took such trouble to brief Ransome, on whom lay the quite heavy responsibility of interviewing and recommending applicants in England. With the passing of the years Mather appeared to become more demanding and the members of his English committee perhaps more exasperated at not being able to recommend teachers for appointment who would measure up to Mather's expectations. Clemes was the yardstick of reference for

---

27. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 20 August 1889, F4/5, T.U.A.

28. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 1 October 1889, F4/5, T.U.A.

Mather's image of the type of Friend teacher he wanted for Hobart because Clemes had undertaken the task with a strong sense of concern as a Friend.

During the fourteen year period 1887 to 1900<sup>29</sup> seven men and seven women came out from England. Of these two were lost by death,<sup>30</sup> one married, ten resigned after limited periods of service and only one, Clark, remained throughout the period.

It could be said with some justification on this evidence that staffing the school with English teachers was not a success. Even by 1891 both Clemes and Mather were openly expressing their doubts. Clemes let slip in a letter to Ransome his view of one of the reasons for this lack of success. "The teachers hailing from Ackworth," he said, "seem rather inclined to expect too much from a new institution, but I hope we shall continue to keep these satisfied until we can train a few teachers of our own."<sup>31</sup> This comment was directed against a small group of Ackworthians who might well have had cause to feel disgruntled with the change they had been encouraged to make, from the security of an established school like Ackworth to the uncertainties of a colonial experiment in Friends' education.

Mather's view was that Friend teachers coming from England found the predominantly day-school in Hobart a different proposition from the English Friends' boarding-schools where parents "hand over children almost body and soul to teachers." In a day-school, he said,

---

29. See Appendix 3.

30. Annie Tanner who had come from Ackworth in March 1889 to take the position of school housekeeper, died in an influenza epidemic in 1891 and Charles Sowden was drowned in the Derwent while yachting in 1897.

31. S.C. to E.R.R., 18 May 1891, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.



"parents allow children to be judges of their teachers" and as a result English teachers find "Australian children think for themselves too much."<sup>32</sup> This view was also expressed by Le Tall in one of his reports written to the *Natural History Journal*. With his background of the boarding-school at Bootham he was not well-disposed to day-scholars. "A mixed day-school and boarding-school," he wrote, "has its disadvantages: - day-scholars staying from school to cut thistles, to go picnics, to avoid rain-storms, etc. : every tittle-tattle passing promptly to a parent's ear; want of oversight in evening lesson-work, etc." (*Natural History Journal*, March 1894, p.18). He conceded however that the day-scholars provided a financial contribution and that their numbers made class grading possible.

Ackworth had a strong Friends' influence among staff and a high proportion of boarders were members of the Society. Friends' School Hobart provided a marked contrast where, because of the predominance of non-Friends among both staff and students, a greater responsibility rested upon English Friend teachers - as Mather kept reiterating - to represent and promote the principles of Friends actively in Hobart. He expressed his disappointment to Ransome that Friend teachers, though Quakers by birth and educated in Quaker schools, did not take a more active part in the Friends' Meeting once they came to Hobart. He rather unfairly compared them with the bird species of starlings, which he said were imported to the colonies because of their supposed "birth" characteristic of leaving fruit untouched, but perversely on arrival in the adopted land they became addicted to fruit and  
 carry mulberries on to the chimney-tops to

---

32. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 30 April 1892, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

let them fall down and spoil the look of the fire-irons and the hearth-stone. There are some imported men who are like the imported bird, only that they spoil out tempers instead of our hearth-stones. The typical man of this class thinks that because he comes from England he is to set everyone right - tells how everything is done where he came from etc. and measuring himself against these men he works with thinks himself a better man because he has just come from England.<sup>33</sup>

Mather tended to give vent on paper to moments of annoyance and frustration and then to regret what he had written. He therefore qualified his "starling" analogy by agreeing that they should be thankful for what they had been given, yet hopeful that the staff the school was about to receive from England would be chosen as carefully as Clemes had been chosen, namely as "ministers liberated for gospel service".

Clemes' serious illness in 1890<sup>34</sup> brought home to the committee how much the school depended on him. For this reason the committee wanted Ransome to look for a Friend who could support Clemes in the specific Friends' work in the school and in the Meeting, could stand in for him in case of illness, and join with him in training staff from young Friends and from the school's own old scholars.

Mather was coming to realize that in view of the impossibility of getting staff from England at a moment's notice, the only staffing plan likely to succeed was that of building up Australian staff from those who had been trained in the ways of the school. This was also the sentiment expressed by Clemes in a letter to Ransome after his

---

33. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 2 July 1892, F4/5, T.U.A.

34. See pages 171-172 below.

illness. He declared that he was looking forward to some old scholars coming forward for training as teachers. This last source of supply would reduce dependence upon imports from abroad.

It seems likely that this problem of staffing was one of the major points of discussion when the English Friend, Alfred Wright, a member of the deputation of 1875,<sup>35</sup> revisited the school in 1891. There is evidence that Wright discussed staffing difficulties not only with members of the Hobart committee but with parents and particularly with Dr. Benjafield, the school doctor, and one of the most prominent non-Friend parents. Wright had been tackled by Dr. Benjafield and asked why Friends had not sent out better teachers to Hobart. Wright's answer, according to Dr. Benjafield, was that English Friends did not realize that such high qualifications of scholarship were required in the colony. The second reason given was that the Hobart committee did not pay high enough salaries. Dr. Benjafield told Mather that the clue to improvement in the quality of teaching lay in increase of salaries. To this Mather made a spirited reply, stating first that the committee must work within the limits of its budget and not "go beyond its tether", that while the committee would try to give just remuneration to its teachers any teachers of worth considered other things more important than pay. Mather concluded: "Dr. Benjafield would not have it that people do ordinary work in the spirit of a missionary; so after a few words we parted."<sup>36</sup>

In reporting to English Friends on his visit to the school in Hobart Wright listed the serious disadvantages of the school as being

---

35. See pp. 80-82 above.

36. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 28 May 1892, F4/5, T.U.A.

high interest rates on mortgages, inadequate classroom and gymnasium accommodation and "teaching staff having to be fetched from England and they, necessarily strange to colonial ways and customs needing to get accustomed to these and to a very different climate from that of England."<sup>37</sup>

There were several direct results of the discussions that had taken place in Hobart. Ransome was asked to concentrate his search for the right Friend to come out as a support for Clemes. In Hobart, however, the accent was now shifting to the importance of attracting teachers of good qualifications from Australian sources. Mather spoke highly of teachers such as James Hebblethwaite,<sup>38</sup> and Harry Kingsmill.<sup>39</sup> Both these teachers came to fill gaps which could not be filled at short notice from England. Benson reported to Ransome that Mather had taken quite a liking to Hebblethwaite and that he was "quietly indoctrinating him in Friendly literature and habits of thought."<sup>40</sup> This should not be regarded as more than a friendly

---

37. Letter dated 10 April 1891 to the Editor of *The Friend*, 1 July 1891, p. 1921.

38. James Hebblethwaite lectured in English at the Harris Institute, Preston, England, before coming out to Tasmania in 1890. He joined The Friends' School staff in 1891 and taught English and physical drill until 1894 when he retired to devote himself to writing. His first novel, *Castle Hill*, was published in London in 1895 and the Hobart *Mercury* published his first book of poetry under the title, *Verse*, in 1896. He later became rector of the Woodbridge parish in Southern Tasmania and remained there until his death in 1921. For an account of his literary work see Miller, 1873, Vol.I, pp. 220-221.

39. H.C. Kingsmill taught mathematics at The Friends' School for the first half of 1892. Previously he had been mathematics master at Christ College in Hobart. He lectured on surveying and became government meteorologist in 1892 when he left The Friends' School.

40. William Benson to E.R.R., 12 January 1891, MS. Box 16, F.H.A.L.

comment, for there is no evidence that Mather or any other member of the school committee at any time exerted any direct pressure on non-Friend teachers to become members of the Society. He might have erred indeed in the opposite direction by reticence. He was a shrewd observer of people and a sound judge of a person's capacity to teach, and, as difficulties mounted for the policy of staffing the school at a distance from England, his respect increased for non-Friend teachers attracted to the staff for educational reasons. Though he maintained his insistence on the importance of a nucleus of well-concerned Friends he recognized that the school would depend increasingly on the service of non-Friend teachers recruited from sources nearer at hand. He summed up this view in these words to Ransome:

Respecting the engagement of a teacher I would like to emphasize what I have previously communicated to thee, that it is of *first* importance that he should be what we term a well-concerned Friend. A young man whose membership means little more than family connection is an occasion of weakness rather than of strength ... On the other hand a man of *different* religious beliefs, who feels himself under some outward bond of union, is careful to show all the respect in his power to those who employ him. Therefore an outsider is to be preferred to a member of our Society who is not strongly attached to our principles. <sup>41</sup>

A third result of the discussions was to encourage likely old scholars to consider taking up teaching as a career. In 1895 three old scholars were engaged as apprentice-teachers, C.F. Fryer, the first science graduate at the University of Tasmania, Amy Elliott and Mary Clemes. This was a significant move towards the objective Clemes had foreshadowed previously. <sup>42</sup>

---

41. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 23 June 1892, F4/5, T.U.A.

42. See p. 160 above.

It should not be concluded from this account of the difficulties which faced the school in relying upon English Friend teachers to staff the school that the committee was therefore blaming Ransome and his committee for any lack of judgment in making their selection. A great amount of time and effort was taken by these English Friends in advertising, making enquiries and indeed in hunting up sometimes a single applicant. Tasmania because of its isolation was still regarded as being almost on another planet and even its climate, according to Wright's comment quoted above,<sup>43</sup> was not regarded as a sufficient reason to leave the security of home. Mather, wanting to reassure Wright that he fully understood the difficulties Ransome faced in acting on behalf of Hobart Friends and of a school he had never seen, wrote: "I do not wish to throw back upon our kind friends the onus of not having teachers that we needed, for I know that it was difficult to obtain teachers to come to Hobart and that they did the best for us that could be done at the time."<sup>44</sup>

Mather's disappointment was due perhaps to his placing undue weight on what he considered the lack of real support from English Friend teachers for the concerns of the Hobart Meeting. He was critical of them, for example, because they did not necessarily attend Meeting for Worship unless they were on duty accompanying boarders or because they did not share in the responsibilities of the Monthly Meeting. In his view it was not sufficient for them to be Friends: they must be seen to be Friends. And yet he was equally insistent that the main force of Friends' influence was through personal example, and

---

43. See p. 167 above.

44. J.F.M. to Alfred Wright, 22 April 1892, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

there was no reason to doubt that the personal influence of these Friends in the early years of the school's history did much to develop that spirit of community which became such an important quality of the school under Clemes' leadership.

The school prospered in its first decade beyond the expectations of its founders and in spite of difficulties of accommodation, finance and staff shortcomings. The following decade brought a much more critical threat to the survival of the school.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE ANATOMY OF A CRISIS

The years 1899-1900 witnessed a serious crisis in the affairs of the school.

The crisis threw into relief a number of important questions, such as the relationship of the Principal to the School Committee and of that Committee both to the Hobart Monthly Meeting and to London Yearly Meeting. It was a crisis which concerned primarily the school's group of Friend teachers and their relationship to the Principal, Samuel Clemes. Some indication of the extent of the threat to the school's stability at this time may be judged from the fact that in the year 1900, of the nine members of the Society of Friends on the staff, only one, George Clark, remained at the end of the year and he left shortly afterwards to establish a grammar-school in Wagga, New South Wales.

A dispute which began with a personal difference between Clemes and two Friend teachers soon involved the position of Clemes himself. How was it that Clemes, to whom the school owed so much and whose influence the school committee valued so highly, left the school in June 1900 and established his own school in the latter part of that year?

There were several significant factors which led the school committee to decide reluctantly that Clemes should withdraw from the position of principal. The first concerned Clemes' state of health. The Committee's anxiety stemmed from a serious illness from which he



had suffered in 1890 and which kept him out of the school for almost the whole year. According to a member of the school committee, William Benson,<sup>1</sup> some oddness of behaviour had first been observed in class, but one day in February 1890, when he was on a Hobart wharf saying goodbye to some friends, he became noticeably ill. Margaret Clemes and her daughter Mary immediately sought the help of Francis Mather and Joseph Neave to get him home to bed. For a fortnight the illness took a very serious turn. Samuel Clemes became so violent that Margaret Clemes was not able to control him and two Friends, Mather and Neave, arranged for a roster of Friends to watch over him night and day. Mather, who was constantly at his bedside during this critical part of his illness, told Ransome that when Clemes suffered an outbreak of "uncontrollable paroxysms it took five persons to get him into the wet pack."<sup>2</sup> The doctor came two to three times a day; two women and one man nursed him during the day and for a fortnight Mather and Neave shared the night watches. It was not until the end of May that there was an assurance of recovery. Samuel and Margaret Clemes were sent off to Kelvedon to recuperate.

Dr. Benjafield, the school doctor, diagnosed the complaint as inflammation of the brain, though not in a form liable to cause permanent brain damage. He thought the cause might have been some infection, possibly a typhoid germ, caught when Clemes had been in Melbourne. During the summer vacation he had attended a social science congress in Melbourne where cases of typhoid had been reported. He had been upset by the heat and by a paper on the Malthusian theories of

---

1. William Benson to E.R.R., 2 April 1890, MS. Box 22(3), F.H.A.L.

2. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 2 April 1890, MS. Box 22(3), F.H.A.L.

population growth and was busy drafting a reply to these theories when he was taken ill. Benson's view was that illness had been brought on by overwork and overstrain, the last straw being the emotional upset caused by the paper on Malthusian theory. Benson therefore urged that Clemes should give up some of his outside interests, such as the Temperance Movement, to conserve his energies and give him more time for school responsibilities. He had written to Ransome to enlist his help in persuading Clemes to this line of action.<sup>3</sup> When Ransome urged Clemes to take things more easily and give his active mind a rest, Clemes assured him that he would withdraw from some of his duties as a class teacher and become "more of a superintendent",<sup>4</sup> but no reference was made to withdrawing from any of his outside activities.

The illness of Clemes in 1890 had two effects. The school suffered financially. Boarders had to be found alternative temporary accommodation; there was some loss of students; the expenses of medical and nursing attention and of temporary help both in the school and in the house upset the slender surplus in the school budget. The crisis also revealed how much the success of the school depended on the health of the principal. Throughout the year 1890 there was a general gloom amongst members of the Society of Friends both in Tasmania and in England. Clemes' illness had come as a severe shock to them and they feared for the future of the school. They confessed to being greatly discouraged. Mather saw how necessary it was to safeguard the principal's health and the school's future by seeking the

---

3. William Benson to E.R.R., 19 May 1890, MS. Box 22, F.H.A.L.

4. S.C. to E.R.R., 17 August 1890, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

help of English Friends in finding a Friend teacher from England who could support Clemes and who could be given authority to lead the school in the event of Clemes' further absence through illness. Mather acknowledged that the school was greatly helped by the loyalty of the staff. He paid special tribute to John Dixon, an Ackworth teacher, who had arrived with his wife and family only a few weeks before Samuel Clemes was taken ill.<sup>5</sup> "It is a relief," he said, "having a good disciplinarian like J.W. Dixon. We hardly know what we would have done without him. He gives a very good tone to the school and the boys like him. At a time when we have some complaints as regards lack of discipline it is well to be sure of some one."<sup>6</sup> At the same time Mather flinched from taking the step of giving Dixon authority by appointing him acting-principal. He was afraid that this might upset the other English Friend teacher, Clark, who had some priority by reason of his earlier appointment to the staff.

The strain on Mather during the year had been considerable. He had borne a lot of the responsibility for looking after Clemes and for restoring his confidence during the long convalescence. A deep bond of friendship had grown up between them. Clemes was most appreciative of the way Friends had given him such devoted attention and spoke of Mather as a dear and trusted friend and brother. Mather was worried about any permanent effect that the illness might have had on Clemes' brain and realized that it might take some time for a full recovery. In answer to Ransome's expression of anxiety he tried to sound reassuring: "There is no need for despondency; a man's brains

---

5. John Dixon returned to England in 1894 to take up a business position on London.

6. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 20 July 1890, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

do not get built up again very rapidly."<sup>7</sup> But the strain left its mark in a nagging fear that the illness might recur and that the school might again be threatened by a period of uncertainty. This is why he made such persistent efforts to enlist the help of English Friends in recruiting senior staff. A year later Mather confided to Ransome his worries about the lingering effect of Clemes' illness:

To a superficial observer he appears to be in full possession of all the mental power which he previously had; but it is not really so. He is not yet capable of any mental strain, neither does his brain appear at present to grasp fully what is required of him at any particular time.<sup>8</sup>

He noted that Clemes did not have the same ability to cope with difficulties as formerly, that he was less able to maintain a continuous mental effort, slower to see what needed attention and more prone to lose his powers of self-command when opposed. Mather noted also that Clemes spoke sharply to Margaret Clemes, "which I did not remember seeing any signs of previously".<sup>9</sup>

In 1897 a yachting tragedy on the River Derwent was the first of the events which later in retrospect were regarded as having produced the kind of situation which might threaten Clemes' health. Charles Sowden, also from Ackworth, had joined the school staff on 23 October 1891 and had been not only a very popular teacher because of his wide out-of-school interests, including yachting, but a capable and strong resident master who had relieved Clemes of much of the anxiety and responsibility for the boy boarders. His death therefore in a yachting accident left a gap and created a potential trouble-spot,

---

7. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 20 December 1890, F4/5, T.U.A.

8. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 21 December 1891, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

9. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 4 March 1892, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

unless someone equally capable could be found to take his place.

The death of Sowden meant that Clemes began to feel "more tied to the place"<sup>10</sup> just when he was hoping to be relieved of some of the burden of responsibility. For this reason he urged Ransome to find a man who could be a "possible successor" to him in Hobart. It was in these circumstances that Le Tall remembered a former colleague of his at Bootham, John Francis Hills,<sup>11</sup> a Bachelor of Arts of London University and a teacher at Battersea Polytechnic. Le Tall recommended to Clemes that English Friends should be asked to interview Hills, for he thought Hills would be particularly suited not only to the task of teaching, but to the organization of games and after-school activities. Shortly after Hill's arrival Le Tall wrote to Ransome:

We have missed Charles Sowden sadly. I think the tone of the school has suffered. Truth, purity, kindness, industry, obedience have been somewhat less in vogue. There has been much discontent. Neither games nor natural history have flourished so well. But I hope much from my old friend, pupil and colleague. He has developed into an excellent disciplinarian. For his teaching powers, his love of both games and natural history and his character generally he is of great value here.<sup>12</sup>

---

10. S.C. to E.R.R., 20 February 1898, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

11. John Francis Hills was a student at Bootham 1882-1884, took his B.A. degree at London in 1886, taught as a junior teacher at Bootham 1886-1889, was assistant master at Penketh School 1890-91 and at Battersea Polytechnic until 1898 when he accepted the offer of appointment to the staff of The Friends' School, Hobart. In 1900 he married Alice Mitchell, a teacher who came out to Hobart earlier that year. They resigned in September 1900 and moved to South Australia where they started a school for boys. Later John Hills joined the South Australian Education Department and taught in State Schools until his retirement. In his later years he became very concerned with questions of Peace and frequently spoke at street corners on conscription and civil rights. He was a much valued member of the Adelaide Monthly Meeting of Friends. He died in 1948.

12. B. Le Tall to E.R.R., January 1899, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

Hills came out to Hobart under the impression that he was being groomed for the position ultimately of principal. Perhaps he was mistaken. Nevertheless Mather in letters to Ransome had given some indication of the Committee's lingering anxiety concerning Clemes' health and of its desire to have appointed to the staff a man of sufficient ability and strength of character to assume control of the school in the event of a recurrence of Clemes' illness. Clemes had also raised the same possibility in his letters of 20 February 1898<sup>13</sup> and 14 March 1898.<sup>14</sup>

On arrival Hills found that much more was expected of him in supervision of out-of-school activities than he had expected. He was critical of the lack of facilities for boys' games.

Games suffer from a playground too mountainous for scientific cricket or for really energetic football. Oh! to see it levelled and asphalted like the Ackworth one! What a dream full of longing! But rugged playgrounds seem the rule in Hobart.<sup>15</sup>

He was more critical of the lack of discipline which he said he had found amongst the boys. Tensions soon began to build up between Clemes and Hills, with Le Tall at first on the side-lines and then backing Hills' views. The focus of the dispute centred around certain incidents of what Hills considered to be unacceptable behaviour. He alleged that Clemes did not back him up, and that he even interfered and reversed decisions which he himself, Hills, had made.

Much deeper than these differences about matters of discipline was a basic disagreement in approach to education. In discussion with

---

13. MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

14. MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

15. Hills to E.R.R., 16 October 1898, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

Mather Clemes explained his inability to work with Hills and Le Tall:

These two men work on the old lines of making University exams. the main thing to be considered; with me the chief thing to be thought about is the character of the child: their control is obtained by severe methods and by terrorism, mine by appealing to the better nature: they are good teachers, I admit, but nothing else; they have no power to mould human character.<sup>16</sup>

The crisis brought out differences of objective and of method. Clemes had made no secret of his opposition to the tyranny of examinations and to teaching methods which he labelled 'cramming'. The greater the school's success in this field of public examinations the more he must have had to bottle up his distaste. Unconsciously perhaps the academic degrees of his two senior teachers and the status these degrees appeared to confer affected his relations with them and made him sensitive to any difference of approach to teaching or to discipline. Mather saw very clearly the differences in their concepts of the aims of education, with Hills and Le Tall accenting the importance of cultivating the intellect, Clemes of developing character. In discipline Samuel Clemes, Francis Mather said, relied on "moral suasion", Hills and Le Tall on "penal discipline".<sup>17</sup> But having affirmed that Clemes' strength lay in this very area of "moral suasion", Mather admitted that in the preceding two or three years Clemes had held to this in theory rather than in practice and that some laxity of discipline, some weakening of moral tone had been evident in the school.

Certain comments had been made by Clemes from time to time which led Mather and the committee to sense that he was anxious to be

---

16. J.F.M. to William May, 26 October 1899, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

17. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 1 December 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

relieved of the responsibility which was becoming the more onerous as the numbers in the school grew. Thus William May, a member of the school committee, recalled in 1900 that two years earlier Clemes had come out of a committee meeting with the words: "Well, friends, I give you my warning that before very long you must make arrangements to relieve me from the responsibility of carrying on this school. I shall not be able to go on with it much longer."<sup>18</sup> When they were at Wigton Samuel and Margaret Clemes' expectations of the school they were to establish in Tasmania were somewhat different from the school which actually developed under Australian conditions. They had been used to a small, intimate, family-style boarding community of not more than fifty to sixty boarders, most of whom were children of members of the Society of Friends. Samuel and Margaret looked forward to developing the same concept in the freer conditions of the colony unhampered by some of the limitations to experiment which existed in the more traditional setting of the English Friends' schools. Early in 1892 Clemes confided to Mather the hopes he and Margaret had had for the school when he accepted appointment to it. He told Mather that before deciding to come to Tasmania he had discussed the situation with Joseph Neave, who had told him that the school would probably be a small one of eighteen or so scholars - which was close to the estimate first given to Clemes by Mather<sup>19</sup> and that he would have time to run a poultry-farm on the side. Margaret Clemes had expected simply to have to keep house while Samuel taught. Margaret Clemes, who was present at this discussion, then made a significant remark to Mather: "She told me that she was sure that if either of them had had the slightest

---

18. William May to E.R.R., 5 April 1900, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

19. See p. 98 above.



premonition of what the school would grow to, they would have shrunk from the work from a feeling of incapacity for it."<sup>20</sup> This conversation occurred when the school, with a population of one hundred and thirty, had already grown to twice the numbers Samuel had had at Wigton and there were prospects too of the school population increasing further, and hence requiring from its principal more administration, and so less teaching and less personal contact with the students.

In motivation Clemes was as much missionary as teacher and, while the two vocations could and did converge harmoniously in his acceptance of the call to come to Hobart, there was the danger that friction developing in one area might well convince him that the other vocation had prior claim. It was therefore not surprising that, as Clemes felt the strains of teaching and particularly of administration becoming unbearable, he should begin to wonder whether he ought to offer himself for missionary service. Thus he wrote to Ransome: "I do not remember if I have owned to thee that of late I have been feeling very strongly that I have a service for the Australian Meetings that I should much like to feel free to undertake."<sup>21</sup> The development of this idea a month later revealed how much the possibility of this kind of change had been on his mind. "As I told thee in my last I have a growing feeling of concern for the help of these Australian Meetings and the scattered Friends in Tasmania. I am sure that in the right time the work here will be provided for and I shall be set free to carry out this concern."<sup>22</sup>

---

20. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 12 March 1892, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

21. S.C. to E.R.R., 20 February 1898, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

22. S.C. to E.R.R., 14 March 1898, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

It so happened that discussions in London Yearly Meeting in mid-1898 fanned this spark of concern. Members of London Yearly Meeting had had brought to their notice the "terrible isolation" of Australian Friends in their scattered Meetings and lonely individual outposts. One Friend evidently thought that conditions he had noted in Australia on a visit in the late convict era still prevailed. What had struck him was the godlessness of the colonists. "The whole of life moved on as if there were no God and no eternity" (*The Friend*, 38, 349). A Minute of Yearly Meeting was then recorded: "Should the way open in the Lord's ordering for a prolonged visit to our Friends in Australasia on the part of well-concerned Friends it would rejoice our hearts" (Proceedings of London Y.M., Mins., 24 May 1898).

Both Mather and Clemes reacted strongly against this Minute of Yearly Meeting. They questioned the value of such visits by English Friends and claimed that English backing of Australian Friends' concerns would be much more effective than sending out English Friends on a mission of doubtful value. Clemes wrote again to Ransome expressing his feeling that he should offer himself for the service of visiting scattered Friends. "I felt more and more convinced," he said, "that the best way of carrying out the concern that evidently lay on Friends' minds is not the way that seemed dominant there."<sup>23</sup> Having reassured Ransome that he had no intention simply of walking out of his duty at The Friends' School "until in the judgment of my friends here it is safe and proper to do so," he nevertheless again expressed his intentions of offering himself for the service which London Yearly Meeting was calling on its own members to consider, and he concluded:

---

23. S.C. to E.R.R., 15 August 1898, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

"I should like very much to see some possible successor ready to take up my work in the school. It is a very different task now from what lay before my dear wife and myself twelve years ago." Clemes put it to Ransome that the best way of carrying out the spirit of the Yearly Meeting Minute would be to find the right successor to himself and he would then be freed to carry out the ministry to scattered Friends with the financial backing of London Yearly Meeting. The irony of this request was that the Friend, Hills, who was sent out to bring this relief, came to be the one whom Clemes held mainly responsible as the cause of all the troubles which followed.

Clemes had already had two periods of absence from school "travelling in the ministry", the phrase used by Friends when one of their members, having expressed in Monthly Meeting a concern to render a particular pastoral service of visiting Friends, is "released" by united decision of the Meeting. In 1896 Clemes had travelled to the north-eastern part of Tasmania and on 7 October 1896 he reported to Hobart Monthly Meeting on the results of his visits to families in that area.<sup>24</sup> Early in 1897 Clemes was released to accompany Joseph Neave on a visit to country Friends at Sandford and on the East Coast,<sup>25</sup> and following his letters to Ransome in 1898 he again sought release to visit Friends. This time the Minute of Hobart Monthly Meeting was more comprehensive: "Our friend, Samuel Clemes, has informed us, at this time, of his desire to visit at various intervals and on repeated occasions those members of our Society who reside in other parts of the colony besides the Capital ... The Monthly Meeting unites in this

---

24. Hobart M.M. Mins., Min.3, 7 October 1896.

25. Hobart M.M. Mins., Min.1, 17 March 1897.

concern."<sup>26</sup> By the end of first term 1899 Clemes had already taken up his missionary role and begun periodic visiting. This necessitated his being absent from school for several days at a time. In this he felt that he was being encouraged by Ransome who had gone so far as to suggest to him that he might consider going to Rockhampton, where there were prospects of a Meeting being formed. Ransome had written: "If thou shouldst feel drawn to go there and be able to go, maybe thou might be a service in it."<sup>27</sup> Ransome however assured Mather that he had also told Clemes plainly that he "did not consider it a wise way of doing the Lord's work to run away from one job to another until the first was properly finished."<sup>28</sup> Clemes, in replying to Edwin Ransome's cautionary comment, said that he was determined not to go on long visits to the mainland until he was satisfied that his presence was not needed at the school.

The crisis was precipitated at Easter 1899 by a difference of opinion between Hills and Clemes on a question of discipline. This brought to a head a clash of personalities through a disagreement on methods and a mutual disillusionment - of Clemes with Hills because he seemed to resent being assigned supervision of out-of-school activities, when that was the express purpose for which Clemes had, on Le Tall's recommendation, brought Hills to the school, and of Hills with Clemes because Hills felt he had been appointed under false promises of senior teaching and a post of responsibility. Le Tall sided with his protégé. He too harboured some resentment because he felt Clemes had not given him the position of responsibility which he said he had been led to

---

26. Hobart M.M. Mins., Min. 1, 14 November 1898, T.U.A.

27. E.R.R. to S.C., 12 May 1899, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

28. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 23 June 1899, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

believe would be his. In a cyclostyled letter circulated amongst his friends in England and dated 5 August 1899<sup>29</sup> Le Tall had written: "They fear that the very serious mental illness, which Mr. Clemes suffered seven years ago and against a recurrence of which my coming out here was a precaution, may be returning." By the end of the second term of 1899 both senior men had sent in their resignations three times to the committee. The committee therefore could not fail to be aware of the staffing crisis, unpleasant as it was to have to admit that in a Friends' school teachers who professed adherence to Friends' principles could not even be friendly to each other. Ransome confessed to his astonishment and perplexity in a letter to Clemes: "It has been an object lesson to me that such a commotion should have taken place in a Friends' school above all others, where, notwithstanding our humanity, one would have expected something different."<sup>30</sup>

The dispute dragged on for over a year and its effects were felt for much longer.

By June 1899 the committee found itself faced with a major upheaval in senior staffing. Both Hills and Le Tall were acknowledged to be good teachers, Le Tall even as outstanding. He had come from Bootham with a reputation as a great scholar and teacher and Friends' old scholars taught by him in the nineties have echoed the memories of him which appeared in the Bootham Centenary volume 1823-1923. After referring to "the amazing eccentricities with which Le Tall's splendid genius as a teacher was frequently marred", the writer continued:

---

29. MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

30. E.R.R. to S.C., 24 January 1900, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

In spite of them it may be doubtful whether Bootham ever had a master who to the same degree brought out from his boys the best they had to give. The teaching of history and geography was revolutionised ... His joy in his chosen vocation was boundless.

(Pollard, 1926, p.102)

Mather, knowing from bitter experience the difficulties of replacing such teachers at short notice, recoiled from the action which Clemes demanded, namely that the resignations of Hills and Le Tall should be accepted. Clemes took the committee's refusal as a sign of weakness and of a breakdown in the committee's responsibility to back him as principal. Mather saw the refusal as a necessity if public confidence in the school was to be maintained and he feared this would be shaken if the academic staff was suddenly depleted. Mather also was hopeful that a solution could be worked out which would involve no resignations and thus safeguard the school.

The solution was thought to lie in persuading Clemes that the time had come for him to withdraw from active control and take more of a supervisory role in the affairs of the school. Mather expected Clemes' ready compliance because Clemes had made no secret of his wish to see his load lightened.

Even before the Easter precipitation of the crisis members of the committee had been aware that Clemes had not been his usual self. There had been instances of somewhat arbitrary and autocratic decisions on both staff and student matters and reports that his science and scripture lessons, which previously had been outstanding, had now become ragged and his remarks to students somewhat sarcastic.

The crisis unearthed an unexpected cause of disquiet. A doubt concerning the orthodoxy of Clemes' religious views must have been

worrying a few Friends for some time, but did not become known until later in the course of the dispute, particularly in February 1900 when the committee made the extraordinary decision that Clemes, if he was to remain as principal, must not teach the subject of religious instruction. There were two reasons for this hurtful decision.

The first was the fear that Clemes was unorthodox in his scripture lessons and in danger of unsettling students by teaching the "higher criticism". Mather reported that some parents were thinking of removing their children because Clemes introduced these new ideas into his lessons. "I said to Samuel Clemes that I thought he was mistaken in bringing the conclusion of the critics into his class lessons at school, but he replied that the truth should not be hidden."<sup>31</sup>

Clemes was clearly influenced by the ideas which circulated in the Manchester Conference of Friends in 1895 when Friends faced up to the impact of the contemporary controversies in religion and science and the effects of the higher criticism of the Bible upon the hitherto unquestioned beliefs of an evangelical Christianity. One of the leaders of this new thrust among Friends was J.W. Rowntree for whom the task was seen as no less than "to reconstruct our cosmogony".<sup>32</sup> Another leader was Rendel Harris. J.W. Hall, an uncle of Margaret Clemes, in correspondence with Charles Holdsworth during the heat of the crisis, recalled that he had been worried about Clemes' religious views as far back as the eighties when he returned from Madagascar, because "he had veered round ... to Rendel Harris' attitude to Christian truth".<sup>33</sup>

---

31. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 1 September 1900, F4/6, T.U.A.

32. Report on the Manchester Conference in *The Friend*, 22 November 1895, p. 755.

33. J.W. Hall to Charles Holdsworth, 6 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

The second reason was related to Clemes' responsibility to teach Friends' principles and testimonies in the school. Mather, who had had such confidence in Samuel Clemes as the expositor of Friends' principles and the centre of the school's witness as a Friends' school, began to be uneasy at what he took to be a lack of attention being given to teaching the testimonies of Friends on such matters as war, oaths and baptism. He claimed even that Clemes had sometimes been "jaunty" in his reference to Friends. And yet even Le Tall admitted that outside the school and in Meeting for Worship Clemes continued to "speak beautifully".<sup>34</sup> It seemed almost as if there were now two Samuel Clemes, the one who was no longer himself amidst the wranglings and worries of a school which looked as if it had outgrown him, and the other, the public figure, beloved by those who knew him as a valued minister in the Meeting, and respected by the people of Hobart as an educator and citizen.

There might well have been an inner religious conflict within Clemes himself, for there was the emotional and evangelical side of his nature which was often manifest in Meetings - even to the extent of weeping as he ministered, one Friend recalled; and there was his openness to the new truth as he saw it in his studies of science, particularly geology, and in his knowledge of the writings of Friends such as J.W. Rowntree and Rendel Harris. Mather did not identify this conflict as contributing to Samuel Clemes' emotional instability; he rather uncritically accepted the views of orthodox parents who were upset because Clemes appeared to adopt a modern approach to religious teaching.

---

34. Le Tall to English Friends, 21 December 1899, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.



Faced with open discord between senior members of staff and with evidence of what he took to be the increasing instability and unpredictability of Clemes himself, Mather came to the conclusion that the only thing that could account for the change in Clemes was that the symptoms which surrounded his illness in 1890 were again becoming apparent. In recommending the action to be taken he had two points uppermost in his mind - to protect the school from collapsing as the result of the threatened staff resignations and to protect Clemes from the onset of mental breakdown. Dr. Benjafield had warned members of the committee that unless they did something to relieve Clemes from his school worries he would not answer for the consequences to his health. The committee therefore decided that Samuel and Margaret Clemes should be given three months' leave, that steps should be taken to accommodate the Clemes family outside the school and that Clemes should be released from teaching. In July 1899 Dr. Benjafield forwarded a medical certificate to the committee confirming his advice.

This was the point where a serious breakdown of communications between the Clemes family and the committee began. The medical certificate was not shown to members of the family because Mather feared that it might further upset Clemes' delicate balance of health. Unfortunately however a copy was forwarded to Ransome and passed on to Margaret Clemes' uncle, J.W. Hall, to inform him of the grounds on which the committee had acted to relieve Clemes of some of his responsibilities. J.W. Hall in turn in a letter to Margaret Clemes gave the family the impression that Dr. Benjafield had declared Clemes to be unsound of mind. A further statement made by Dr. Benjafield on Clemes' state of health on his return from three months in Queensland did not bear out

this interpretation of Dr. Benjafield's diagnosis.

Now that Mr. Clemes has returned from his well-earned holiday (which in his worked-out condition three months ago I then considered absolutely necessary) I am glad to report that in every way he has greatly benefited. What I would now suggest is that he should be relieved from the worry consequent upon too close connection with the school and that he act as General Principal.<sup>35</sup>

Clemes and his family felt that there had been a conspiracy on the part of Hills and Le Tall to get rid of them and that the committee aided by Dr. Benjafield had abetted this conspiracy. Again the methods adopted by the committee aggravated rather than resolved the conflict. The committee's assessment of the situation was that the school was becoming too heavy a burden for Clemes, that the time had come to lighten his load and that alternative areas of service, such as ministry to Australian Meetings of Friends, should be found. This indeed was an alternative which they knew had been considered by Clemes himself. Instead of putting these views to Clemes at Easter when the trouble was first brewing, Mather did not reveal the committee's plans until Samuel and Margaret Clemes were away in Queensland and unavailable for consultation. The plans however were fully discussed with the "conspirators", Hills and Le Tall, but separately. Mather tended to consult people separately, rather than together. He found it easier to handle a difficult problem by discussing it with members of the school committee individually than by facing the whole committee. Although he did not mean to play off one against the other, this was sometimes the impression he gave. In this case he wrote an indiscreet letter to Hills on 26 June 1899 marked at the top "Private : kindly do

---

35. Statement signed by Dr. Benjafield, 28 October 1899, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

not to speak to anyone concerning the contents and return the paper to myself when thou next sees me" and ending with "kindly do not copy out any of the above before returning it to me".<sup>36</sup> Although Le Tall was to be equally involved in the management of the school, Mather started the letter to Hills with the words: "I write this letter lest thou may come to see me in company with B.B. Le Tall; for there are some matters which I now communicate to thee which at *present* I cannot let him know."<sup>37</sup> He then proceeded to tell Hills, who had been one of the main parties to the dispute, what the committee proposed to do about Clemes in his absence. He explained that the committee wanted to effect the alterations in his position in the school quietly and

without hurting the feelings of our Friends who have worked for the institution in its early stages. This feeling presses upon us the more, inasmuch as some of us are of the opinion that the unevenness of management and apparent inconsistencies are due to mental failure which shews itself whenever our Friend is worried or out of temper.

The proposed alterations were far-reaching in their implications. The Clemes family was to vacate the House by the end of the year and Clemes was to become non-resident principal presiding over what appeared to one English headmaster to be a 'republican' form of government. Le Tall was to be named vice-principal, responsible for curriculum, school discipline and allotment of staff duties. Hills was to be in charge of the boarder boys, and persons as yet unspecified were to be appointed to fill the two other executive positions in the House, senior mistress of girls and housekeeper.

It was a major error of judgment to communicate these changes

---

36. J.F.M. to J.F. Hills, 26 June 1895, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

37. J.F.M.'s underlining.

to Samuel and Margaret Clemes by letters which reached them only as they were returning through Sydney. The changes were presented as 'faits accomplis' and not as a basis for negotiation.

Separate letters were written by Mather to Samuel and Margaret Clemes. The one to Samuel was prefaced by a reminder of his oft-expressed intention of seeking relief from active work in the school, that to Margaret by a reminder of Samuel's previous breakdown and of the danger to his health from a "position where either much expenditure of brain power or much mental strain" was probable.<sup>38</sup> Mather had expected Margaret Clemes to be an ally in the cause of persuading Samuel to accept a much less responsible position. She had had the same fears as Mather of the likely effects of continuing worry on Samuel's health. Charges that Hills and Le Tall had made about her interference in the affairs of the house and of the school may have had some basis, but it was more likely that such activity was motivated by a desire to shield Samuel from worry, and sometimes from the results of wrong decisions made under emotional stress. The Clemes' daughters, Madge and Mary, who were shown the committee's plan by Mather before their parents returned and reported to have considered them "excellent", confirmed to him the view that the family, as well as the committee, had been worried about signs of strain in Samuel Clemes. Mather reported this to Ransome: "They said also that their father had been autocratic and it would be better if he were at times more controlled by the committee. They also acknowledged that he was given to overlook things at times which ought not to be overlooked."<sup>39</sup> The manner

---

38. J.F.M. to Margaret Clemes, 6 September 1899, MS. Box, 19, F.H.A.L.

39. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 30 September 1899, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

chosen by the committee to resolve the situation turned Margaret Clemes bitterly against the committee and ruined any possibility of the alliance that Mather had hoped for.

On their return Samuel and Margaret Clemes declared that the conditions were totally unacceptable and asked the committee to withdraw them and to restore full responsibility to Samuel Clemes as principal.

The committee's attitude was stiffened by what it took to be evidence of Clemes' apparent assumption of powers which properly belonged to the committee. In 1899, before the dispute flared up, Clemes himself had, without the committee's knowledge, discussed his retirement plans with Hills and Le Tall and even the possibility of their taking over control so that he could be released for service amongst Friends.<sup>40</sup> Other causes of complaint were now cited, such as one that Samuel Clemes had made arbitrary decisions about expulsions without reference to the committee. The committee refused to accept Clemes' insistence that no member of staff should have access to the committee but through him. Mather also reported that Clemes was making enquiries about standing for Parliament and this was interpreted as evidence that he had already decided to leave the school and was looking for an alternative. Mather and the committee were therefore adamant that for Clemes' own sake and for the sake of the school's future they could not withdraw from the proposed conditions.<sup>41</sup>

It was Margaret Clemes who finally persuaded Samuel to accept

---

40. Le Tall to English Friends, 26 December 1899, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

41. J.F.M. to E.R.R., received by R.R.R., 18 December 1899, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

the committee's conditions - but as a truce, rather than as a peace treaty. Neither of the parties to the dispute had any faith that the proposed 'republican' scheme would be successful. It is doubtful whether the committee thought of the conditions as providing other than a temporary arrangement to give time for Samuel Clemes to depart with honour.

Clemes hoped that the truce would enable English Friends to bring pressure to bear upon the committee in Hobart. This hope was expressed in a letter he wrote to Ransome:

We have decided to fall in with the committee decision for a while at least, so that Friends in England may be able to give some counsel in the matter ... By quietly submitting to the indignity for six months we shall gain time both for the committee and for ourselves ... I do not think the committee quite understands how hard it is to work a school up and how easy it is to run one down. However if you can give them some counsel I shall be very glad. Possibly you may think I need some counsel myself and in that case I hope you will at least hear<sup>42</sup> my side of any question before you condemn me.

The year 1899 ended therefore with an uneasy truce on conditions that sowed the seeds of future conflict. There was a division of authority in the school - Hills was placed in charge of the boarding house, Le Tall of the Senior School and Clemes was restricted to supervision of the Lower School which was minimal in view of Margaret Irvine's experience and competence. He was also to be responsible for interviews with parents and the handling of pupil accounts - the final responsibility for holding the school together lay with Mather cast in the role, as it were, of president of a republic.

---

42. S.C. to E.R.R., 11 December 1899, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

We are not giving Samuel Clemes and Le Tall co-ordinate authority; but are separating their work; which separation will give me much trouble to maintain, but I am prepared to take the trouble until a satisfactory way is presented which I anticipate will come if we can be patient enough. <sup>43</sup>

That patience was sorely tried, but not exhausted over the next few months. In February 1900 Le Tall resigned, for reasons of health and of inability to work with Samuel Clemes. He had been suffering from what was thought to be locomotor ataxia, but he himself attributed the cause of his bad health to school worries.<sup>44</sup> This left open the position of vice-principal. For help Mather turned to Ransome with the urgent request that a young Friend should be found immediately who could be groomed to take over as principal. This brought the expected reaction from England that with the unsettled state of the

---

43. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 15 January 1900, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

44. Benjamin Le Tall had threatened to resign in the second term of 1899, but had withdrawn this notice when the committee decided to change Samuel Clemes' role in the school. He told J.F. Mather in November 1899 that he could not continue without a thorough rest. He warned the committee however that if he did not feel better after the vacation he would regard the intimation of November as sufficient notice of resignation and withdraw. In spite of the committee's expressed willingness to grant leave, Benjamin Le Tall finally wrote out his resignation in March 1900,

"because he could not work with any of the Clemes family as their presence caused him to lose control of his limbs" (J.F.M. to E.R.R., 19 January 1901, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.). When Samuel Clemes resigned in June 1900 Benjamin Le Tall was upset because the committee had accepted his resignation earlier in the year. When applications were called in *The English Friend* for a successor, he applied but was unsuccessful.

He continued to live for some time at "Bootham Cottage" in Hobart, but returned to England and died at Gloucester on 16 August 1906. A post-mortem revealed that the condition observed by J.F. Mather as being due to locomotor ataxia had been caused by a tubercle on the brain.

school in Hobart being known so widely in England there was little hope of any help coming from that quarter. Mather therefore had to turn his attention to seeking a senior teacher from nearer at hand. Robert Hamilton, who had been senior resident-master of the Hamilton and Western District Proprietary College, Victoria, was appointed in March 1900 and quickly gained the confidence of both Clemes and the committee.

The central problem of control of the school however still remained. All the advice coming from English Friends who had been drawn into the dispute was that the committee should take decisive action and restore the authority of the principal whoever he might be. Henry Thompson, who had been headmaster of Kendal Friends' School and then a member of the committee of Ackworth, wrote to Francis Mather saying that he agreed that the committee did right in taking Clemes' welfare into consideration, but he added: "If thou wilt forgive my saying so I almost think you have parleyed too much with him since you became convinced he ought to go ... I cannot imagine one of our committees so forbearing."<sup>45</sup> Henry Thompson added that he was upset by the blunt comment of Frederick Andrews, headmaster of Ackworth, that "the Hobart School committee has manifested amazing incompetence by trying to do the impossible things in school management." This referred to the "republican" period.

The committee was forced to the conclusion that a decision about the position of the principal could be postponed no longer. Members were also clear that neither Hills nor Clemes could take this position,

---

45. Henry Thompson to J.F.M., 20 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.



Hills because he was temperamentally unsuitable and required "a long apprenticeship before being fitted to take a chief position",<sup>46</sup> Clemes because he no longer held the confidence of the committee. The committee refused to accept Samuel Clemes' demand that he be reinstated with full powers as principal.

Mather then took the initiative. After consulting privately with two members, William Benson and William May, but without calling a further meeting of the committee, he wrote to Clemes suggesting that the only course open to him was to retire. To this Clemes replied immediately that he would resign at the end of June. A committee meeting was held and a decision taken to pay to Clemes "without any restriction" the sum of £200 during the first year of retirement and £150 for each of two succeeding years.<sup>47</sup> On 9 May Clemes replied indicating that he had no other course open to him but to break completely with The Friends' School at the end of the following month. He also refused the committee's offer of £500.<sup>48</sup>

Mather admitted that he was hurt by Samuel Clemes' blunt refusal to accept the committee's offer, which had been made from a sense of gratitude for Samuel and Margaret Clemes' outstanding contribution to the school and out of a desire to provide for his retirement.

The phrase "without any restriction" was a significant one. At the end of the previous year when there were rumours that if Clemes retired he would start another school, some members of the committee had been unwilling to consider any retiring allowance if that allowance was to be used to finance the opening of an opposition school. By the

---

46. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 29 January 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

47. J.F.M. to S.C., 3 May 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

48. S.C. to J.F.M., 9 May 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

time the break actually came a more generous attitude prevailed, although members realized that Clemes, with health considerably improved, might take this option of establishing a school of his own. This in fact is what he had in mind and this was the reason why he refused the money. He resented the imputation that he was no longer fit mentally and physically to exercise full responsibility as a principal and he particularly resented being denied the right to teach scripture. He was determined therefore to prove that the facts were otherwise. He could scarcely open a new school in opposition near by and continue receiving money from his previous school.

The first era of the school came to an end in June 1900 with the resignation of Samuel Clemes. The repercussions of this crisis on parent and community confidence in the school and on the support of Friends at home and abroad could well have been serious, but at the surface-level this was not so. In fact the crisis brought forth a demonstration of confidence in the school and in the school management.

The crisis had little effect on school numbers. The figures for the four years 1898 to 1901 (including the years immediately preceding and following the crisis years of 1899 to 1900) were as follows:

	<u>1898</u>	<u>1899</u>	<u>1900</u>	<u>1901</u>
Boarders ..	25	19	21	28
Day students .	125	146	164	158
	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
Totals ..	150	165	185	186
	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>

At one stage in 1900 the numbers rose to the record level of 190.

This evidence of support surprised and encouraged Mather who had feared the effects of internal troubles upon public support.

Mather reported to the committee that only nine scholars transferred to the new school which Clemes started after the winter vacation in July 1900 in Pirie Street, close to The Friends' School in Commerical Road.

The school retained not only its enrolment of students but the confidence of parents. The parent body was not formally organized into a Parents and Friends' Association and yet, when there was occasion for it, parents were called together to discuss school affairs and school policy. Dr. Benjafield was the unofficial prime mover in some of these meetings. One meeting had been called in 1890 when it was felt that Clemes needed to be reassured after the months of serious illness.<sup>49</sup> Another meeting was called early in November 1899 when the committee was negotiating with Clemes about his future role in the school. This was the period when Samuel Clemes apparently had decided to resign and had asked several parents for their opinions about his standing for parliament. A meeting of parents invited Mather to brief them on the course of the dispute. E.W. Piesse, M.L.C., and Dr. Benjafield were appointed by the parents to meet with Samuel and Margaret Clemes in an attempt to persuade them to accept the committee's proposals for changes in Clemes' responsibilities as principal. Clemes did not accept their suggestions.

A further meeting of parents was called in April 1900 just before the final break occurred. This time the chemist, H.T. Gould, chaired the meeting, which had the particular purpose of seeking ways in which parents could help the committee. Parents expressed faith in Mather

---

49. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 1 November 1890, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

and the hope that Clemes could continue as principal, but they recognized that he ought to be given less responsibility. They also raised the question as to whether Hills should have been retained on the staff, as he had been such a central figure in the dispute. When Gould met with Mather after the meeting and conveyed the meeting's suggestions to him, Mather explained to Gould that if Hills had gone, Le Tall would also have left. He praised Hills for the good work he had done during the three months of Clemes' absence in Queensland. Gould then replied: "I do not see how you could have done anything else than you did, really I don't. The wonder is that you kept the school together at all."<sup>50</sup> From the messages of support reaching him, Mather concluded that these provided a "testimony to the estimation in which our Society, apart from the individuals composing it, is held by the public at large."<sup>51</sup>

This show of confidence in the committee for its handling of the crisis did not mean a withdrawal of sympathy from Clemes. He had established a firm reputation in Hobart for his work at The Friends' School. There was some uneasiness evident amongst some parents because of the stories their children brought home about eccentricities of behaviour, which were beginning to appear as Clemes became more deeply involved in school affairs, but the solution they hoped for was that the school could be reorganized to permit his work load to be lightened. There was real regret therefore when the only solution found was his retirement. There was no major exodus when Clemes opened up his own school, nor was there any illwill towards him as a result of this move.

---

50. H.T. Gould to J.F.M., 21 April 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

51. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 16 July 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

The subsequent success of Clemes' new venture perhaps provided confirmation of the theory that The Friends' School had grown beyond the limits he desired. Now that he had an opportunity to start again with smaller numbers, with a more intimate family-type school, with his own personal control of his staff and with no responsibility to a committee or to a Friends' Meeting, he was happy in his work and untroubled in mind. Unfortunately the manner of his transfer from The Friends' School made it difficult for him and for his family to see this as a blessing in disguise.

The crisis had an effect on the relationship of the school to the local Hobart Monthly Meeting. Some members of the Meeting already felt that the school dominated the Meeting too much, because most of the active members were so absorbed in their school duties that they had little time available for other concerns of the Meeting. The parties to the dispute were members of the same Meeting and therefore it was perhaps inevitable that the affairs of the Meeting and the school should intersect. Some members of the meeting took sides in the dispute and though Mather and members of the School committee did their utmost to prevent school matters being discussed in open Monthly Meeting, parties opposed to the Clemes family used the Meeting to make allegations against them. When one member tried to reopen the dispute in discussion with Mather, he told her not to wake up the past, but as she still persisted, he added: "I remarked that the advice of Paul to the Thessalonians ('Study to be quiet and mind your own business') was one that we might all follow to advantage."<sup>52</sup>

---

52. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 24 December 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

There is no doubt that the spiritual health of the Meeting suffered greatly at this time, although Samuel and Margaret Clemes continued to attend Meeting and Samuel Clemes ministered frequently and acceptably. Nevertheless the feelings of the Clemes family were deeply upset, and after further difficulties in the Meeting in the years following they moved away from sympathy with the Society and retired from active participation in the affairs of the local Meeting.

If the bond of understanding between Mather and Ransome had not been so strong, the crisis could have led English Friends to lose confidence in the committee's ability to conduct a school. The climate of opinion amongst English Friends was at first distinctly cooler towards the school, because of the rumours of dissent which had reached schools and Meetings in England. Parties to the dispute had sought support from their friends in England. Thus Le Tall had sent highly excited cyclostyled accounts of his troubles to his friends at Bootham and attached all the blame to Clemes. Margaret Clemes had sought the active intervention of her uncle, John Hall of Thirsk, and went so far as to ask him to place their case before London Yearly Meeting. Early in 1900 Hall was constantly in touch with Ransome on behalf of the Clemes family. He also circulated amongst Friends a statement of confidence in Clemes, containing tributes to his work as a missionary in Madagascar and as an educator in Wigton and Hobart. Ransome explained to Hall that the dispute could be settled only in Hobart, that he and his Continental Committee had no power whatever to tell the Hobart School committee what it should do, that indeed, having had access to the views of all parties to the dispute, they could only sympathise with that committee in their trials, and commend

them for their patience.

Hall met with Ransome and Holdsworth just before Yearly Meeting in May 1900. By this time a significant change had taken place in Hall's attitude. He said he now realized that the Hobart Committee had acted only out of good feelings towards Clemes. As a result the matter of the dispute was not raised at Yearly Meeting. Having just received copies of the full correspondence between Clemes and the committee, Hall was prepared to accept that Clemes' health had been the main contributing factor in the troubles. He also expressed some doubts about Clemes' religious teaching. He told Ransome: "I have had a private letter from Mrs. P.<sup>53</sup> myself on the subject. Two years ago she says she noted unsound teaching in Samuel Clemes' sermons. I had my fears all along on these points. When I first knew him he was as Methodistical as H.S.V. and when he returned from Madagascar he had veered to W.E. Turner or more correctly to Rendel Harris' attitude to Christian truth."<sup>54</sup>

Hall then endeavoured to reconcile the parties, first by cabling Clemes that the matter of the dispute was closed as far as London Yearly Meeting was concerned. He advised Clemes to accept the £500 offered by the committee. He also counselled him to set up a school in Melbourne rather than risk further trouble by starting one in Hobart. Hall told Holdsworth that if he had known what had been going

---

53. This Mrs. P. was probably the Sarah Pumphrey who wrote to Edwin Ransome when she heard about the troubles in Hobart and said: "It was evident before we left, two years ago, that the strain of the work was too much for Samuel Clemes mentally and of course he has been much worse since then" (Sarah Pumphrey to E.R.R., 22 March 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.).

54. J.W. Hall to C.J.H., 6 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

on in Hobart for the previous two or three years he was sure he could have supplied a remedy. He further offered £25 to be added to the £500 (if it was refused by Samuel Clemes) towards bringing Friends in Hobart together, presumably by sending out two or three English Friends to talk with the parties to the dispute in Hobart.<sup>55</sup>

Perhaps the crucial test of Ransome's faith in Mather and the members of the school committee was his immediate response to Mather's request that he and Holdsworth should set themselves to the unenviable task of finding a successor to Clemes. With admirable patience they accepted this commission.

Their task was complicated by Mather's addendum that the principal's wife should also be the subject of careful scrutiny. Then, adding that the work did not seem to be sufficiently "heroic" to attract the right people, Mather concluded: "If there was a possibility of being massacred by the Chinese or if there were some lepers to live amongst a noble woman might feel drawn to sacrifice herself."<sup>56</sup> Ransome and Holdsworth might have been pardoned a rejoinder that under the circumstances it might well have been easier to find workers for China or for a leper colony than for the school in Hobart with all its uncertainties.

The one person who was responsible for holding the school together throughout these difficult times was Francis Mather. One of the members of the school committee, William May, in a letter to Holdsworth two years later, expressed what many, not only the committee members, felt about Mather's role.

---

55. J.W. Hall to C.J.H., 15 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

56. J.F.M. to C.J.H., 9 July 1900, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.



We were attacked and perplexed on both sides, by those who were in direct and bitter antagonism with each other. That the school was not wrecked is something to be deeply thankful for. Very largely this result, this escape, we owe to the indefatigable labours and skilful pilotage of J.F. Mather. <sup>57</sup>

This tribute represented the generally accepted judgment of all parties, even of those who blamed him for what they considered to be the mistakes of the committee. But on one thing all were agreed and that was that Mather acted as he did from the motive of saving the school from collapse, even though this meant taking blame and criticism on himself. They agreed that he had tried to be scrupulously fair and just to all parties in the dispute. The hurt was deepest where the bond of friendship had been strongest. He had the greatest admiration for Samuel Clemes and unstinted praise for what he and Margaret Clemes had done for the school. He readily embraced Clemes' ideas on education until they became part of his own philosophy of education. <sup>58</sup>

Mather had helped to nurse Clemes through a critical illness and then had watched anxiously over his slow return to health. As the school grew in numbers, in staff and in influence, he saw symptoms of disquiet and restlessness in Clemes. It was as if the school were beginning to be other than what he, Samuel Clemes, wanted it to be. When the dispute flared up, Mather feared for its effects on Clemes'

---

57. Wm. May to C.J.H., 17 October 1902, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

58. Clemes' successor, Edmund Gower, having received a statement from Mather about his views on education, commented in a letter to Ransome: "I feel convinced that his views on the essentials of a good education are sound and I fully endorse all he says. It is very pleasant to know that such a prominent member of the Hobart Meeting takes so great an interest in educational matters" (E. Gower to E.R.R., 17 November 1900, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.).

health and acted to shield him from anything which might aggravate a threatened breakdown.

Out of a desire to protect him and not to hurt his feelings Mather made decisions without consulting those who were to be most affected by these decisions. A niece of his, Marguerita Robey, recalled<sup>59</sup> that, though the dispute (the "family word for it was 'rumpus'") of the years 1899-1900 was never discussed in the family circle, she remembered it being said that her "Uncle Frank was cut to the heart about Samuel Clemes". She touched upon what was perhaps the tragic flaw - "If only he could have said things ..." If only he could have brought himself to speak earlier to Samuel Clemes about his misgivings and about his concern for the effect of the growth of the school on his health, a solution might well have been found which would have made it possible for the change in Clemes' role in the school to take place smoothly and without recrimination. Errors of judgment caused kindness to be interpreted as its opposite. Thus Clemes, reporting on the meeting held with the committee before he left for Queensland, said that he had appealed

tearfully and fervently for help. I declared I could not work any longer with these two men and called on the committee to dismiss them. They would on no account listen to this and seemed to think I could not safely be subjected to the strain of extra teaching that would then fall to my lot.<sup>60</sup> In kindness to me they seemed actually cruel.

Mather also felt very deeply about the probable effect the school's internal squabbling might have on the community's attitude

---

59. In personal conversation with W.N. Oats.

60. S.C. to E.R.R., 26 November 1899, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

to the Society of Friends. He told Ransome in one of his letters that several remarks had been passed on to him to the effect: "If you Friends cannot agree to settle matters amicably, what can be expected of us Gentiles?"<sup>61</sup> On another occasion when he had been urging the school to take a stand in opposition to war and not to join in public rejoicings at the relief of Mafeking, he saw the incongruity of advocating peace in South Africa while Friends could not resolve tensions among themselves at home.

Ransome, sensing this anxiety in Mather, did not conceal a similar apprehension about the effect of the crisis on the public image of Friends. "The scandal part is the worst feature, as the public are apt to point to 'fruits' and may think these barely correspond with the motives for establishing the school."<sup>62</sup> But Ransome was able to put the crisis in perspective in a pertinent story told in a letter written three months earlier to cheer up the belaboured Mather. He recalled a story of his youth about a cock-fighting match:

I remember hearing of an Irish servant who had been instructed by his master to take a batch of fighting-cocks to one of these matches. The man had not sufficiently safeguarded these from one another - consequently en route they did some fighting on their own account amongst each other and when they arrived at their destination they were unfit for their duties! When the master remonstrated with his servant the latter excused himself by stating that: 'I thought they were all on *our* side, yer honour. I never dreamt of their fighting among themselves!' These school squabbles have over and over again made me think of the foregoing.<sup>63</sup>

Mather's cable code-name was most aptly chosen - "Hopeful, Hobart".

---

61. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 16 July 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

62. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 8 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

63. E.R.R. to J.F.M., 15 March 1900, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

G. Lowes Dickenson once said, "Hope is a vision of the goal".

Mather's vision of the school's role in the Society of Friends and of the Society as a leavening influence in the Australian community enabled him to give the leadership that was needed to pilot the school through the stormy period of 1899-1900. It also was the source of that hope which he expressed to the mid-year gathering of the school community in mid-June 1900. Having touched on the strain through which the school had been passing, he concluded:

Yet the knowledge of the great expectations which many persons have cherished in regard to this institution and the knowledge of the continuous help which has been rendered by our Friends in the 'homeland' is sufficient incentive for all the labours which the members of the Committee are called upon to give. It is their earnest hope that, notwithstanding the difficulties and misunderstandings which are at times wearying to the flesh and the spirit, the work of the school, so well begun, may be carried on to ever fuller development; and then the institution will be an increasing power for good when Tasmania (no longer a separate community) is bound together with the other colonies on the mainland in one great Australian Commonwealth, of which let us have the expectation that Tasmania will be more and more accounted an important part, not only because of its celebrity as a health resort, but also because of its distinctive products and its special industries and thus fulfil its separate function as a member of an ideal family where each is distinctive, yet all are one. 64

---

64. J.F.M. Address to Parents, copy sent to E.R.R.,  
18 June 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### I M P A C T

By the end of the nineteenth century the school had a recognizable identity and though the subsequent years brought some important changes, its main features were already formed as a result of the school operating within two contexts. The school functioned as a Friends' school within the context of the philosophy and practices of the Religious Society of Friends and as a "High", "liberal", grammar-type school, providing an unsectarian and what Friends called a "guarded Christian education" within the context of the wider non-Friend community.

It seems appropriate to examine the impact which the school made in each of these contexts during the formative early years of development and to discover what features appeared to be significant to Friends and to non-Friends. Did the school measure up to the expectations of Friends both in Australia and in England? Did the school satisfy the demands which non-Friend parents made on it? What changes were foreshadowed at the beginning of the twentieth century as a result of the experience of the nineteenth?

Functioning within these two contexts was never a question of two isolated processes. No separation of "Friend" and "non-Friend" functions was ever attempted, nor was it ever even considered. Friends initially offered to supply a Friends' education based on the tradition of English Friends' schools. The demand for such an education from the non-Friend community exceeded all expectations.

Members of the wider community of non-Friends, far from being neutral observers, gave their active support and indeed made it possible for the school to become a viable institution. Some of the features of the school in its early formative years were determined by this interaction between supply and demand.

The demand was reflected in the enrolment pattern which is given in the following table<sup>1</sup>:

1887:	33	1894:	132
1888:	90	1895:	135
1889:	96	1896:	130
1890:	130	1897:	150
1891:	140	1898:	150
1892:	130	1899:	165
1893:	113	1900:	185

The number of children of Friends entering the school in this period 1887-1900 was 74. Francis Mather, in compiling the above statistical survey of Friend enrolments for these years, placed a further 54 in the category of "connected with Friends", but did not state the criteria for this classification. 550 non-members brought the total enrolments to 678.

Friends therefore represented only a little more than ten per cent of this total enrolment, or nineteen per cent, if the category of "connected with Friends" is included. But in the boarder group of 133, which represented twenty per cent of the total of boarders and day students, the proportion of Friends and "connected with Friends"

---

1. The numbers given are the enrolments at the beginning of each year. The decrease in 1893 was due to the economic depression and to a severe epidemic of measles. The total attendance dropped to 80 at one point in that year.

was relatively high at sixty per cent, due to encouraging support given to the school by Friends from the mainland of Australia and from New Zealand.

Of this group 31 boarders came from within Tasmania, 25 from Victoria, 7 from Queensland, 6 from New South Wales, 5 from South Australia and 5 from New Zealand.<sup>2</sup> These figures indicated the importance of the boarding-house as a service to Australian Meetings of Friends.

The school made a noticeable impact on the Society of Friends. It provided a means whereby the children of Friends might be nurtured in the principles and ideals of Friends and ultimately, it was hoped, carry on the work of the Society of Friends in the Australian community.

It also became a centre for the scattered Meetings and paved the way for the eventual linking of these Meetings into an Australian General Meeting, which first met in Melbourne in November 1902. Although control of the school was not vested in the Australian General Meeting until 1923,<sup>3</sup> the new committee of management appointed by London Yearly Meeting in 1902 was representative of Australian Friends and not only of the Hobart Monthly Meeting. This underlined one of the valued features of the school - its Australian character.<sup>4</sup>

It was significant also that an Australian periodical, *The Australian Friend*, was first published on 8 July 1887, six months

---

2. J.F.M., *Letterbook* No.2, p. 151, F4/6, T.U.A.

3. See p. 219 below.

4. non-Hobart members appointed were William Cooper (Sydney), William Benson (Melbourne) and Thomas Robson (Adelaide) - see p. 218 below.

after the establishment of the school. Much of the initiative for the production came from Hobart Friends connected with the school. The first editor was William Benson, a member of the school committee and at that time resident in Hobart. Subsequent editors were William May and Francis Mather, both of whom were deeply involved in the school. Communication between the scattered Meetings was promoted by this publication. *The Australian Friend* also served to keep the Society of Friends in Australia and in England informed of the rise and progress of the school through extensive reporting of school affairs.

Praise for the school came from a quarter where some reluctance to admit Hobart's success in this venture might have been expected. Friends in Victoria praised the "marked" success of the school which they attributed to the enterprise and energy of Hobart Friends and the wisdom of English Friends in backing that enterprise.<sup>5</sup> Five years later it was reported that Friends in Victoria were talking of the Hobart School as 'our' school, and this was taken by Hobart Friends to mean not only acceptance of the school, but a healthy sense of participation and a recognition that the school was functioning as a school for Australian Friends.

The school was also reported as having exercised an observable influence on the local Friends' Meeting in Hobart. A personal view of the extent of this influence was provided by Alfred Wright, one of the three members of the Australian Delegation of 1874-5. He returned to Hobart in 1890 and recorded his impressions in a subsequent volume of his memoirs, *Stones of Memorial*.

---

5. Hobart Annual Meeting Minutes, 29 November 1887, S1/14(2), T.U.A.



But the greatest improvement I found was in the new 'High School' for the children of Friends in Australasia and which I believe was doing more for the permanent help of the Society of Friends in the colonies than anything else that could have been instituted. Partly in consequence of this the Meeting was much larger than on my previous visit, and seemed to be in a more lively and hopeful state. I had much satisfaction in visiting this Institution, and in seeing the good management it was under; and how much it appeared to be appreciated both by the scholars and their parents. <sup>6</sup>

English Friends were impressed by evidence of the school's successful establishment and progress, but some were not clear how far they should be committed at such a distance to a school which relied for its existence mainly on the patronage of non-Friends. Reports and letters from the Hobart Committee, particularly from Francis Mather, therefore tried to reassure English Friends, first by a statement of plain fact that without such support from non-Friends the school could never have taken root. They pointed out that the school had to be "sufficiently advanced to attract the attention of Christians of other denominations who desire for their children a guarded and religious education, yet wide enough in scope to meet all the requirements of modern thought, and the committee saw from the first that it was on the support of such non-members that the success of the school would in large measure depend."<sup>7</sup> They added that in spite of the large numbers of non-Friend children the school had been conducted exactly as if it had been an English Friends' school, where the great majority of children and staff would have been members of the

---

6. A. Wright, *Stones of Memorial*, Vol. III, p.25, MS. Vol. Series S349, F.H.A.L.

7. Mins. of Hobart Annual Meeting of Friends, 1890, S1/14(2) T.U.A.

Society.

There was one surprising sentence however. Having established the importance of non-Friend support and pointed out that a first-rate school was being built up at comparatively little cost to the Society, the report added the comment that the children of Friends "will be able to take entire possession of it as soon as their numbers have sufficiently increased." Such a forecast was quite unrealistic and contrary to the assessment made by Hobart Friends when they made it clear to English Friends in 1885 that the school could not be self-sufficient as a school only for children of Friends. This sentiment appeared at no other time in correspondence and must therefore be attributed to a moment of wishful thinking on the part of the writer or to a misguided effort to mollify any critics in London Yearly Meeting who took a narrower view of the purpose of the school.

Francis Mather sensed this restiveness amongst some English Friends and hastened to reply to it. Edwin Ransome, who had the responsibility of speaking on behalf of the School in meetings of English Friends, had justifiably asked for statistics about the numbers of Friend students in the school. Mather replied that in his view too much weight was being given to this factor. He wanted English Friends to realize that the school depended on non-Friends for its existence. Without their support the school could not possibly have offered a satisfactory level of education. In answer to the query whether the school had 'gone beyond its tether' he pointed out that expansion was necessary because the members of the school committee had endeavoured to provide boarding accommodation for Friends from distant Meetings. This letter<sup>8</sup> was written after the announcement

---

8. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 5 December 1888, MS. Box 20, F.H.A.L.

that the school was moving from Warwick Street to Hobartville, a move which raised doubts in some Friends' minds because of the capital expenditure involved.

Those Friends in England with wider vision, like Edwin Ransome, Charles Holdsworth and Joseph Braithwaite, who were given special responsibility for oversight of the school in distant Tasmania, realized that the school in Hobart was an entirely different proposition from the Friends' schools in England. The Hobart school was primarily a day-school, serving the local community. English Friends' schools were mainly boarding-schools, responsible to a Friends' Meeting, but without strong links with a local community. These men realized that if the school in Hobart was to fulfil its aims as a Friends' school serving the specific needs of Friends it must be encouraged to develop its boarding component so that it could cater for the scattered groups of Friends in the Australian States. The first report of the Hobart Committee in the Epistle of 1887 pointed out that the problems of distance and expense of travel hampered the school's effectiveness as a boarding-school. Edwin Ransome understood this difficulty and later encouraged English Friends to find money to subsidise these expenses for Friends from the mainland of Australia and from New Zealand.<sup>9</sup>

The second concern of English Friends was to endeavour to keep the component of Friend teachers sufficiently strong in the school so that Friends' influence could be maintained by means of their example. The school was seen as one way by which the Society of

---

9. New Zealand boarders might spend up to three weeks travelling home and back to Tasmania during their once-a-year vacation.

Friends might contribute to "leading on a growing nation to know more of the way, the truth and the life" (*The Friend*, 1888, 28, 155). Francis Mather's faith in the future of the school was reflected in the tireless efforts which Edwin Ransome and Charles Holdsworth made on behalf of the school and in the response which their confidence in turn generated amongst English Friends.

The crisis of 1899-1900, however, brought about some important organizational and constitutional changes. The first change of note concerned the relationship of the school to the local Hobart Monthly Meeting. The initiative for the establishment of the school had come from Hobart and the members of the school committee were originally drawn from the Hobart meeting. The crisis reinforced Mather's view that the school should not be under the control of the local Monthly Meeting.

He realized not only the danger of school affairs being raised in the Meeting, but also the possibility of members using the Meeting as a means of actual interference in the affairs of the school. This danger became patent later when there was a move in the Monthly Meeting under the clerkship of one of the disputants, Le Tall, to set up an enquiry into the school's finances. Mather therefore set about treating it as a matter of urgency to revise the constitution of the school committee, and particularly that section which dealt with appointments of members. He wanted to see control deliberately removed from the local Meeting. Though the changes were not finally concluded until 1903, the crisis of 1899-1900 crystallised Mather's thinking on this matter, and strengthened his resolve to persuade English Friends to his view.

A change of constitution would have been necessary in any case because legally the members of the committee - and their descendants - were personally liable for the school's debts if the school should at any time fail. When the school mortgage was taken over by the Australasian Fund, the opportunity was seized to get rid of this anomaly and thereafter no liability devolved upon members of the committee or their descendants.

The increasing age of the committee members raised the further question of the method of appointment. If members were to be appointed by Monthly Meeting, as the first committee had been, Mather saw the danger of unsuitable people being appointed. The crisis therefore sharpened his resolve to move as quickly as possible with the help of English Friends to determine in what body of Friends the school property should be vested and what bodies of Friends should appoint the members of the committee. Mather conceived of the school as an Australian Friends' School and not merely as a local Hobart school, but there was as yet in existence no established body of Friends, representative of Australian Friends, which could be responsible for the appointment of members of the school committee of management.

He appealed therefore to English Friends to agree to the property being vested in the Meeting for Sufferings or in the Continental Committee, so that ultimate authority for appointments would be removed from the Hobart Monthly Meeting to this distant, but impartial, body of Friends. He was quite frank about the reasons for his wanting this done. "Such an institution as a school," he said, "would be torn to pieces amidst contending factions; so I cannot help concluding that, for the present, the property should be controlled by some

central body having its headquarters in London."<sup>10</sup> The crisis had revealed what damage "contending factions" could do to the school and strengthened Mather's resolve to have the constitution of the school committee altered as soon as possible.

He was concerned about the Meeting as well as about the school. In a letter to Ransome he wrote: "The school committee has had a great deal of obloquy cast upon them and our little Meeting at Hobart, which was once accounted as steady and well conducted as any, has, through these school troubles, lost for the time some of its effectiveness for building up the Society of Friends in this place."<sup>11</sup>

Holdsworth was the main source of correspondence with Mather on constitutional matters. While he could see the force of Mather's arguments, he was afraid that English Friends might think they were being manoeuvred into taking over control of the school, debts, problems and all. He was quite clear that English Friends would not accept this, that, though they were quite willing to provide "holding trustees"<sup>12</sup> and to help with the search for Friends' staff, they wanted control to be in the hands of Australian Friends. Negotiations were not finally concluded until 1903, when London Yearly Meeting agreed upon the future constitution of the committee of management and board of trustees of the Hobart school.<sup>13</sup>

London Yearly Meeting agreed to appoint the committee of management. This met Mather's point of view that appointments should

---

10. J.F.M. to C.J.H., 10 December 1900, F4/6, T.U.A.

11. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 22 April 1901, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

12. C.J.H. to J.F.M., 29 May 1901, F4/2 T.U.A.

13. Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting for 1903, pp.173 to 177.

be taken out of the control of the local Meeting. The appointment of members from other Australian Meetings as well as Hobart was also in line with Mather's concept of the school as an Australian Friends' School. Under the new constitution Meeting for Sufferings and the Australasian Friends Fund Trust had power to nominate. It is significant that their nominations were of Hobart Friends.

The committee of management was constituted as follows:

<u>For Four Years</u> :	William Cooper,	Sydney Monthly Meeting
	William Benson,	Melbourne M.M.
	Thomas Robson,	Adelaide M.M.
	Francis Mather,	Meeting for Sufferings
	W.L. Wells,	Meeting for Sufferings
<u>For Six Years</u> :	Thomas Mather,	Australasian Friends' Trust
	Robert Mather,	Hobart Monthly Meeting
	N.H. Propsting,	Hobart M.M.
	W.L. May,	Hobart M.M.

Francis Mather remained chairman. Appointment was normally for four years, the initial six-year appointments being the means of ensuring some continuity.

In addition the Trust Deed was re-constituted to enable trusteeship of the school property to be transferred to London Yearly Meeting which appointed fourteen trustees, including four Australian Friends, William Benson, Francis Mather, N.H. Propsting and Thomas Robson, and ten English Friends.

Francis Mather and Edwin Ransome were relieved that these changes had been brought to a successful conclusion. Holdsworth reported that Ransome had come home from a crucial meeting and said: "Last night on bedside bended knee I gave thanks to our Heavenly

Father for having so beautifully helped us through with the Hobart matter."<sup>14</sup> Mather was particularly relieved that Hobart Monthly Meeting did not raise any awkward objections to the transfer of control from Hobart Monthly Meeting to London Yearly Meeting.

The constitutional partnership of London Yearly Meeting and the Hobart Committee of Management remained operative until 1923, when control of the school was handed over to the Australian General Meeting of the Society of Friends, thus preserving Francis Mather's view that the school should be seen as an Australian Friends' School.<sup>15</sup>

The second area which came up for review as a result of the crisis was that of the role of the Principal. Mather had been clear from the outset that Friends' influence in the school was dependent on the principal, but when he was indicating to Ransome and Holdsworth the qualities needed in the successor to Clemes, he understandably rated tact, commonsense and skill in "the art of living with others" as highly desirable.

The main qualification was a religious one, joined to the power to organize and oversee with *tact* and *commonsense*, together with a general alertness to discern any tendency to disorder that it may be dealt with discreetly before it makes headway. Moreover it should be remembered that colonial children (especially) require to be led, not *driven* ... Another point needs to be mentioned because most Friend teachers seem to be lacking therein, i.e., 'the art of living with others'.<sup>16</sup>

---

14. C.J.H. to J.F.M., 2 May 1902, F4/2, T.U.A.

15. In 1964 the Australian General Meeting, until then responsible to London Yearly Meeting, became recognized as an independent Yearly Meeting and the school since 1964 has therefore been under the control of the Australian Yearly Meeting, which appoints the School Board of Governors.

16. J.F.M. to E.R.R., - J.F.M.'s underling, with a double line under 'driven', 14 April 1900, M.S. Box 19, F.H.A.L.



The events of 1900 made these qualities seem so desirable to Mather that he was led in a moment of weakness to put forward the tentative suggestion that, if a suitable Friend could not be found in England to succeed Clemes, a non-Friend was to be preferred to an unsuitable Friend. The immediate reproof that came from Holdsworth sufficed to restore Mather to his normal insistence that the principal of the school should be a member of the Society of Friends, but, Mather added, he must be a Friend in deed as well as in name.

Non-Friend parents also made it clear to the school committee that they wanted the principal to be a Friend.<sup>17</sup> Mather took such views to be an indication of the value parents placed on the Quaker foundation of the school and as evidence that "our fellow-Christians are being unconsciously leavened by the principles professed by our Society." This membership qualification for the position of principal has remained to the present day, though the Australian Yearly Meeting in 1973 provided for the possibility of departure from this principle.

Another issue highlighted by the crisis and discussed by Ransome and Holdsworth in their correspondence with Mather about the appointment of a new principal was the relationship between the principal and the committee, particularly with respect to the appointment of teachers. The situation in Hobart had been greatly confused, first by the establishment of the interim 'republican' form of control, when the committee, to keep the peace, initiated a 'Divide and Rule' principle. The suspicions of certain English Friends, such as Isaac Sharp, that the committee was intent on maintaining this as a 'status

---

17. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 1 September 1900, F4/6, T.U.A.

quo' of power were roused still further by the quite extraordinary precautions taken by Mather to prevent disruption in the period between the resignation of Samuel Clemes at the end of June 1900 and the arrival of a new principal two terms later on 22 February 1901. In effect Mather assumed the responsibility of control, with Robert Hamilton senior master in charge, but in reality acting as Mather's mouthpiece in the running of the school. Hills had resigned in July, upset, it was thought by the advertisement in *The Friend* for a new principal which ended any hopes he might have cherished or the fulfilment of any promises alleged to have been made that he might eventually become principal.<sup>18</sup>

At the time Mather drew up his regulations he had not anticipated Hill's resignation and he was particularly meticulous in his specifications so that Hamilton's authority should be made clear to Hills. Hamilton was given authority for the curriculum, disposition of staff, supervision of discipline and general oversight of boarders. Regulations were framed covering periodic written reports to the Committee on attendance, fee receipts and general school matters. All correspondence to and from parents was to be presented for the perusal of the committee. Any innovations in teaching or school policy were firstly to be approved by the committee. Detailed instructions were given about boarding routine, about supervision of leisure-time and school games. "The committee is of opinion that the work of teachers

---

18. William Benson commented: "It is as I thought - he dreamt of being principal. No one need censure him for a laudable ambition, but it was a foolish one, for he has too many disqualifications ever to fill the post" (William Benson, to J.F.M., 9 July 1900, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.).

in this direction should be more regular and more organized than it appears to have been in the past.<sup>19</sup> Specific references to such matters as "loitering and interfering with workers" and instructions "to strenuously put down all tyrannical behaviour on the part of elder children towards young ones" alluded by inference to some of the causes of disorder which had led to the crisis in school affairs. Lastly all communications from staff with the committee were to be thorough Hamilton, but, if any teacher had a personal grievance connected with the general management of the school, direct access to the committee was to be open, provided that the secretary was advised beforehand in writing.

Further evidence of the extent of Mather's intention to keep interim control was given by his annotations to the text of the address which Hamilton was preparing to give to staff at the opening of the winter term. The corrections pencilled in by Mather, like those on a student essay by a teacher of English, provided significant amendments in spirit, style and content. Mather wanted Hamilton to lead rather than to command. Hence wherever 'must' appeared in the text 'should' was pencilled in. Where Hamilton, in referring to the need for teachers to be watchful at all times, even when off duty, had written: "To refuse to do so and to shelter myself under the plea of not being on duty is absurd and childish in the extreme and on no account whatever to be tolerated at The Friends' School. And for myself personally I shall not for a moment tolerate any laxity in this matter," Mather advised a change of tone by rewording as follows: "To neglect to do so is incompatible with what should

be expected from the teaching staff of The Friends' High School."<sup>20</sup> Perhaps Mather should have left his drapery-store for the principal's chair. At least he would have then had only one burden of responsibility instead of two.

There were several specific points at issue in the relationship of principal and committee; first, whether the principal was to be a member of the school committee; second, whether appointments were to be made by the principal or by the committee; third, whether members of staff were to have direct access to members of the committee. The advice received from England was that in English Friends' schools the principal was not a member of the school committee, although he was generally invited to meet with that committee. On both first and second points Mather assured Holdsworth that before their troubles commenced, that is, prior to 1899, although the committee nominally engaged the teachers, it was always on the advice of the principal.

We members of the committee and Samuel Clemes were accustomed to sit in council as brothers, Samuel Clemes giving his expert opinion as to capacity and possibility of filling his requirements and we gave our opinions as to character and antecedents. There was never any difficulty in this respect or in any other matter. Samuel Clemes had only to say what he wished done and, as soon as possible, his wish was complied with. <sup>21</sup>

This mutual confidence was sadly shattered by the crisis and as a result Mather contended strongly that the committee must retain nominal control of appointments so that in the event of emergency, such as a breakdown in health of a principal, or in his control of

---

20. J.F.M. to Robert Hamilton, 12 July 1900 MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

21. J.F.M. to C.J.H., 16 October 1900, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

the school, the committee would have the power to act in the interests of the school. Another aspect which worried Mather was the concentration of all authority in the principal. He regarded Clemes' inability to delegate authority as one of the causes contributing to his breakdown. He also considered it had been unwise of Samuel Clemes to have four members of the Clemes family on his staff.<sup>22</sup> Teachers had been heard to remark that Samuel and Margaret Clemes spoke of the school as if it were their own. "There is a little in this, but not so much as they make out", was Mather's comment.<sup>23</sup> Mather admitted that the detailed instructions he had issued to Hamilton did not represent much delegation of authority and that many of the regulations were on petty details, but he defended his action by pointing out that this particular situation was quite unusual. Hamilton was senior master, holding only temporary power over others. He therefore had to be armed with this authority if he was to run the school. Mather assured Holdsworth that when a new principal was appointed he would be head of the school "in reality as well as in name".<sup>24</sup>

He also assured him that when normal conditions were restored no teacher would be allowed to approach the committee except through

---

22. His wife, Margaret, was Mistress of the Household; his sister, Isabella, who obtained her mathematical tripos at Cambridge in 1881 and who worked for a time at Greenwich Observatory until she had a breakdown in health, came out to Hobart and began teaching senior mathematics part time at the school in 1896; his daughter Margaret (Maggie) was acting as a housekeeper for a brief period and his daughter, Mary, who had done her apprentice-teaching at the school, was a valued assistant to Margaret Irvine with the younger children.

23. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 1 June 1899, MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

24. J.F.M. to C.J.H., 24 December 1900, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

the principal. The committee looked forward to the arrival of Edmund Gower in February 1901 with high hopes that this would signify a return to the normal conditions of the first decade of the school's existence.

One noticeable trend which developed as a result of the difficulties of staffing the school with distant Friends selected in England was the increasing number of non-Friends who were appointed to the staff from Australian schools. While Mather held to the importance of a strong Friends' influence within the staff, he was also a realist and after the turbulence of the years 1899 to 1900 and the impossibility of getting staff replacements from England at short notice he was ready to settle for teachers who were competent but not necessarily members of the Society of Friends.

In the twentieth century the school came increasingly to rely upon such teachers. The loyalty of these men and women to the school and their respect for Friends' principles did much to stabilize the school through further difficult years when there were frequent changes in school administration and leadership.<sup>25</sup>

- 
25. A complete list of the school's headmasters or principals indicates that during the years 1901 to 1923 there were no less than seven changes.

1887-1900	Samuel Clemes	Principal
1900 (June-Dec.)	Robert Hamilton	Senior Master, acting as Principal
1901-1903	Edmund Gower	Principal
1904-1907	Edgar Smith	Principal
1907-1908	Godfrey Williams	Principal
1908-1916	Edmund Gower	Principal
1912	Dr. Herbert Thorp	Acting-Principal
1915	Alfred H. Brown	Acting-Principal
1916-1923	Charles Annells	Headmaster
1923-1944	Ernest Unwin	Headmaster
1944-1945	Stuart Hickman	Acting-Headmaster
1945-1973	William Oats	Headmaster
(1949-1951)	Wilfred Asten	Acting-Headmaster
1974-	Roderic Grosvenor	Principal
		(contd.)

One such teacher was Margaret Irvine, who was a foundation member of the school staff and a source of strength during the crisis of 1899 to 1900. A year later, when school troubles were still causing some concern, Margaret Irvine wrote to Ransome to express her confidence in the school and her support for Mather in what she considered to be a difficult and thankless role. She said that she was "deeply grieved" at the way some Friends in Hobart were acting towards the school committee.<sup>26</sup> Three months before this she had written to the school committee: "In all your relations with me I have been impressed by your justice. Although not a Friend, you have always treated me as one, which I believe I am now at heart. I deeply regret all the worry and annoyance that you must have suffered by recent school troubles."<sup>27</sup> Margaret Irvine's period of service to the school, 1887 to 1925, spanned thirty-nine years of the school's history. Such length and quality of service brought continuity and stability to the staffing and enabled the school to weather the frequent changes in administration.

Another member of the school's solid core of staff was Charles Annells, who, although he was appointed at the end of the period of development under review, did much to help the school retain the confidence of parents during the months immediately following the resignation of Samuel Clemes. Like Margaret Irvine he did not become a

---

In 1904, when Edgar Smith was Principal of Friends' School there were three other schools in Hobart headed by former headmasters or acting-headmasters of Friends. Samuel Clemes was headmaster of Leslie House School, Edmund Gower co-principal of King's Grammar School, and Robert Hamilton headmaster of Officer College. Edmund Gower had two periods at The Friends' School, the second being marked by two lengthy periods of absence in England.

26. Margaret Irvine to E.R.R., 20 July 1901, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

27. Margaret Irvine to J.F.M., 3 April 1901, copy to E.R.R., MS. Box 19, F.H.A.L.

member of the Society of Friends, though he was fully in sympathy with its ideals and had a deep respect for the chairman of the school committee, Francis Mather. Charles Annells was in charge of the school from 1916 to 1923 during the difficult years of the World War, when Friends' views on war brought some divisions within the school community. Charles Annells also served the school for a long period of forty-two years, 1900-1907 and 1913 to 1948. As a result of the efforts of teachers such as these the effects of crises on the school itself were minimised, so that apparent calm on the surface concealed the turbulence below.

The initial impact of the school on the non-Friend community is indicated by the fact that the non-Friend section of the community provided ninety per cent of the total enrolments of 678 for this period.<sup>28</sup> Though the proportion of Friends to non-Friends in the school was greater in this period than at any other time in the school's history,<sup>29</sup> this proportion of Friends was nevertheless much lower than in Friends' schools in England either at that time or since.<sup>30</sup>

---

28. See p. 209 above.

29. In the most recent years of the nineteen seventies the proportion has varied from 2.6 to 3.6 percent.

30. There has been a steady decline in the proportion of Friends to non-Friends in England Friend schools and particularly during the last decade. In the period 1962 to 1972 the number of Friends' children in English Friend schools declined by an overall percentage of 42 per cent, even though the total enrolments in these schools increased by 9 per cent. The proportion of Friends to non-Friends in the same period declined from 36 to 19 per cent. (*Friends' Schools in the Seventies*, London: Friends' Schools Joint Committee, 1973.)



The school became a viable institution because of this initial and continuing support from non-Friends.

Some of the reasons for this support may be found in statements made by non-Friend parents, such as Dr. Benjafield, who was one of the school's most ardent and most vocal supporters. On a number of occasions he publicly stated his reasons for recommending the school. He praised the school for the thoroughness of its teaching, its emphasis on 'useful' and practical subjects, its introduction of science subjects, but the most important contribution the school had made, he claimed, was the building of the character of those who passed through it. He saw religious education as the main component in this character-building. This view was supported by a number of parents who made explicit affirmations of their support for the school in the aftermath of the crisis of 1899-1900.<sup>31</sup>

The non-Friends quoted were a representative group and all testified to the school's influence in the development of character. Philip Seager, Registrar of the Supreme Court of Tasmania, spoke of the school's emphasis on "respect for truth". Professor Williams, Professor of Classics and Literature at the University of Tasmania, praised the school's "good moral tone" and its upholding of "simple, honest, virtuous principles". He said that it was for this reason "rather than for educational reasons (though in this respect too the school compares favourably with the others)" that he chose it for his two sons.<sup>32</sup> W.E. Shoobridge, land-owner, appreciated the school's

---

31. Francis Mather forwarded a collection of these testimonials to Edwin Ransome in 1902, when there were still echoes of the crisis reaching the ears of English Friends.

32. E.R.R. Papers, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

encouragement of its students "to find out and think for themselves" and added: "I am glad that recent changes in the school have not affected its distinctive character."<sup>33</sup> Hector Ross, Sheriff of Tasmania, said that the school was helping "to form the character of youth in habits of steady industry, love of truth and that kindly consideration for the feelings of others which go to make up the character of the Christian gentleman."<sup>34</sup> H.T. Gould, pharmaceutical chemist, said he believed that "the object which its founders had, viz., the combining of school instruction with a distinctly religious education on the broadest possible basis, has been and is being accomplished."<sup>35</sup>

H.T. Gould's testimonial reflected one of the most important features of the school as seen through the eyes of non-Friends. They valued the school for its provision of "religious education on the broadest possible basis", the principle on which Lancaster based his schools a century earlier and which Backhouse espoused and communicated to Hobart Friends. This reputation of The Friends' School for providing a broadly-based unsectarian education was undoubtedly what drew many non-Friends to enrol their children at the school. Dr. Benjafield made this point in an article dated 30 January 1913, entitled *The Tasmanian*.<sup>36</sup> In speaking of the school he stated that "the highest moral training combined with such an unsectarian education

---

33. *Ibid.*

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*

36. A typed MS. of this article has recently been lodged by a member of the Benjafield family with the T.S.A. for micro-filming.

as none could object to was the prominent part of the curriculum."

It was clear also from Dr. Benjafield and others that non-Friends did not fear Friends would use the school to proselytize. In fact, he commended Friends for "a magnanimity quite their own" in keeping<sup>37</sup> the Quaker element in the background in their religious education in the day-school, but in a speech delivered at the end-of-the-year gathering on 16 December 1897 he was reported by *The Mercury* on the 17 December 1897 as saying that when the bonfires were to be lit the following week to mark Queen Victoria's Jubilee celebrations, the name "Quaker" should appear blazened on the greatest of these bonfires, because of Quaker leadership in the fight to free the slaves and in defence of freedom of thought.

If Friends did not use the school to attempt to convert students to Quakerism, Dr. Benjafield's statement at least indicated that through the school Friends' testimonies on such matters as war, slavery and prison reform were known and respected. In this way the school was a channel for the dissemination rather than the propagation of Friends' principles, or, as Francis Mather phrased it, "a very important means for keeping in prominence the testimonies of our beloved Society." <sup>38</sup>

This role as a disseminator was not always an easy one particularly in the case of the Quaker testimony against participation in war.

Thus during the Boer War, when the community was celebrating the relief of Mafeking, some enthusiast in the school ran up the

---

37. The Friends' School Hobart - article by Dr. Benjafield, received by E.R.R., 20 January 1900, MS. Box 21, F.H.A.L.

38. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 12 January 1895, F4/5, T.U.A.

school flag to the mast-head. It was promptly hauled down again by two of the Friend teachers. Charles Holdsworth commenting on this incident saw in it an example of the willingness of Friends to "risk the popularity of the school for such a cause".

What a risk in excited times like those for a school containing over eighty per cent of non-Friends! What a lesson for those children some thirty years hence when they think over the days when they were not allowed to cheer in class for such a cause! Will they not say to themselves, how strongly those old Friends must have been opposed to war, if they could deliberately risk the popularity of the school for such a cause.

(Holdsworth, *The Friend*, 16 May, 1902, p. 316, F.H.A.L.)

When in 1910 the Defence Act required all boys between the ages of 12 and 14 to be given military drill at school and all those over the age of 14 to be drilled at the Government drill ground, Friends in Hobart sought the advice of English Friends on the action they should take to uphold Friends' testimony concerning preparation for war. Three English Friends, Dr. Hodgkin, T.P. Newman and Charles Holdsworth, sought a hearing with Prime Minister Fisher of Australia when he was in London in 1911. Fisher referred the matter to the Defence Minister, Pearce, who conceded that "he was prepared to allow the whole school to be trained as a unit under the St. John Ambulance Association."<sup>39</sup> At London Yearly Meeting in 1913 English Friends, realizing the problems which Hobart Friends faced in holding strictly to the Peace Testimony in a school community where the great majority did not belong to the Society of Friends, recorded the following

---

39. C.J.H. to J.F.M., 15 June 1911, F4/3, T.U.A.

minute:

After discussing the difficulty in all its bearings, the prevailing opinion was that, in view of the responsibilities undertaken towards non-members, as well as towards Friends, care should be exercised not to place disabilities upon non-members beyond what is necessary for preserving the Friends' character of the school whilst every endeavour should be made to strengthen our own members in a faithful testimony against all war. <sup>40</sup>

This sympathetic understanding of the school's difficulty did much to reassure the Hobart school committee, and although there was some falling off in numbers, not necessarily because of parents' disagreement with Friends' attitude to war, the basic unity of the community that was so well developed in the early years of the school's development was preserved, with Friend and non-Friend alike respecting differing views sincerely held.

Much of the impact of the school was due to two men, Samuel Clemes and Francis Mather. There are still Tasmanians living who have personal recollections of Samuel Clemes and who remember his reputation as an innovator, "fifty years ahead of his times". The ideas he expressed in the school and in his public addresses were well in advance of current educational practice. He was a firm believer in the kindergarten movement, based on Froebel's ideas and later in Leslie House School he urged the introduction of Madam Montessori's methods. The kindergarten was a place where children were meant to be happy and he wanted to see this happiness shared by children in other areas of schooling. In an address which he gave

---

40. Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting, 1913, p.150, F.H.A.L.

at the Hobart Technical School on the subject "Physical Science as a means of education" he made this point: "The kindergarten children look upon their school time as a happy time of play, and there is no reason in the nature of things why all schools should not partake more or less of this character in the estimation of the children attending them."<sup>41</sup>

In this same address he emphasized the relevance of science to the real educational task "of educating thought that, instead of going contrary to all the child's nature, has the child's own nature and boundless curiosity and love of change as its most potent allies all along."

Samuel Clemes' freshness and breadth of outlook on education captured the attention, if not always the support of his contemporaries. He had wide-ranging views on curriculum and methods.<sup>42</sup> He urged the development of neglected fields such as those of technical education and physical training, and drew attention to the urgent need for Tasmania to concentrate on the sciences, particularly geology and metallurgy. He anticipated by half a century the emphasis on education for leisure. Perhaps no other aspect of the application of his ideas to school life attracted more continuous attention in newspaper reports than the June exhibitions of hobbies and leisure-time pursuits. One reporter wrote: "The whole formed quite a good-sized exhibition and many present declared the whole proceedings to be unique in character." (*The Mercury*, 18 June 1896). Some perceptive parents recognized

---

41. The text of this address was printed in *The Australian Friend*, 26 September 1892, p. 140.

42. See Chapter Four above.

the significance of the opportunities these pursuits promoted.

Of the pupils who have left the school, nearly every one of the older boys has a hobby which has fastened upon him during his school course - chemistry, photography, moulding, carpentry or other manual work. Some of those who next leave will probably be under the spell of botany; and let us hope that ere long geology will lay strong hold upon a few.<sup>43</sup>

(William May, editor of *The Australian Friend*, in the issue of 26 December 1892, p.145.)

The emphasis on the informal curriculum, on the development of hobbies, on education for leisure and on the kind of activities that the Natural History and Essay Society was originally formed to promote continued long after Samuel Clemes had left The Friends' School and gone on to promote the same tradition in Leslie House School.

Perhaps one of the school's most significant features was the result of Clemes' concept of the school as an extension of the family and as an experience of community. He would have been in sympathy with the views of the modern educational philosopher, Professor M.V.C. Jeffreys, who said: "What kind of community the school is matters far more than what kind of instruction is given there" (Jeffreys, 1962, p.139). Attention has already been drawn to the public recognition of what was felt to be a different sort of atmosphere as a result of student-teacher relationships.<sup>44</sup> One Hobart newspaper reporter, commenting on the good standard of technical exhibits in the June 1892 exhibition, attributed this standard to what was for him something

---

43. This hope was realized later in the person of Noel Benson, enrolled in 1898, who gained his doctorate in science and became professor of geology at Otago in New Zealand in 1916.

44. See p. 129 above.

new in the relationship of student and teacher.

The lads seem to have taken a thorough liking to practical pursuits. The system is quite opposed to the old plan, where a gaunt, grim teacher, with severe aspect, rod in hand, drove the youngsters to work of one kind, without having regard to the taste and inclination of the pupils, and when the sound of the teacher's step made the more timid quake with fear; under these more modern methods the boys seem to enjoy their work as thoroughly as their instructors do the imparting of knowledge. 45

What apparently drew people's attention to the school was not that it was different because it was co-educational, or because Clemes did not favour cramming. These differences certainly created some impact and impact was a condition of the school's foundation and development. Its appeal rested on surer foundations than on impact alone and stemmed from what people felt was a different spirit in the school community, where there was a strong bond of understanding between teachers and students, which in turn appeared to draw parents into active sympathy with the ideals and ideas underpinning this community. This feature of the school as a co-operative school community bore the imprint of Samuel Clemes' influence.

The impact of Francis Mather was less obvious, but none the less significant. When he retired from the chairmanship of the school committee in 1923 after thirty-seven years of continuous service to the school, many tributes were paid to the quality of this service, but one by Pearl Walter, herself a teacher at the school for twenty-five years, 1908 to 1932, was particularly pertinent. She gave expression to the feeling that when people, particularly non-Friends,

---

45. Quoted in *The Australian Friend*, 29 June 1892, pp.108-109.



thought of the specifically Quaker features of the school, they thought of these as they were reflected in the person of Francis Mather.

I learned to recognize the worth of such a counsellor and friend. His patience amazed me. He was sometimes faced with hostile criticism, generally when his actions were misunderstood, but I never knew him to complain or utter a word of protest in self-defence. Such a nature seemed to me heroic and created in my mind an understanding of the power of non-resistance.

*(The Friends' School Seventy-fifth Anniversary, pp. 34-35)*

Francis Mather was a central figure in the formative years of the school's history. That the school survived the hazards of birth and growth, the severe blows dealt by the troubles of 1899-1900 and the subsequent withdrawal of Samuel Clemes from what had been a very close partnership was due to Francis Mather, to his faith in the future of the school, to his completely selfless devotion of time, energy and patience and to his determination to continue this support in spite of all the difficulties and misunderstanding he encountered. He was indeed, in Shakespeare's words (*Sonnet cxvi*) the "ever-fixed mark, that looks on tempests and is never shaken."

It therefore seems right to conclude the history of the formation and early development of the School with a substantial quotation from a letter written by him to Edwin Ransome in 1902. This letter was the last major letter to pass from Mather to Ransome, who, although he lived until 1910, was happy to hand over to Charles Holdsworth the main responsibility for carrying on the unique partnership of English and Tasmanian Friends which he had begun.

This partnership was outstanding for its continuity and quality.

The rose and the waratah were its symbols.

In the following letter Francis Mather expressed his hopes for the school and for the contribution the Society of Friends could make through the school to the newly-established Commonwealth of Australia.

As I have said to C.J. Holdsworth, I should have very greatly hesitated to encroach so much upon the time of prominent Friends, already fully occupied, were I not strongly of the belief that upon the success of this school will largely depend the welfare of the Society of Friends in Australasia. This is a great deal to say; but I am of the opinion that in no way can the Society of Friends better obtain a permanent place in Australasia than through the establishing of schools; and, if this school should prove the success which we are striving to accomplish, there will be warrant for establishing similar institutions on the Australian continent and in New Zealand.

Of course, this is looking very far ahead; for possibly no other school can be established for some years to come; but the more completely this institution fulfils the intention of its promoters, the sooner will the way open for federated establishments, say, first in New Zealand, then in Queensland, and afterwards in the other States.

Judging from the progress of this school, and what is said of it by people in Australasia, the extension of such a system of education will be gladly welcomed, because people appear to be recognizing that institutions in which the Friend cult has free course will supply what the Australian Commonwealth is needing; for thoughtful people everywhere are increasingly feeling the need of something more in school education than the training of the intellect. There seems to be demanded not only the building of moral character, but also the laying of the foundation of that inwardness and spirituality in religion, that steadiness of judgment, that true republican feeling which abolishes class feeling and exclusiveness, that refined simplicity of life, and that right estimate of the value of time which has characterised the typical Friends...

I may be considered too ideal, yet I must confess that it is this ideal which has emboldened me to trespass so continuously on the time of thyself and others. My goal is not the perfecting of this particular

institution but the establishing of the influence of Friends (indirectly) *through* it and *from* it. It is for this reason that I have earnestly desired that the Friends who come out as teachers should not only be connected with the Society of Friends but also *love* the Society of Friends, and enter into its *spirit*.

Again expressing my sense of the great help thou hast rendered to Friends' educational work in the Australian Commonwealth by thy exertions on behalf of this school, which I trust will prove only the forerunner of other such institutions,

I am thy Friend sincerely,  
J. Francis Mather <sup>46</sup>

---

46. J.F.M. to E.R.R., 23 June 1902, F4/6, T.U.A.

## APPENDIX I.

FRIENDS' HIGH SCHOOL. HOBART.Particulars of *Donations and Loans* to 12th Mo. 1900

## To meet initial expenditure

1887 to 1890 Subsidy from		
Meeting for Sufferings		480. 0. 0
Subsidy from		
Tasmanian Friends		147. 2. 0
		627. 2. 0
		=====

## For Furniture and Improvements

1887 Chemical Apparatus	England	100. 0.0	
1887 to 1893 Furniture	"	275. 0.0	
1889 to 1896 Donations for Improvements			
	England	2439.13.8	2814.13. 8
1891 Donation towards Gymnasium.	Sidney		
	and Melbourne		31. 8. 0
1888 Donation for deposit Hobartville Estate			
	Tasmania	150. 0.0	
1889 " " Furniture	Tasmania	100. 0.0	
1900 Proceeds Sale Work for Improvement			
	Tasmania	54. 2.9	
1894 to 1897 Smith's Legacy		218. 5.4	522. 8. 1
			3368. 9. 9
Loan Austr. Friends' Fund			5000. 0. 0
- Cape Fund			400.14.10
			8769. 4. 7
			=====

Particulars of Expenditure on Improvements  
Furniture and Legal Charges to end of 1900.

Original purchase Hobartville Estate	3150. 0.0	
Improvements	5373. 0.0	
* Chemical Apparatus. Furniture and Books	2400. 0.0	
Legal Charges	153. 0.0	
	11076. 0.0	
Less amount of Loans and Donations	8769. 0.0	
		£ 2307. 0. 0
		=====

\* 12½% being deducted annually for depreciation the asset of Furniture appeared in the books at end of 1900 as £945.

Total amount received from England	3294.13. 8
" " " " Tasmania	669.10. 1
" " " " elsewhere (Sydney & Melbourne)	31. 8. 0
	<hr/>
	3995.11. 9
	=====

APPENDIX 2.

THE FRIENDS' SCHOOL

Statement of Assets and Liabilities to  
31 December 1900.

<u>Assets</u>		<u>Liabilities</u>	
1) Hobartville Estate	7664.15.7	Loan: Australasian Friends' Fund	5000. 0. 0
2) Live Stock	15. 0.0	Loan: Cape Fund	400.14.10
3) Building Society	52. 1.0	Sundry Creditors	194. 3.10
Furniture and Books	945. 5.4	Due to Bank	357.15. 8
School fees owing	686.17.0		<u>5952.14. 4</u>
		4) Excess of Assets over Liabilities	<u>3411. 4. 7</u>
	<u>9363.18.11</u>		<u>9363.18.11</u>

NOTES:

- 1) In the first balance sheet 1890 the Hobartville Estate was put down at a valuation of £5,500 to cover the purchase price, the improvements made at time of transfer and a realistic valuation of the property in terms of current market value. By 1900 the following items of major building expenditure had been listed in successive balance-sheets under the heading of "Extraordinary Expenditure".

1890	Improvements	249. 3. 6
1891	Two gymnasia and three classrooms	1307.19. 0
1892	Hospital	317.19. 3
1893	Depression	nil
1894	New Bedrooms and sitting-rooms	538.17. 4
1895		nil
1896	Verandah and balcony	252. 5. 0
	New roof	
1897		nil
1898	New gates	covered apparently under 'repairs'
	Girls' ground levelled	
1899-1900		nil

- 2) Livestock represented by two cows!

- 3) Building Society: this investment was made to establish a

fund to pay off the mortgage (eventually).

- 4) The accumulated surplus in 1899 was given as 3882.11.2; this means that a loss of 471.6.7 was incurred over the year 1900, which was not surprising in view of the unsettled state of the school in that year.

In the *Working Account* of 1900 the main items of expenditure out of a total of £3118. 4. 3 were:

Teachers' salaries	1447.15. 4
House expenses	730.17.11
Interest & insurance	249.16. 7

The main sources of income were:

Fees: day scholars	1547.13. 0
Fees: boarders	902. 8. 0
Australasian Friends' Fund	75. 0. 0
used to pay interstate	
Friend boarders'	
travelling expenses	
Day boarders' dinners	46. 5. 0

#### Schedule of Fees in 1900:

<u>Day scholars</u> : Prep. Lower	1 guinea per quarter
Prep. Upper	1½ " " "
Junior under 10	2 " " "
over 10	3 " " "
Senior	4 " " "

Extra: 2/6 per quarter for gym. fees (except for prep.)

Friends' children : no reduction in Lower School, except that 11 yrs., not 10, was taken as the dividing line.

In senior school fee was 3 guineas.

Boarders : (including tuition)

Friends' children under 11	£11. 0.0	per quarter
over 11	£12.10.0	" "
over 13	£14. 0.0	
Non-Friends under 12	£14. 0.0	
over 12	£16. 0.0	

A reduction of 5% was made for two children and of 10% for three or more.

Note: The above rates were unchanged during the period 1887-1900.

# APPENDIX 3.

## STAFFING 1887-1900

F : Member of the Society of Friends  
P : On Probation as student teacher

### From England

F Samuel Clemes	1887-1900 (June)
F Margaret Clemes	1887-1900 (June)
F George Clark	1890-1901
F John Dixon	1890-1894 (April)
F Annie Tanner	1890-1891
F Edith Fletcher	1890-1891
F Charles Sowden	1881 (oct.) - 1897 (Nov.)
F Benjamin Le Tall	1892 (Nov.) - 1900 (March)
Isabella Clemes	1895-1899
F Miriam Davis	1898 (July) - 1899
F Gilbert Rowntree	1898 (Sept.)- 1900
F John Hills	1898 (Sept.) - 1900 (July)
Miss Avern	1899-1900 (Sept.)
Alice Mitchell	1900 (April) - 1900 (July)

### From Australia

Margaret Irvine	1887-1925
F Henrietta Pierce	1887-1897 (P 1887)
A.G. Mason	1887 (May) - 1887 (Dec.)
R. Hogan	1888 (Feb) - 1888 (May)
C.J.H. Chepmell	1888-1892
F Alfred Propsting	1889 (P)
F Mary Robson	1889 (P)
Edith Clemes	1890
Janet Wilson	1891-1899 (April)
F Madge Clemes	1891 (Sept.) - 1897 (June)
A.M. Elliott	1891 (P)
James Hebblethwaite	1891-1894
F M.A. Harloch (from N.Z.)	1891-1892 (Sept.)
H.S. Kingsmill	1892 (Jan. to June)
Miss McKenzie	1893-1897 (June)
C. Bjelke Petersen	1894-1907 (March)
F Charles Fryer	1895(P) -1899(Sept.)
F Mary Clemes	1895(P) -1900(June)
Amy Elliott	1895 (P)
F Catherine Piele	1897-1899(June)
Miss Bjelke Petersen	1897(Sept.)-1910
Miss Hurst	1898
F Evelyn Davidson	1900-1902(June)
Robert Hamilton	1900-1903
Charles Annells	1900(Sept.)-1907(July)
F Jane Pollard	1900(Sept.)-1902



## REFERENCES

---

### 1. BOOKS

- Austin, A.G., *Australian education, 1788-1900*. Melbourne : Pitmans, 1972.
- Backhouse, J., *A narrative of a visit to the colonies*. London : Hamilton, Adams, 1843.
- Backhouse, J., *Extracts from the letters of James Backhouse*. London : Harvey and Dalton, 1838.
- Backhouse J., and Tyler, C., *The life and labours of George Washington Walker*. London : Bennett, 1862.
- Backhouse, S., *Memoir of James Backhouse*. York : Sessions, 1870.
- Beale, E., *The earth between them*. Sydney : Wentworth Press, 1975.
- Biographical Catalogue*. London : London Friends' Institute, 1888.
- Bolger, P., *Hobart Town society 1855-1895*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra, 1968.
- Bonwick, J., *An octogenarian's reminiscences*. London : Nichols, 1902.
- Braithwaite, W.C., *The beginnings of Quakerism*. London : Macmillan, 1919.
- Braithwaite, W.C., *The second period of Quakerism*. Cambridge (U.K.): Macmillan, 1901.
- British and Foreign School Society, Sixty-sixth report of*. London : B. & F.S.S., 1871.
- Christian faith and practice in the experience of the Society of Friends*. London: London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1961.
- Cloverly, J.F., *Governor Bourke and the introduction of the Irish National System*. In C. Turney (Ed.), *Pioneers of Australian education*. Sydney : Sydney University Press, 1969.
- Brown, J.G., *Proverty is not a crime*. Hobart : Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 1972.
- Essays and Reviews*. London : Gregg International, 1970 (original edition of 1860 republished).

- Ford, J. (Ed.), *Sketch of the history of education in the Society of Friends*. York : Sessions, 1871.
- French, E.L., *Secondary education in the Australian social order 1788-1898*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne, 1957, 2 Vols.
- Isichei, E., *Victorian Quakers*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Janney, S.M. *Life of William Penn*. Philadelphia : Friends Book Centre, 1876.
- Jeffreys, M.V.C. *Personal values in the modern world*. London : Penguin, 1962.
- Jones, R., *The later periods of Quakerism*. London : Macmillan, 1921, 2 Vols.
- Knight, K., *A history of Sidcot School 1808-1908*. London : Dent, 1908.
- Lloyd, A., *Quaker social history 1669-1733*. London : Longmans, 1950.
- Mackie, F., *Traveller under concern*. Hobart : University of Tasmania, 1973.
- Miller, M., *Australian literature 1795-1838*. Sydney : Sydney University Press, 1973.
- Nadel, G., *Australia's colonial culture*. Cambridge (Mass. U.S.A.): Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Pollard, F.E. (Ed.), *Bootham School 1823-1923*. London : Dent, 1926.
- Reed, D.W., *Friends School, Wigton, 1815-1953*. Carlisle : Wigton Old Scholars Association, 1954.
- Roe, M., *Quest for authority in Eastern Australia 1835-1851*. Melbourne : Melbourne University Press, 1965.
- Rowntree, J.S., *Quakerism past and present*. London : Smith, Elder, 1859.
- Rowntree, J.S., *His life and work*. London : Headley Press, 1908.
- Rules of Discipline of the Religious Society of Friends*. (3rd ed.). London : Religious Society of Friends, 1834.
- Salmon, D., *The practical parts of Lancaster's improvements and Bell's experiment*. In D. Salmon, (ed.), *Landmarks in the history of education*. Cambridge (England): Cambridge University Press, 1932.

- Sherman, J., *Memoirs of William Allen*. Philadelphia : Longstreth, 1851.
- Stephenson, C., *With unhurried pace*. Melbourne : The Religious Society of Friends (Australia), 1973.
- Stewart, W.A.C., *Quakers and education*. London : Epworth Press, 1953.
- The Friends School 1887-1961*, Hobart : The Friends School, 1961.
- Vipont, E. *The story of Quakerism*. London : Bannisdale Press, 1954.
- Wallis, I.H., *Frederick Andrews of Ackworth*. London : Longmans, Green 1924.
- West, J., *The history of Tasmania*. (new edition). Sydney : Angus & Robertson, 1971.
- Wheeler, D. (Jr.), *Memoirs of the life and gospel labours of the late Daniel Wheeler*. London: Harvey & Dalton, 1842.

## 2. JOURNALS AND PAMPHLETS

- A defence of the British and Foreign School Society*. London : B. & F.S.S., 1821.
- French, E.L., *The Australian Tradition in secondary education 1814-1900*. *Comparative Education*, Vol. 1, No. 2, March 1965.
- Lester, J.A., *The Place of Quaker Schools in contemporary education*. *Friends' Intelligencer*, 88, 1931.
- Mather, J.B., *Account of the rise of the Society of Friends in Tasmania*. Typed MS., Hobart : 1883, F4/67 T.U.A.
- Mather, J.B. *Assorted papers* (MS. missing)
- Shoobridge, I.M., *Samuel Clemes 1845-1922*. Hobart : Author, 1933.
- The Friend*, published weekly, London.
- The Australian Friend*, Published bi-monthly, 1887 to the present, Melbourne.
- The Natural History Journal and School Reporter 1893-1896*. London. F.H.A.L.
- Friends' Schools in the Seventies*, London: F.S. Joint Committee, 1973.

*Reports and Essays of the Friends' Education Society 1837-1845.*  
London : Harvey & Dalton.

*Reports and Essays of the Friends' Education Society 1846-1856.*  
York : Linney.

*Report of the London Education Conference 1879.* London :  
Newman, 1880.

*Tasmanian Sunday School Teachers' Magazine and Journal of Education.*  
Hobart : July 1857.

### 3. MANUSCRIPTS

*Manuscript material* is classified according to location:

#### A. The Tasmanian University Archives (T.U.A.)

1. *Records of the Society of Friends* on indefinite loan to T.U.A. from the Hobart Regional Meeting of the Society of Friends.

Access: permission (in writing) required from the Clerk of the Hobart Regional Meeting.

- S.1/11 Minutes of Hobart Monthly Meetings 1833-1950,  
6 Vols.

In Vol. 1 (rear) the following registers are kept:

Marriage	1834-1887
Births	1834-Jan. 1886
Deaths	1834-Aug. 1888
List of Members	1833-1869

- S.1/12 Duplicate of above minutes for use at Kelvedon, where Monthly Meetings were held in alternate months with Hobart 1833-1843  
with Launceston 1844-1851  
2 Vols.

- S.1/13 Minutes of Launceston Monthly Meetings  
1844-1851.

- S.1/14 Minutes of Annual Meetings 1834-1902. 2 Vols.  
Vol. 2 (rear) contains a list of members 1834-1895.

2. *Records of the Friends' School Hobart* on indefinite loan to T.U.A. from the Board of Governors of The Friends' School.

Access: by authority of the Board of Governors only.

- F.4/1 Letters (127) received by J.B. and J.F. Mather of Hobart from Edwin Ransome of London concerning the finances and management of the F.S.H. Draft replies (15) from J.B.M. and J.F.M.
- F.4/2-4 J.F. Mather's correspondence with Charles Holdsworth 1893-1924.  
F.4/2 contains correspondence for the period 1887-1906.
- F.4/5 J.F. Mather's Letter Copy Book 1887-1900, including school financial statements 1890-1896 school annual reports 1891-1898.
- F.4/6 J.F. Mather's Letter Copy Book 1899-1915, including financial statements and annual reports for 1899-1908.
- F.4/15 Statement of Accounts 1900-1909.  
This book also contains an historical account of the progress of the school in brief, diary form for the years 1887-1944.
- F.4/19 Register of students 1887-1910.
- F.4/20 Lists of students arranged in the order of Friends' boys, Friends' girls, non-Friends' boys, non-Friends' girls, together with year of entry, State of origin, subsequent occupation (where known).
- F.4/27-29 School Diaries kept by students, describing leisure activities 1896-1905.
- F.4/30 Weather Diary 1896-1898.
- F.4/31-32 Minutes of meetings of the Hobartville Association (1888-1910). This Association had been called the Natural History and Essay Society until 1892.  
F4/31 1888 - October 1900.
- F.4/33-43 Bound Volumes of student essays delivered at meetings of the Hobartville Association. 11 Vols. cover the years 1888-1900.
- F.4/44 Cash book and library catalogue of the Boarders' Literary Society 1890-1894
- F.4/45-49 School Magazine, *School Echoes*, 1890-1958. Complete for years 1890-1902, but thereafter incomplete.  
Note: Complete series in bound volumes is held at The Friends' School Hobart.

F.4/52 C.H. Robey Press Clipping Book 1886-1909.

F.4/54 *Sixty Years 1887-1947* - a printed brief history of The Friends' School Hobart.

F.4/55-58 Photographic Albums 1890-1940.

F.4/67 'A manuscript account of the rise of the Society of Friends in Tasmania, written by the late Joseph Benson Mather'. 1883 typescript.

### 3. The Walker Papers

Access: at the discretion of the archivist : an application form is to be signed, agreeing to acknowledge use of the papers.

Material used in the thesis came from the following:

W.9/1/1 Correspondence of George W. Walker.

W.9/1/1/4 *Letter Books of George W. Walker 1831-1844*, 4 volumes.

W.9/2/1(1) Letters from James B. Walker to Sarah B. Mather, 1855 and 1884-1890.

W.9/3/1(1) to (7) Letters received by J.B. Walker.

W.9/3/2(1) to (5) Letters outward from J.B. Walker.

W.9/3/3(1) to (36) Diaries of J.B. Walker.

W.9/3/6 Memoirs and Reminiscences of J.B. Walker.

### B. Friends' House Archives, London, (F.H.A.L.)

The Library at Friends' House, Euston Road, London, contains the most complete records of the correspondence between London and Hobart for the period under review 1832-1900.

In 1972 much of this material was microfilmed for the Australian Joint Copying Project and the scope of this material was described in the catalogue:

"Manuscripts in the British Isles, relating to Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific", Ed. Phyllis Mander-Jones, Canberra, 1972, pp. 314-320.

Some of the correspondence between Edwin Ransome and J.F.Mather was not released for microfilming, because of its more personal nature. This correspondence provided the source

material for Chapter VI, 'The Anatomy of a Crisis'.

MS. Boxes 19, 20 and 21 contain this material.

MS. Boxes 4.2, 7.7, 25 (re New Zealand), 28 were also not released for microfilming, but do not concern the school as directly as 19, 20 and 21.

The following MSS. are incomplete on microfilm (i.e., odd items have not been released or have been omitted):

Robert Lindsey MSS., MS. Boxes 15(5), 16(1) to (5),  
17(1) to (3), 18(1) to (4),  
29.

There are 15 reels of microfilm, copies of which are held at Friends' House, London and at the State Archives, Hobart.

For easy reference the relevant records at Friends' House, London, are listed under the numbers of the reels of microfilm. Sections which are not directly relevant to the subject of this thesis are marked with an asterisk

C. Tasmanian State Archives (T.S.A.), the State Library, Hobart.

<u>Reel No.</u>	<u>F.H.A.L. ref.</u>	<u>Description</u>
1	MS. Vols.25 26(to 1908)	Minutes of London Yearly Meeting 1834-1856 relating to Australia and New Zealand and including relevant reports of the Continental Committee and the Meeting for Sufferings. From 1857 the Minutes were printed as 'Proceedings'. Both MS. and printed Minutes are indexed. The report of the 1875 Deputation appears in Y.M. Proceedings 1876.
2	(1) Vol.26 (2) Vols. 43 to 55 (pp.137-8)	Minutes of London Y.M. 1908-1916 Minutes of Meeting for Sufferings, 1823-1916, relating to Australia.
3	(1) Vol.55 (from p.156) Vol.56 (2) Vols. 6 & 7 (3) Vols. 65-70 (4) Temporary Box 98/4, Vol.1.	Ditto Ditto Testimonies concerning deceased 'ministers' 1728-1872 (7 volumes) (After 1873 all testimonies concerning Australian Friends appeared in Y.M. Proceedings.) Epistles of London Y.M. Minutes of the Continental Committee, 1817-1905, indexed. Australian Committee Minutes 1908-1919.

<u>Reel No.</u>	<u>F.H.A.L. ref.</u>	<u>Description</u>
4	(1) Temporary Box Box 98/4 Vols. 2-4.	Australian Committee Minutes 1908-1919 Ditto
	* (2) Portfolios 8, 6/59, Miscellaneous Correspondence 17/103, 17/115-6, re Australian Meetings on 18/14, 19/104, matters not directly relevant 25/67, 28/93, to the theme of the thesis. 30/72, 40/70, 42/80-3.	
5	(1) Daniel Wheeler MS. Vol. 2	Covers visit of Daniel and son Charles to Australia and their meeting with Backhouse and Walker, 1834-35.
	(2) James Backhouse Collection, MS. Vol. S 48.	<i>Letter Book 1</i> , 1831-35.
6	Ditto. MS. Vol. 57 MS. Vol. S.69 MS. Vol. 58 Temp.Box 61/1 MS.Vol. S 355 Case 101	<i>Letter Book 2</i> , 1835-67. <i>Letter Book 4</i> , 1837-41. <i>Letter Book 5</i> , 1841-68. <i>Journal Letter Transcripts</i> 1831-33, 2 Vols. Account Book and Correspondence.
7	Robert Lindsey MSS.	Journals of visit to Australia with Frederick Mackie 1852-56.
8	(1) Robert Lindsey MSS.	Ditto
	* (2) MS. Boxes 1/9, 2/4, 5/13, 5/23, 13/1.	Miscellaneous - Australian Meetings.
	(3) MS. Box 14	Epistles to and from Australia and New Zealand.
	(4) MS. Box 15 (1) to (4)	Letters and journals of Henrietta Brown and E. Maria Bishop who visited the Friends' School Hobart in 1902.
9	(1) MS. Box 15(5)	Ditto
	(2) MS. Box 16	Miscellaneous letters and reports, including some notes of Edwin Ransome re Friends' School Hobart and the Austral- ian Deputation of 1875.



<u>Reel No.</u>	<u>F.H.A.L. ref.</u>	<u>Description</u>
*10	MS. Box 17(1) to (3) MS. Box 18(1) to (4)	Alfred H. Brown Correspondence 1905-16 re Friends' School Hobart.
*11	(1) MS. Box 18(5)& (6) (2) MS. Box 22(1) to (7) MS. Box 23(1) to (5)	Correspondence with Australian Meetings. Correspondence and papers relat- ing to The Friends' School Hobart.
12	(1) MS. Box 23 (cont.) MS. Box 23(6) to (8)	Ditto
	* (2) MS. Box 24	Correspondence : New Zealand and Rockhampton.
	(3) MS. Box 26(1) to (4)	Cuttings relating mostly to The Friends' School Hobart.
13	* (1) MS. Box 27(1) to (4)	Matters concerning Australian Meetings
	(2) MS. Box 29	Charles Holdsworth Collection
	(3) MS. Vol. Series S S 286-292	<i>William Benson Journals 1866-1888</i> , (7 Vols.)
	(4) S 347	<i>Stones of Memorial</i> : Alfred Wright. Vol.1 : Australian Deputation 1875.
14	(1) S 347 (cont.) S 349	Alfred Wright: Vol.1 (cont.) <i>Stones of Memorial</i> . Vol. 3, record of second visit of Alfred Wright to Australia, 1890-92.
	* (2) Isaac Sharp MSS.	Diaries of visit to Australia and New Zealand 1880-1882.
*15	* (1) Isaac Sharp MSS.	(cont.)
	(2) Letter Boxes L 2, Q, R, T, W	Miscellaneous Documents, lists letters re Friends, chiefly for the period 1900-1920.
	* (3) Gibson MSS.	
	(4) MS. Vol. 72	Wilfrid Littleboy Letters - Visit to The Friends' School Hobart 1909.
	(5) Uncatalogued	Miscellaneous Correspondence.