

BE SUBSTANTIALLY GREAT IN THY SELF:

Getting to Know C.E.W. Bean;
Barrister, Judge's Associate, Moral Philosopher

APPENDIX I

CEW Bean, Thomas Arnold, Australian Character and the ANZAC Spirit

(With Quotations in Chronological Reverse Order)

(1) What was "The Arnold Tradition"?

Extracts from C.E.W. Bean, *Here, My Son: An Account of the Independent and Other Corporate Boys' Schools of Australia* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1950)

Page 53

"Arnold's vision led him to make [Rugby School] what he wanted to make the State – a community founded on, and working out, the Christian view of life. He took the school institutions as he found them – prefect system, games, classical curriculum, chapel; but his attitude and leadership transformed all these activities. Prefects had existed in these schools for centuries... to help in control and teaching, but they had become too often privileged bullies, who on many occasions mutinied against their master in defence of their customary rights. Arnold, by making them his trusted lieutenants and adoring friends, cleaned, disciplined, and ennobled his whole school. He recognised the games, hitherto the concern only of the boys, as a factor in the moral health of the school – a counter-attraction to gambling, drinking, and poaching. He taught classics (and added French, mathematics, and history), not merely to produce scholars but to equip leaders for public life; with him a lesson on Thucydides illuminated the problems of 1830 – as it can those of 1950. But it was on his addresses in the chapel and his personal contact with his boys in and out of school – and the choice of his masters – that he relied, with astonishing success, in making Rugby of his days 'a school of Christian gentlemen'. Above all he introduced the principle of trusting boys instead of spying on them. 'Even in the lower forms', writes Dean Stanley, one of his most famous pupils, 'he never seemed to be on the watch for boys, and in the higher forms any attempt at further proof of an assertion was immediately checked: - 'If you say so, that is quite enough; of course I believe your word'. And there grew up in consequence a general feeling that 'it was a shame to tell Arnold a lie – he always believes one'".

Pages 108-109

“Until his time school chaplains at Rugby and elsewhere conducted the services and usually gave the addresses. But to a man of Arnold’s fervour and strength – as to many headmasters since – it must have been almost unbearable to sit in chapel while the chaplain seemed to him to miss or misuse this precious weekly opportunity. He was, says Stanley, against having more religious services than ‘the boys would bear without a sense of tedium or formality’. The regular services were therefore all the more important. After a year or two he petitioned the school’s trustees to appoint him chaplain without the chaplain’s fee. ‘Whoever is chaplain’ he wrote, ‘I must ever feel myself, as headmaster, the real and proper religious instructor of the boys. No-one else can feel the same interest in them, and no-one else (... by virtue of my situation) can speak to them with so much influence’. The advantage of the school chapel, he added, was that he should be ‘officially as well as really’ their pastor.

And with such a man it was so indeed. In the chapel more than anywhere else almost every boy was at some time, sooner or later, emotionally attuned to feel the influence of the greatest force in education, that of personality. ‘What was it,’ asks the writer of [Tom Brown’s School Days], describing the chapel in the twilight, with ‘the tall gallant form’ of Arnold speaking to ‘the long lines of young faces rising tier above tier’ –

What was it that moved and held us... three hundred reckless, childish boys, who... put the traditions of Rugby and the public opinion of boys in our daily life above the laws of God?... We listened... to a man whom we felt to be, with all his heart and soul and strength, striking against whatever was mean and unmanly and unrighteous in our little world... He showed them by every word he spoke in the pulpit and by his while daily life, how that battle was to be fought.... The true sort of captain, too, for a boys’ army, one who had no misgivings, and gave no uncertain word of command and, let who would yield and make truce, would fight the fight out (as every boy felt) to the last gasp.... It was this thoroughness and undaunted courage which more than anything else won his way to the hearts of the great mass of those on whom he left his mark, and made them believe first in him, and then in his Master....”.

Pages 109-110

“The Headmaster’s task [according to Arnold] was to implant not merely rules and habits of conduct but religion – that is, a conception of the universe and its laws in accordance with which ... boys would determine their conduct. It meant, for example, something more than instilling, as English schools do by their traditions and discipline, a keener sense of responsibility. It is true that this is a foremost necessity, especially in countries where people’s happiness lies so much in their own hands; but it is not enough. To take an extreme

example, Hitler instilled into German boys a strong sense of responsibility, but deprived them of the still more necessary guiding star, such as the Christian ideal, by which each could direct his own conduct.

In Arnold's time, in an England still mainly Puritan, the sole guiding star for many people was still the Bible, even 'the Bible without note or comment'. But in all Western countries since the Renaissance the general attitude towards religion had been changing; and towards the end of the nineteenth century the change became noticeable to everyone by the change of Sunday from an occasion for churchgoing to one for almost general holiday....

The findings in many branches of science had undoubtedly bewildered a great part of the Western peoples. A considerable part, while clinging more strongly than ever to the humanitarian teachings of Christ, and to the paramount value of His example, came to doubt all but the simplest theological doctrines and adopted much greater latitude of belief. The most widespread religion of the West today seems to be a Christian humanitarianism. Most Western peoples, however far their conduct may diverge, have as their guiding star the ideal embodied in the teaching and example of Christ, and many who are proud to call themselves Christians hold no more definite view".

Page 117

"In all branches of education and in all ages the most powerful instrument of education is personality..... The real worth of a school depends on its morale; and as the morale of a regiment can be created or wrecked by a good or bad colonel in less than a year, so – and little less quickly – can that of a school by a good or bad headmaster".

Page 130

"Arnold's moral aim was to produce boys fit to take the leadership in a Christian State and Empire. And his method in the first place was to build on the boys' existing sense of honour and to trust them".

Pages 143-144

"And, whereas Hitler taught his youth not to think but to follow him blindly, in a democratic people every headmaster worth his salt tries to teach his boys to think for themselves.

Arnold's boys were largely self-governing in those activities, such as games and debates, that concerned mainly themselves....

... [The] aim of [modern Australian] schools is far more democratic than in Arnold's time. He accepted the fact that his boys were upper and middle class, and in a few years would be occupying leading positions in Parliament or even in the Government, the Law, the Church, the civil and fighting services and business; and his main task was to fit them for these high responsibilities – which, on the whole, his system thoroughly succeeded in

doing. ... But it is significant that, in the next generation after Arnold, John Percival¹ had a different aim – that at least some school should pour forth, for the next stage of England's progress, 'social missionaries of a new type' whose idea, whatever their calling, would be to create a new world for the desperately underprivileged masses".

(2) CEW Bean's Definition of "the "ANZAC Spirit": Extract from his *War Aims of a Plain Australian* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 2nd and 3rd eds., 1945)

Pages 164-165

Contrary to some expectations our fighting men will not come back [at the end of WW2] hardened by war against the vision of beautiful things. It doesn't work that way. The man who has been through a world war comes back longing, more than any other section of the community, to have done with destruction. ... [He longs] to put destruction behind him and to turn to the constructive tasks of peace. Moreover he has known at the front, and now looks for in peace, high, unselfish leadership.

Here is contest enough to engage a young Australian's fighting spirit for the full remainder of his days;... moulding the Australia that we fought for in both wars, above all a land of equal opportunity for all, of real liberty, equality, fraternity.

Don't let anyone tell us that we have not the will or quality for that peaceful struggle. If we 'know ourselves' we know that there has always been in Australians an outstanding eagerness for better things, for themselves and others. Australian opinion was a world force in 1890 when money flowed from all our classes to sustain the London dock strike, and when our socialists staked their fortunes on the Murray River settlements and in New Australia in Paraguay. The 'Anzac spirit' of brotherhood and initiative as shown in our fighting forces and Legacy Clubs is the kind of force to move the world. In the world wars, along with many faults, the ordinary Australian has shown also many qualities of peculiar value – devoted loyalty to a mate, stubborn comradeship that always stood by the 'underdog', frankness and freshness of outlook unafraid of authority, restless curiosity, resourcefulness in every difficulty, great endurance, capacity for cool judgment but also for intense effort in a crises. But above all in Australia the different classes live much closer together than in Britain or perhaps even in America..."

¹ Percival started his teaching career at Rugby School (1860-1862), served as Headmaster at Clifton College (1862-1879) during Edwin Bean's student days there, and later served as Headmaster at Rugby (1887-1895) before his appointment as Bishop of Hereford.

Pages 167-168

“Freedom! Our chief object is to enlarge to the utmost the most important freedom man can have – freedom for each individual to develop the best that is in him, consistently with the opportunity for all other men to do the same. To secure and maintain that freedom is not merely our right but far more – our constant duty and the aim of our planning. We intend to reach it partly by a better sharing of wealth and opportunities for the three-fourths of our people whose chances were previously sacrificed for the wealth of a fraction of the other fourth. But the basic means of freedom is itself freedom of access to truth.

The most vital element in our plan is education to a level more adequate for our future. Nothing that man can achieve – no work, no system – is permanent. Do what each generation can, its most effective achievement is, probably, to educate a people capable of facing the next tasks of human progress. To place Australia, as we can, somewhere in the van of the world’s thought; to establish our land as one in which, at least, men’s chances are really equal; to thrust on, level with the first in mankind’s march into the unknown; to set our youngsters facing straight up the long heights unafraid, eagerly hewing out the steps of science, philosophy, art, or industry, that will carry each generation higher; to strive shoulder to shoulder with mates all over the world in the generous effort to fill the all-too-short-limits of each human life with the utmost measure of usefulness and happiness, to hear Australia’s name honoured wherever men speak of mankind’s fight towards Truth as the foundation of all progress – surely this is an aim for which this generation of us can not only die but live.

(3) CEW Bean’s Assessment of “Australian Character” (and the role of education) in the immediate aftermath of World War I: Extracts from Chapter XVI (the final chapter), on “Education”, in his *In Your Hands, Australians* (Cassell and Company Ltd, London, 1st edition, 1918)

Page 86

A country is not as happy nor as prosperous as it ought to be unless it is making full use of all the brains, character, and bodily strength of every new citizen that is born into its nationō .

Page 86-87

“The nation likely to be most prosperous and happy is the one in which every boy and girl is enabled to use his or her brain and character in exactly the work for which they are best fitted, so that this country gets the whole value out of every citizen in it. To see that every young citizen fills, as far as possible, exactly the job he is most capable for – that is the object of the States system of education. It should not only enable each youngster to

reach the employment he is best fitted for; it should, with all its power, encourage him to do so...”.

Pages 87-88

“Only by a system of education which gives to every child born an equal chance (and positive active encouragement) to develop every ounce of brain power, physical strength, and manly or womanly character that is in them; which takes them from the Primary School, if they have capacity, either to the High School or to the Trade School, and from there to the University or the Agricultural College or the Technical School, or Commonwealth Military or Naval College, or to a School for the Merchant Sea Service of Australia, or the Conservatorium of Music or Painting or Sculpture in any of our great towns, or possibly even in some of the big country centres – which lies open; in short, to every Australian child the whole, well thought out, carefully planned educational system which we will some day have in the new Australia. You have to make that system, young Australians. It is one of the greatest works, perhaps the greatest, that you can do for your country....”.

Pages 88-89

“Now what sort of a system would an ideal system be? What parts of the child ought the system to educate?

“Surely the truth is that the proper object for education is every part of the boy which can be educated – that is: body, mind, and character”.

As to the education of the mind, the first object of the State is to discover all the powers in a boy or girl, or let them discover themselves by giving them sufficient knowledge to understand their own people and country and history and literature and other people and their countries and something of their histories.”.

Pages 90-92

“...[The] most important of the three qualities of every Australian is character. If you think it out – the big thing in the war for Australia was the discovery of the character of Australian men. It was character which rushed the hills at Gallipoli and held on there during the long afternoon and night, when everything seemed to have gone wrong and there was only the barest hope of success. It was character which made the Australian soldier say on thousands of occasions: ‘It’s better to risk it over the open than stand here faltering, wondering whether to cross the open or not; it is better to go slap dash straight through the barrage with ammunition wagons than weakly loiter by on the off-chance that the barrage may lift; the chaps out there now, in shell-holes, want their guns to protect them; they must have their rations, poor beggars; let us get the food to them hot’. It was character which made them decide instantly, on all occasions, and which, when they had decided, caused them to hang on despite rain, despite mud, with the wagon apparently helplessly stuck, or the platoon hopelessly off its track, not to give up as

thousands would do, but to go on trying first this means and then that until at last the wagon did come clear or the platoon did find its way.

They had a character which firstly led them fearlessly and independently to face each problem; to turn round to it squarely and apply their mind to it straight. It was character which made of the Australian girl such a true "sister" to the men, even amidst the bombs at Abbeville or Trois Arbres.

Secondly, Australians had the habit of making decisions without always referring to someone else for advice – a very rare and precious habit these days.

Thirdly, when they had once made up their mind they went at their job with a boyish enthusiasm which carried them through everything, even when things seemed hopeless. They seemed to be able, with that single firm twist of decision, to screw themselves so tight that in spite of strain they did not work loose or wobble any more. Complete frankness and freshness in tackling any problem; the habit of making decisions for themselves; a fresh enthusiasm in carrying them out; those three were the outstanding qualities which made the fighting power of the AIF so great. How can Australian education encourage those qualities? Where did they come from?

They probably came from the adventurous spirit of our ancestors who wandered out here to discover a fresh world for themselves apart from the old settled ideas and traditions of the old world. They have been preserved ever since by the bush and the mining camp, where each man is forced to settle every problem for himself or else the problems will settle him (much as happens in war). It is the difficulties of our country that have made our character – not its ease. The character of city Australians is really founded on the bush also. The country is so wide and empty to-day that almost everyone in the biggest city has lived in the bush (or else his parents or his friends have). Our boys hear or read the stories of the bush, and the standards they have in their minds are in nine cases out of ten the standards of the bush.

Now this freshness of outlook, resourcefulness, and habit of making decisions has to be preserved by some deliberate plan as our country grows more inhabited and the bush gradually recedes. It will never quite disappear; there will always be huge central tracts where the population is scanty. But only one or two in every hundred will live there, whereas twenty in every hundred live there now. How are we to make up for the loss of the bush as the training ground for our national character?

Like everything else it can be done if we use our brains in planning that it shall be done. Each young Australian in his life passes through two great schools of character.

The first is his home. The second is his school, college, or apprenticeship.

The greatest factor in all education (in spite of all other set ideas about it) is the home, and beyond question a boy or girl's greatest educator is their mother. ..."

Pages 93-96

"The home conditions can, therefore, be planned to keep our young Australians possessed of these three characteristics – freshness, decision, enthusiasm. Our schools – the second great educator – can do their best work by adding an all-important quality to their character – public spirit. It would be possible to write many volumes upon what a school or college, or even an apprenticeship, ought to be. It is the factory of the nation, and according as it is planned so will the nation be turned out (at present in many countries it is not planned at all). Those who read this book must be left to plan out the ideal school for themselves. But this much may be said:

Whatever system a nation adopts for its life in these modern days – Socialism, Liberalism, Conservatism – really depends upon each citizen being so trained that he can be trusted upon to do his duty to the State, and undertake, without shirking, his fair portion of the nation's work. The other citizens, if they are to do their share, must be able to depend upon his doing his part. ...

... In the great English and Australian schools, where education is more or less expensive, immense care is taken in developing the character of every boy who goes through them by giving him a strong sense of his duty to his country, making him public-spirited, ready to stand up for the interests of the community even if his own selfish interests point another way. Why should not every Australian child and student be given the advantage of character-training as careful as that of the very best schools in the world? ...

What does it need? It means that the masters of the schools must be chosen, like the officers of an Australian battalion, not so much for what they know, but for what they are. They must be men and women whose characters the boys or girls under them will admire and respect; men who know men, who can stand strong in the world. There must be enough of them to allow them personally to attend to every pupil not only in school, but on the great character-training ground of the British race – the playground – also. They should themselves be men or women training in places where they, too, have the advantage of contact with great and inspiring men. If we have teachers' training colleges at our universities the thing is not difficult. The first step would be to see that the head of each college was a man of altogether outstanding character, with full power to choose his own staff. That is the lesson learnt a thousand times over by the AIF.

All this means money on education – good salaries – numerous staff – careful selection and training. But nowhere will either care or expense be either better or more instantly repaid than in this factory of the nation.

There is one danger in a factory. Unless you specifically provide against its doing so, it will turn out all articles exactly alike. Now the last thing in the world that Australians want is that their young Australians, when poured out of school, should all be exactly similar to one another.....

Therefore we want as much variety as possible in our training. We have only to plan for it and we can bring it about. We might leave some of our education in local hands, help the towns to have their own conservatoria of music, or encourage varied points of view in our art and technical schools, and differences in our universities. ...

... [When] we fit our schools and universities to teach the knowledge of almost every science in our national life (as we were forced, for mere efficiency, to do with our AIF schools in France), then let us use to the uttermost limit the young Australians whom we have taken such pains to train.

We have never used brains upon any sort of plan worthy of the name for the progress and happiness of our nation. We have the only country in the world that is still to make. Fifty-seven thousand young Australians, who left Australia in high hopes to fight for her, fifty-seven thousand who will never return to her dear shores, have preserved that power to us. We can make her what we will.

It is in your hands, Australians”.

(4) CEW Bean’s Assessment of “Australian character” before the commencement of World War I: Extracts from the First Edition of his “The ‘Dreadnought’ of the Darling”(Alston Rivers Ltd, London, 1911)

Page 307:

“In the outside country, life, whether pastoral or at the mining camps, is above all things simple. On the land – you go on making money until drought, or pest, or fire, or flood knocks you down, and then you begin again. The demeanour with which he takes those disasters, when they come upon him, is the most lovable thing about the up-country Australian. Day after day news will come in from the paddocks of more cattle dead or dying with the tick pest, or sheep dwindling through want of feed – it is almost always want of feed, not want of water. Everybody knows that ‘the boss’ must be feeling as if his heart’s blood were draining away; and yet from the conversation around the breakfast table you would hardly know there was a tick in Queensland. If things get better they may pull through and start again stronger than their neighbours; if they get worse the boys may have to go off and work for somebody else, and the girls will enter a tea or flower shop in Sydney or Melbourne; or the old man may perhaps be left by the banks as manager of the run he once owned.

In a country like that it is impossible for money to be a criterion in social position – and the mere possession of money has not a tithe of the admiration which it gets in older countries. I have not known a man or a boy in Australia who showed the least shamefacedness in owning himself poor when he was in rich company – I do not believe even a germ of that feeling exists, and one devoutly hopes it never may. It means there is an almost entire absence in Australia of any striving to keep up the appearance of being richer than you are.

In the same way the fact that, in Australian opinion, any calling is honourable so long as it is honest, is probably due to the ideas of the back country. In the back country, where a man is face to face with nature all the time and fighting her for all he is worth, his success, and indeed his very life, depends on facing the facts – there is no time or use for frills. ...

One could not pretend to claim that there is no snobbishness in Australia; there is a fair amount of it in certain circles. But I think it is not in the sentiment of the people, and there is this powerful influence of the out-back life which may be relied on to fight against it all the time; so that the prospect really seems to be that with the younger generations it may grow less rather than more.

There are some very attractive points in that out-back code. It may be a trifle on the charitable side in its treatment of periodical ‘bursts’ – but then, where perhaps fifty weeks in the year must be spent upon nothing but tea, a certain percentage of the population may naturally be tempted to spend the other two under liquor – and the Western code takes that all in its stride. That same code comes with the force of a sledge-hammer on to any man that injures a good woman. A woman’s life is hard in this far West, and there are not many women out there – perhaps not nearly as many as there should be. But if devotion, almost amounting to worship, shown in little thoughtful attentions, in tender consideration in small things and large, can help a woman over her difficulties and troubles, that attention almost every man in the West will lay at her feet.

Another delightful law in the up-country code is that of hospitality... One can only say that in every case they treated these unexpected visitors as if they were long-invited guests....

Out in this country of huge distances they seem to take all this as one of the conditions of life. A strange buggy is seen jogging across the paddock, and they make its occupant honestly feel they are glad he has come and are sorry when he goes away. That out-back hospitality sets the idea for the Australian; it is what the city Australian as well tries to act up to, in so far as it is feasible, in big cities. Of course it cannot be quite the same in crowded parts. But one has hopes that it will always remain the standard for Australian hospitality.

Perhaps the strongest article in the out-back code is that of loyalty to a mate. Possibly it is an article of faith with all Anglo-Saxons. But it is worth mentioning here because that loyalty is a quality which largely originates in the back country – especially in the mining camps. Wherever you have men on the British race engaged in mining precious metals on their own account, you always seem to get a tremendously strong public opinion in favour of straight

dealing between mates. It is public opinion, not the police, that really prevents thieving in a mining camp. The average digger is the most loyal man on earth. They have nothing particular to get from a Labour Government, but they make the most solid Labour constituencies in the country, partly because they are highly independent, but chiefly because it is a necessity to the miner to be what he considers loyal to his mates elsewhere. You cannot talk about that sort of loyalty – the more it is bragged about the shallower it becomes. But one may just say this, that although the Australian will never be an effusive ‘imperialist’ or, probably, favourable to any hard and fast parliamentary constitution binding his country to the Motherland, still, if ever a certain ancient country, the old friend and protector of a younger land, finds herself in difficulties, there is in the younger land, existing in quite unsuspected quarters, a thousand times deeper and more effective than the more showy protestations which sometimes appropriate the title of ‘imperialism’, the quality of sticking – whatever may come and whatever may be the end of it – to an old mate.

The back-country man is usually tenderly kind to animals....”

(5) CEW Bean’s Earlier Assessment of “Australian Character” before the commencement of World War I: Extracts from his Sydney Morning Herald articles on “Australia” (1 June – 20 July 1907)

(IV) The Australian (22 June 1907)

“[The Australian’s] character is the simplest imaginable. The key to it is just this – that he takes everything on its merits, and nothing on authority. Perhaps he goes further, and takes everything on its merits except for a bias against authority....

And so it is the genius of Australia, this looking of facts in the face, and taking nothing on authority. The Australian is a deduction from it – in his virtue, his vice, manners, dress, customs; in his politics, in the elections, in the elected; in the problems he tackles, and the way he tackles them. ...

[The] Australian judges [men and women] by what they are, and not by the manner in which they dress: indeed, he affects utility almost to the point of untidiness.

... Australia really owns no class distinctions. The foundation for them was never laid. Society here did not begin with a peasant looking to his lord for his protection against robber knights, and huddling under the castle walls; and this tie has not lasted for centuries so as to bind the tenant to his lord by bonds very different from mere contract. There is no basis for the old distinctions, and the newcomer [to Australia] cannot help seeing that such as survive are only skin deep. Every man in dealing with any other has a certain unaffected assurance, which is a little foreign to the engrained feudalism of England. It is that same proud, self-confidence which travellers notice in every Spaniard, rich or poor. Bago el ninguno. That of itself goes a long way to make gentlemen. It has literally turned the whole Spanish nation into

aristocrats, and they say that it is doing the same for the American farmer. It may well be a part of the Australian ideal.

You can see that this point of view is likely to make a very 'square' man of the Australian. And it has done so. In the country especially frankness is written largely across his face. He is pre-eminently a lover of the truth, as I can vouch, who have seen and admired that quality again and again in Australian boys at English schools. Perhaps most of all his squareness shows in his friendship. When once the sort of Australian whom I regard as typical has taken a man on his merits for a friend – well, may the powers that be long preserve him to the quality of that friendship. Absolute trust in you, absolute fidelity on his side; generosity unsurpassed in life, or even in literature – it is a sacred place, the inner sanctum of his confidence. Admission is not easy; but once it is gained he will trust you to death, and beyond, if that may be. The only thing which can undo that fast, firm bond will be that one thing which the Australian hates more bitterly than any poison – a want of straightness on your part. He will never forgive that. It is a picturesque code. If you wish to see it in print, go to Bret Harte²... and inquire how the Californian regards his mate. It is but another evidence of the origin of this most romantic standard [that characterises the Australian].

The Australian is always fighting something. In the bush it is drought, fires, unbroken horses, wild cattle; and not unfrequently strong men. Never was such a country for defending itself with its fists. ... An Australian will not pocket an insult. Where an Italian or a Spaniard would knife you, an Australian will fight you. We look upon all this as very shocking and unruly in England nowadays; but there is no doubt that having to fight for himself gives a man pluck. Not so very long ago the men who fought in the Peninsula and on Nelson's ships were trained in the same school. The noble art was more in repute in those days. It is not altogether for good that this rough and ready method of settling differences is disappearing from the English schools and from the East End.

All this fighting with men and with nature, [fierce?] as any warfare, has made of the Australian as fine a fighting man as exists. He would be the best soldier, too, were it not for the lack of just that one quality which is necessary to turn the fighting man into the soldier. That same hatred of authority, which would make him the last to wave a white flag just because this is the sort of regrettable occasion upon which it is customary to waive it, would make it hard for him to submit to any irksome command. Beyond a doubt it is difficult for him to obey any order, especially one of which he does not at the time see the precise expediency....”.

² An American-born writer of the 19th century, by turns a friend and foe of Mark Twain; relocated from the US to England; and a role model for Henry Lawson.

(VII) The Australian Ideal (13 July 1907)

"There is no doubt that the Australian finds his ideal in that strong-hearted and sturdy philosopher who is being at this day turned out by the thousand for him in the bush. He does not ask perfection of him by any means. He condones his recklessness and roving temper. A man may live and drink pretty hard at times without forfeiting his respect. But he must be strong and straight and generous. He is to be an adventurer with all the adventurer's frank and generous virility. The politicians and the papers call for the industrious and intelligent yeoman; and, of course, he is the ideal ideal, if one may use the expression. But the actual ideal of Australians, the man they admire, whom the future Australian will probably for that reason resemble, would certainly include an adventurer... .

To live in his home with his family, in privacy, and without interference; to respect his womenfolk, his Judge, and his parson, but to own no superior beneath the King; to read his Bible, his Shakespeare and his newspapers; to talk intelligently; to stick to his rights and vote for his principles; to live by his horse, his gun, and his morning tub; to amuse himself in clean sports, and work with a clean conscience – it is a thoroughly western life from first to last which the Australian intends to lead.

The trouble is that he proposes to lead a western life in an eastern land. I suppose it is the chief trouble of Australia. It has fallen into disrepute under the name of the White Australia question".

.