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'The advent of the United States of America as the greatest of world-Powers is the greatest political, social and commercial phenomenon of our times. For some years past we have all been more or less dimly conscious of its significance. It is only when we look at the manifold manifestations of the exuberant energy of the United States, and the world-wide influence which they are exerting upon the world in general and the British Empire in particular, that we realise how comparatively insignificant are all the other events of our time.'
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INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken for several reasons.

First, there was the gap in knowledge. Australian-American relations and attitudes have been reasonably well covered for the period up to the Civil War, and especially for the gold rush period.¹ Two theses bridge the gap to 1888.² That story has also been taken up from the end of World War One to the present day.³ But, as Lionel Fredman put it in his book America Enters The Pacific, the year before this study was begun (1969): p.46:

Books on Australian history leave the impression that there was a kind of hiatus in Australian-American relations between the Gold Rushes of the 1850's and the visit of the Great White Fleet, if they take it seriously at all. Even the more specialized works seem to find the period unimportant.


² L.G. Churchward, 'A Sketch of the Origins and Early Growth of the Social and Economic Relations between Australia and the United States, 1790-1876', Unpublished M.A., University of Melbourne, 1941. I understand that T. Kidd of the University of Queensland is writing an M.A. along the lines of Churchward's to cover the period 1876-1888.

³ For this voluminous literature, a good starting point is N.D. Harper (ed.), Australia and the United States (Melbourne, 1972), pp.62-261, especially the Bibliography, for books p.269. An outstanding work in this period is R. Esthus, From Enmity to Alliance (Melbourne, 1964). For a comprehensive list of articles on Australian-American relations, see W.J. Hudson, 'Australia's External Relations: Towards a Bibliography of Journal Articles' (Section II, "The United States"), Australian Outlook, Vol.25, No.1, April 1971, pp.91-2.
This states the problem precisely. Any gain in knowledge at all would help fill this historiographic gap. Two slight works have so far dealt with Australian press attitudes toward the Spanish American War.\textsuperscript{1} Two theses and two articles cover the Great White Fleet from an Australian viewpoint, but as a 'gala' phenomenon rather than an end point in a process of maturation of attitudes.\textsuperscript{2} L.G. Churchward's articles on American contributions to the Australian labour movement\textsuperscript{3} on trade relations and on the Pacific Mail Service\textsuperscript{4} and American precedents in Australian Federation,\textsuperscript{5} as well as the writings of some American visitors to Australia are all that is available.

As a result of these gaps in research, especially for the vital period 1895-1901, generalizations by commentators on the period tend to stress how little interest was taken in the United States and fill their writings with some misleading half-truths.

Far from being a period of relative inactivity, this was a complex and often turbulent period, covering the pivotal 1890's in both countries. America emerged as a World Power and Australia as a Federation. Preliminary study of the early 1890's and the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, convinced me that a distinct change had come over the Australian press in its general attitudes and reactions toward America, and all evidence seemed to suggest that this change took place around the turn of the century. As well, I felt that the press had been neglected as a research tool.

'There can be few stories more exciting and more significant than the changes in ownership and control of the great opinion forming institutions', W.M. Corden has written.

\begin{figure}
\caption{Figure 1: Overview of the Study}
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\caption{Figure 2: The Key Actors}
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\textsuperscript{1}Wellington and McIntosh, see Chapter 9.
\textsuperscript{2}Megaw and Matherell, see Chapter 11.
\textsuperscript{6}E. Hunt, \textit{American Precedents In Australian Federation} (New York, 1930, 1968).
Yet Australian historians have tended to neglect the history of the Australian press. The lives of certain individual newspapers have been recorded but no attempt so far has been made to provide an overall view.¹

Corden's criticism, of seventeen years ago, still holds. A history of the Australian press, as comprehensive as that performed by Mott on the American scene, is still one of the most urgent tasks awaiting Australian historiography.²

Certain pioneering works there are - in particular Henry Mayer's The Press In Australia (Melbourne, 1964) and W. Sprague Holden's Australia Goes To Press (Detroit and Melbourne, 1961). The first book is an excellent first approach to the whole area, but raises far more questions than it answers. The era covered by this thesis gets short shrift in the 15 pages covering the whole history of the press in the nineteenth century. Holden's work is rather shallow and even more contemporary. Mayer's helpful bibliography refers to those writers on our press who, to use K. Inglis's words 'were either too dogmatic, too kind or too lazy' to provide more than some 'short sprints' on the subject.³

In any attempt to sketch in the background to the whole subject of the press, one is hampered by the lack of work done previously in the area and is further dogged by the problems of proper perspective. The problem of finding out just 'who says what in which channel to whom with what effect?'⁴ presents special problems to those seeking precision (such as circulation figures) in an unworked area and before the organization of fact-collecting bodies.⁵ No gazettes or registers summarise Australian press opinions and indexing exists for only two newspapers - one of these for only a part of the period. This is unlike the situation which assists American studies of newspaper sources and helps explain why theses attempting to use newspapers comprehensively, are rare.

²Francis Luther Mott, American Journalism (New York, 1950), rev. ed. and other works.
⁵Most newspaper organizations were founded after 1908, e.g. Imperial Press Union (1909); Australian Journalists' Association (1910); Press Directory (1914); Newspaper News (1928) and Audit Bureau of Circulations (1932).
Some of the questions which I wished to ask were:
1. Was the press of the Australian colonies a viable research tool for studying aspects of history at the turn of the century?
2. Could the press reveal new significance in or perceptions of American actions and Australian aspirations in that period?
3. Was the press essentially hostile or friendly toward the United States in that period?
4. Did the attitude of a substantial part of the press change toward the U.S. over a period of time? If so, why?
5. What groups of interests made up the press in the 1890's and early years of the twentieth century? Which group(s) dominated opinion?
6. What would a comprehensive exploration of the provincial press reveal regarding those newspapers' relation with the metropolitan press and of their interest in, or originality of comment regarding foreign affairs?
7. What were the patterns of similarity and difference regarding press comment on American and other overseas events?
8. In what context - Atlantic or Pacific - did the press view American developments? What was the place of the U.S. in the developing 'World View' of the Australian press?
9. Was the tone and emphasis of the Australian press purely British in its attitudes and reactions?
10. What ideological elements formed the underlying bases for the majority of press attitudes?
11. What can be said regarding the quality, popularity and influence of the press and the sources of information of the press at that time?
12. What does the press reveal regarding the 'climate of opinion' of the period in Australia during the final years of the twentieth century?
There are some difficult problems of definition and influence which must be discussed before these problems are approached. First, the vast and conflicting literature attempting to define 'attitude' is probably best summarised by Milton Rokeach in the International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences: 'An attitude is a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner'. Other researchers have defined the two factors that determine an attitude as one, the predisposition of the person (his identifications, demands and expectations) and two, the environment that impinges upon his attention and formulates his perceptions. Another body of literature concerns the distinction between 'attitude' and 'opinion'. Attitudes, which are more deep-seated and unchanging can be built up by or expressed in, opinions, the result of reactions to phenomena. What will be studied in this thesis are the expressions of opinion of various Australian colonial editors, revealing underlying attitudes as reactions to events. The process is circular: reactions to events may help formulate opinions that result over a period of time in the crystallisation of attitudes. In both processes 'opinions' are considered to be more changeable than 'attitudes'.

'Public opinion' has over fifty definitions. One outstanding reference describes it as, 'a collection of individual opinions on an issue of public interest which can exercise influence over individual behaviour, group behaviour or government policy'. This combines concepts defined by J.D.B. Miller as either 'populist public opinion' which holds that public opinion is identifiable and recoverable - that a general opinion prevails, or 'pluralist public opinion' which holds that there is no general opinion, only opinions of groups which may be minorities. Miller warned that both concepts may be fallacious on

4 International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences op.cit., Vol.13, p.188.
occasion. What this dissertation posits is that minorities in a majority of the groups that are represented by their presses in the Australian colonies, will have their opinions and attitudes on the U.S.A. either created by the press, or that the presses will reflect the prevailing attitudes or opinions of the group represented, in a two-way process. As such, the thesis will be referring to public opinions expressed by groups, not 'public opinion'.

More specifically, the dissertation will refer to 'press opinions' which are recoverable evidence in the absence of other forms of opinion collection. It is not a study of news reporting (except occasionally) but an analysis of opinion as contained in editorials, leading articles and letters to the papers and magazines. It is a study of interpretation of facts and of value judgements and prefers to record and examine what was said rather than how much was said on issues, though the latter element is indicated quantitatively by the number of editorials recorded as commenting on any particular matter.¹ The scope of the study is therefore limited, yet attempts to see press reactions in a setting of government action and outside stimuli. Only one strand of reaction will be isolated, which can be linked causally with the inflow of information, but whose outflow influence cannot be demonstrated with certainty.

There can be no doubt that the press influenced foreign policy formation to some extent as it monopolised the information market.² Though only a small amount of editorial space may have been devoted to foreign affairs in relative terms³ and though only a small number may have read or understood the overseas political news,⁴ these statements need some qualification for the period under consideration.

¹ The author is somewhat unconvinced by the content analysts that 'the volume of attention [paid to an issue] indicates the saliency of such news in the minds of the readers'. R.L. Merritt, Symbols of American Community 1735-1775 (New Haven, 1966) p.47; R.C. North et al., Content Analysis (Illinois, 1963).


³ See H. Mayer's analysis for 1962 for a rough comparison: The Press In Australia (Melbourne 1968 edn.) pp.226-7. Mayer sets the figure at 6% to 10% of editorial space in that year for the 14 leading dailies.

The collection and communication of information, opinion and interpretation by the press created a major part of the image of the environment which all sections of the community needed to form or reinforce their opinions.\(^1\) Only those who received and made decisions had direct access to primary sources of information, so that for the great majority foreign affairs information was gained at second hand through the press or again at one remove through personal contact with someone whose information was also derived from the press.\(^2\) The press could not make foreign policy as the decision-maker did, or as the electorate did negatively at the polls, but in its intermediate position as selector, compressor and controller of the circulation of information, it was vital in the chain of influence from the electorate to the decision maker. This chain was probably effected by a combination of 'specialist and amateur opinion'\(^3\) leaders who organized collective opinion 'from centres and sub-centres, forming a kind of intellectual feudal system'\(^4\) in the hope of influencing in Australia their politicians, premiers, colonial (and Commonwealth) governor(s) and through them, the Colonial Office and imperial policy.

Ernest R. May stresses the vital intermediary role of the press during the 1890's in opinion formation. The small town qualities of large cities, the need to flesh out bare cable reports with editorial comment or those of readily recognizable opinion leaders; the need to reflect the interests of the newspaper's constituency and the almost total lack of an alternative source of data gave it this status. As regards the transmission of attitudes it was 'as intricate and delicate as those among layered cobwebs'.\(^5\)

This thesis has no ambition to untangle those delicate layered cobwebs. It undertakes only tentatively the task (almost impossible under any circumstance) of tracing the complex influences and relationships

---


\(^2\) V.O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion and American Democracy (N.Y., 1961).


\(^4\) E.A. Ross, Social Psychology (N.Y., 1908) p.248.

that exist between the active minorities within most interest groups, and presses that represent them, opinion leaders and decision makers and the two way effects of those processes. It recognizes that such relationships do exist,\(^1\) possibly more clearly in the period 1895 to 1901 than they do today. What the dissertation does seek in brief, is to examine what changes occurred in Australian attitudes and reactions toward the United States during the period in which it emerged as a World Power, as they were created and reflected by a broad sample of the presses of the Australian colonies between 1895 and 1901. Throughout, the role of press influence will be often cautiously indicated, but must remain open to uncertainty and differing interpretation.

Some notes may be in order. Older misgivings on terminology may have to give way to popular modern usage. The terms 'imperialism' and 'expansionism' are sometimes employed in this thesis interchangeably and without moral overtones, unless invested with them by the source itself.\(^2\)


(Continued on following page)
The term 'America' is used interchangeably with 'U.S.' or 'United States', intending no slur on 'Canada' or Central and South American countries, which are always referred to separately.

The year 1889 was chosen as a starting point because it coincides with the first year of Harrison's Presidency, and his Secretary of State Blaine is often credited with inaugurating the new international policies that culminated in the abandonment of isolation. It is the year before Mahan launched his intellectual assault on the minds of Americans regarding Sea Power. Most important, it is the year of the cyclone in Apia, Samoa: the event which is often taken as marking America's modern involvement in world affairs.

The year 1908 was chosen as an ending place because it coincides with the termination of Theodore Roosevelt's term of office and the arrival in Australia of the Great White Fleet. By that time, America had fully emerged as a World Power, with an outlook totally different from that of 1889.

These years provide a seven year period on either side of the key years 1895-1901 to enable brief but important comparisons and contrasts to be made. The years 1895-1901 receive the majority of the research, in the middle of the study. The year 1895 is chosen, as it is the year of the significant Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute. The year of McKinley's assassination, and Australian Federation, 1901, is also a convenient cut-off point. Between them, these years cover the end of Cleveland's administration and most of the McKinley era during which the most important events and changes occurred.

1 (Continued)

In his book, The Colonial Empires: A Comparative Study (London, 1966) pp.341-8, Fieldhouse claims that due to its Republican principles, the U.S.A. was an unlikely imperialist and indeed found Empire an 'ideological embarrassment'. It resolved this by incorporating possessions as states of the union or making them fully independent by 1964, thus working within its traditionally liberal political framework.
CHAPTER ONE

AUSTRALIA'S PRESS: A BRIEF SURVEY, 1889-1908
CHAPTER ONE

AUSTRALIA'S PRESS: A BRIEF SURVEY, 1889-1908

One of Australia's earliest statisticians, Sir Timothy Coghlan commented in 1901:

Few things show more plainly the social superiority of a civilized people than a heavy correspondence and a large distribution of newspapers. In these respects all the provinces of Australia have for many years been remarkable. In proportion to population it is doubtful whether any country in the world can boast of a larger number or a better class of newspapers than they publish.¹

Coghlan's statistics revealed that in 1901 there were 828 newspapers in Australia — 323 in Victoria (130 in Melbourne and suburbs); 306 in New South Wales (92 in Sydney and suburbs); 115 in Queensland, 46 in South Australia, 22 in Western Australia and 16 in Tasmania. By one criterion — the number of newspapers per head of population handled by the post offices — Australia was a close third behind the United Kingdom and the United States. The ratio was just ahead of Germany, Scandinavia, Argentina and Switzerland and well ahead of Austria and Canada. The Australian figures — 117,584,798 newspapers, or 31 per head of population for the year — was double that of France, seven times that of Spain and fifteen times that of Russia.²

The number of newspapers sent via post offices in 1901 in Australia had grown tenfold since 1861. In the forty years 1861-1901 the numbers of newspapers handled by the post offices doubled in Queensland, tripled in Victoria and South Australia, quadrupled in New South Wales and Tasmania and quintupled in Western Australia. Even in 1891 the figure had been impressive. In that year, 93,067,361 newspapers had been sent — 29 per head of population for the year. To handle the added volume, the number of post offices increased from 4,463 in 1891 to 5,256 in 1906. We are assured that throughout this period these

¹ Sir T.A. Coghlan, A Statistical Account of the Seven Colonies of Australasia 1901-1902 (Sydney, 1902), p. 691.
² Coghlan, op. cit., p. 692. See also, 1904 edn., p. 27.
figures on newspapers are 'largely in excess of any other country'.

Though it is difficult to make accurate and meaningful comparisons between countries regarding proprietorships and readerships, figures worked out for 1882 by J. Arbuckle Reid in The Australian Leader, suggest that in terms of actual newspapers in existence per head of population, every colony in Australia was far ahead of England. Whereas Great Britain had 1,986 newspapers, the ratio was one newspaper published per 18,000 inhabitants. Every Australian colony greatly bettered this. Victoria, though it had only 146 newspapers in that year, produced one newspaper per 5,867 inhabitants; South Australia had one per 5,880; Queensland one per 7,096; Western Australia one per 7,500; New South Wales one per 7,872 and Tasmania one per 10,545.

These ratios are also better than those for the United States. In 1880, after a period of 'remarkable...numerical increase' in the number of newspapers, the United States, with 7,000 newspapers had a ratio of only one newspaper per 7,143 inhabitants. By 1890, despite further great increases in the number of newspapers, the ratio was no better than one per 5,250 inhabitants. After this time, though circulations increased spectacularly, the ratio of new publications per head of population did not.

In Australia, the twenty years 1882-1901 witnessed similar great increases in the number of 'new' newspapers produced in the colonies, with the exception of Tasmania and South Australia whose figures remained stable. The number of Victorian papers doubled. The number of New South Wales paper tripled. Queensland papers quadrupled and the Western Australian figures increased six times. By 1901, the overall ratio of newspapers to population was one per 4,725: a figure that narrowly exceeded the American and greatly excelled the British

---


3 Francis L. Mott, op.cit., p.11.
in their best years. Given that Australia's population increased by only one third in the period of the 1880's and 1890's - the latter decade being dominated by a depression, this 'golden era' of the Australian press, is all the more 'remarkable', to use Coghlan's expression.

In his *The Legend Of The Nineties*, Vance Palmer stated:

If the nineties have seemed to stand out with special prominence it is partly because of the lively journalism...[which] gave a suggestion that the national mind was in ferment as never before.

Most observers of the Australian press scene c.1889-c.1908 agreed with this assessment.

Alfred Deakin wrote to the *Morning Post* in London in 1901:

"Everywhere in Australia the Press is in the ascendant...all [newspapers] enjoy a public esteem and confidence well warranted by the integrity of their past....the net result is that, while the creature of public opinion, the Australian Press is largely its creator....Our Commonwealth, reposing on the broadest suffrage, rests on the Press, which controls its exercise; it consists of States whose chief voice and influence are those of their principal journals; and it's therefore in almost as absolute a fashion a Federation of newspapers as of Colonies."

Though somewhat exaggerated this assessment of Australia's Press status by a talented journalist who was Australia's leading politician is significant.  

The English traveller and journalist Francis Adams thought:

"The power of the press is a very considerable fact everywhere; but in Australia, where "Society" is impotent and wealth not yet fully organised, the newspaper is the best if not the greatest institution in the country."

---

1 W.M. Corden, op.cit.


The first Australian edition of the English monthly, the *Review of Reviews*, remarked like Adams, in 1892, 'the leading Australian journals for energy, character and literary quality, will — allowing for exceptions — bear comparison with any journals in the world....' They were considered less sensational than American journals, yet more lively, enterprising and less partisan than English journals. Not only did they 'represent a quite distinct literary type' but they were held to 'have a quite unique social function....The great dailies remain the greatest purely secular steadying forces the colonies possess'.

Edwin L. Godkin, one of America's most distinguished political commentators, found little that was encouraging in Australia 'except in the one matter of a solid and reputable press.' His book, *Unforeseen Tendencies of Democracy* (1898), reviewed in Australia during the worst excesses of America's 'Yellow Press', was appreciated by Australian journalists.

Gauging them mainly by their editorials, the American ex-newspaperman, Mark Twain, took 'extreme pleasure' in the colonial journals which he read during his Australian visit in 1895. Viewing them with the eye of a competent and cosmopolitan professional, he said of the Sydney and Melbourne journals: 'I am most favourably impressed with the vigour of their style, their scholarly language and logical conclusions.'

Another experienced newspaperman and general travel writer, the Englishman Frank T. Bullen, writing in a series of articles for the *London Standard*, ultimately collected in book form as *Advance Australasia*, demonstrated that the standards of the Australian press of the early 1890's had not waned by 1907. From a six month


2 *Perth Morning Herald*, 21 July 1898; 'An American on Australian Democracy' (Leader). See also *The Inquirer*, 22 July 1898; *Age*, 10 Oct. 1898.

3 *Table Talk*, 6 Dec. 1895.

4 His views are remarkably similar to those of the Rt. Hon. the Earl of Meath who wrote, ...'As far as I was able to judge, during my short visit to Australia and New Zealand, the daily papers in these colonies were superior in tone to the American'... in, 'A Britisher's Impressions of America and Australasia', *The Nineteenth Century*, No.193, March 1893, p.502.
observation of a wide variety of journals, he praised
the high level of excellence and independence maintained
by the Press. The newspapers of Australasia, with but
two or three exceptions, are the equals of any of our
newspapers at home and in some respects their superiors.
Beside praising their matter, paper and format, he was grateful for
the tone of the press, free as it was from political slander. 'And
while the Colonial news is very full in detail and interest,' he added,
home and foreign affairs are most comprehensively dealt
with and widely disseminated....In bulk, of course,
these journals do not rank with the American
newspapers...but in quality the Colonial newspapers
are so immeasurably superior that no comparison is
possible.'
'The Australian newspaper is a power in the land', claimed G.
Mackay local historian and editor of the Bendigo Advertiser in an
article for a book published by an American in several editions
throughout this period.
Whatever may be the cause of its influence, it wields
a power for good or ill such as is not generally
approached in older countries. It not only fulfils
the commonly accepted object of a newspaper in
interpretation of public opinion, but goes beyond it
and on special occasions leads the public....Separated
by thousands of miles of sea from their Mother Country,
from the seat of the nation of which they are a part,
colonists read their daily paper more regularly and
anxiously than do Englishmen living in England.
J.W. Gregory, a skilled Scottish observer and former Victorian
geographer held, in 1907, that
newspapers are read with equal interest by all sections
of the community. No one is so poor as not to afford
his daily paper, while the weekly illustrated papers
find their way to huts far below the grade at which
one would expect to find them at home.

1 F.T. Bullen, Advance Australasia (London, 1907), pp.259-60. Bullen
excepts the Tribune, Outlook and Saturday Evening Post 'and a few
others'.

2 W.B. Kimberley (ed.), Annals of Bendigo (Melbourne and Ballarat, 1895),
p.211.

3 J.W. Gregory, Australasia (London, 1907). See Age review, 8 June 1907.
Unfortunately Gregory's later editions neglect to comment on the press.
A.R. Wallace in his earlier edition of Stanford's Compendium of Geography
is also silent in his Australasia (1893).
More recently, K. Inglis has remarked: 'Australians are more intensely addicted to daily newspapers than almost any other people in the world'.

As well as acknowledging the occasional flattery of overseas visitors, spokesmen of the Australian press often showed themselves to be aware of their own status. As an important shaping force in a newly developing and advanced society, they jealously guarded the journalistic honour and high standards of the international profession of which they considered themselves a part. In a more general way, Australian pressmen idealistically regarded themselves as among the leading promoters of liberty and progress.

In the case of the great Sydney and Melbourne journals in particular, these self-estimates had some material basis. At the time of federation at the turn of the century, Melbourne, Australia's temporary capital, with a population of 470,000 was a great city of the British Empire - sixth in the value of its trade; fourth in the value of its city property in the Empire. Sydney, with 427,000 inhabitants was even more impressive. Property values were second only to London. Sydney was the fourth most important seaport of the Empire, the value of its trade being surpassed only by London, Liverpool and Hull. In 1891, the total value of Australian production was £96 million. In 1896-7, the value of production was £26 per head of population. In 1898, bank deposits amounted to £30 per head. These latter two figures placed Australia, in these respects, far ahead of any other country in the world. An index of the superior


conditions of life were the excess of births over deaths. In 1901 these amounted to 18 per 1,000 in Australia, compared with 11 per thousand in the United Kingdom and 10 per thousand in Europe. Though it may have occasionally desired a wider audience or greater international recognition; the Australian press nonetheless generally attracted talent, developed responsibly and was worthy of serious consideration, despite a population of less than one tenth the Mother Country.¹

The developing national self-confidence and self-awareness of Australians, based on either actual or usually promising material prosperity and a growing consciousness of having 'escaped the stultifications of the Old World and the turbulences of the New', did express itself in the realm of journals as elsewhere, during this period. Francis Adams, writing during the opening years of the 1890's even considered that the intellectual life and culture of the country was dominated by the journalists.² However, other observers felt that even though a characteristic and distinctive nationalism was struggling to emerge in journals such as the Bulletin, seasoned with republican, socialist, protectionist and xenophobic materials, they believed that nonetheless overseas and particularly British influences remained a dominant factor in the Australian press and emerging national cultural life.³

H.M. Green probably exaggerates in his historical sketch of the press during this period:

The daily newspaper was by no means strikingly Australian in tone: its outlook was what may be called British-Australian; a reading of the daily papers alone would convey little idea of the democratic nationalism that was now finding so marked a literary expression.⁴

¹See Appendices, Coghlan and Ewing, op.cit.

²F. Adams, op.cit., pp.47, 58.


Yet despite the fact that most Australian newspapers and magazines
usually consciously avoided the conservative tone of the London Times
and reacted extremely slowly to the 'New Journalism' of the Daily Mail
(1896), outside commentators were impressed by the 'Englishness' of
the Australian colonial newspapers in their search for respectability
and authority.

As Green put it:

in the absence of cheap and developed cable services, and
of course of wireless, interest in foreign affairs had
to be met partly by republication from English, European
and American newspapers and periodicals.'

Britain exerted the predominant influence, not only because of the
prestige of London as the centre of empire, but also because cable
messages were collected and despatched from London and canons of
acceptable taste were more firmly established in that centre.
Magazines, newspapers, interviews and correspondents' letters fleshed
out the Australian press perception of American events gained by cable
and presented them in Anglo-Australian terms.

In 1906, Australia received 2,132,659 newspapers from overseas
mail steamers. Orient Lines brought 974,717; P & O brought 917,626
in 1906 and the bulk of these would have been British. 2 Professor J.W.
Gregory in that year described the weekly mail which 'often brings an
English paper as well, the squatter getting his Spectator and the
boundary rider his Lyoads News [sic]' 3

Those who did not receive printed matter from England direct,
were regularly given summaries of the contents of these magazines
in the larger dailies - usually in a Saturday supplement. Editors
were usually meticulous in mentioning the names of authors and articles
when borrowing from, or commenting upon ideas gained from overseas
sources. Not only a journalistic ethic, but also the jealous eye of
leader-writer rivals usually prevented open plagiarism. From 1892,
the Review of Reviews provided a valuable service in familiarising

1 Green, op.cit., p.337. It was this tendency, most prominent during the
1930's that so disgusted W. Macmahon Ball. See his (edited) Press,

2 Official Yearbook, op.cit., p.616.

3 Gregory, op.cit.
readers and editors with important contents (in summarised form) of the magazines - especially expensive and sophisticated monthlies and quarterlies from Britain, the United States, Europe and other parts of the Empire.¹

Subscriptions were possible even in the remotest parts of Australia. Gordon and Gotch worked through agents, although some overseas distributors advertised direct in Australian papers. On 14 December 1895 the *Northern Public Opinion* of remote Roebourne in Western Australia² advertised subscriptions for 19 English dailies, 88 weeklies, 40 monthly magazines and three quarterlies. These had to be pre-paid in either yearly or half-yearly instalments and, in the case of the dailies, cost £5.18.0 per annum for the full *Times* to £1.19.0 for the *St. James Gazette*, while the weeklies cost from £2.17.6 per annum for the *Economist*, to 6s 6d for *Tit Bits*. The monthlies cost from £1.10.0 for the *Contemporary* to 8s 0d for *Longman's*, while the *Edinburgh Review* among the quarterlies cost £1.5.0 per annum. Thus the most remote colonist could easily receive the magazines and newspapers of his choice, in Australia between a month and two months after their overseas publication. The comment upon America in such materials was substantial.³ Most however, probably found this source of information too expensive. An English journalist at Mt Morgan in 1903, complained that the price of an ordinary London penny daily was threepence.⁴

Comment upon these English materials usually acknowledged the source of any article extracts and reviews. Notes on British press

¹ The *Mount Alexander Mail*, 27 Apr. 1898 complained that but for the Melbourne Public Library, the Temperance Hall in Russell St.; the Atheneum; the Exchange and Gordon and Gotch's, Melbourne had no adequate Newspaper Room where the overseas newspapers and magazines (which were up to date) could be perused free of charge.

² The overseas distributor in this case was M.G. Taylor, 40 Southwark St., London; see also, *Years To Remember - The Story of Gordon & Gotch 1853-1953* (Melbourne, 1953) and Gordon & Gotch, *Australasian Newspaper Directory* (Melbourne, 1892), pp.238-9.


attitudes - beside the all-pervading Times - were included with cable messages. In 1905, beside the Times, edited by Moberley Bell, the Daily News, edited by A.G. Gardiner, the Star and Morning Leader edited by Ernest Parke, the Daily Chronicle, edited by Robert Donald, the St. James Gazette, edited by S.J. Pryor, the Morning Post, edited by J. Nicol Dunn, the Pall Mall Gazette edited by Sir Douglas Straight, the Daily Mirror, edited by Hamilton Fyfe, the Echo, edited by F.W. Pettie Lawrence and the Sun, edited by C.H. Jackson, were the most important London dailies referred to in the Australian press. As well the press of Sir Alfred Harmsworth (Lord Northcliff) - the Daily Mail, the Evening News, the Leeds Mercury, the Glasgow Record and Manchester Courier was mentioned less often, as was the press chain of C. Arthur Pearson - the Standard, Evening Standard, Daily Express, the Birmingham Daily Gazette and Evening Despatch, the Leicester Evening News, the North Mail and the Evening Mail. The Daily Telegraph, Observer, Westminster Gazette, Globe, Financial News, Advertiser, Daily Graphic, Manchester Guardian, Yorkshire Observer, Newcastle Daily Leader, Birmingham Post and some other provincial journals also rated a mention on occasion for their attitudes this period. 2

Of the magazines, the Nineteenth Century, Fortnightly Review, Whitehall Review, Contemporary Review, Spectator, Saturday Review, Truth, Westminster Budget, Punch, Weekly Sun, Cornhill Magazine, Review of Reviews, National Review, Blackwoods, Quarterly Review and Edinburgh Review were among the most frequently consulted on foreign affairs. 3

But a number of other journals could rate an occasional mention such as Twentieth Century, Pall Mall Magazine, Athenæum, Academy, New Age, New Statesman, British Weekly, Illustrated London News, Sketch, Sphere, Windsor, Cassell's, Strand, Pearsons and others.

Though all of the above helped form the Australian press image of America, materials direct from America itself were the most effective

1 A.W. Jose, who became Australian correspondent for the Times in 1903 left an interesting memoir of the paper in The Romantic Nineties (Sydney, 1933), pp.85-90; Montague Grover, editor of the Sydney Sun, praised the Times' foreign news coverage in 'Held Over: Reminiscences of a Newspaper Man', Lone Hand, 1 Aug. 1914, p.188.


3 These lists do not suggest a rank order of importance.
newsmakers and opinion-builders on that country. The Oceanic line, travelling from San Francisco, delivered 145,372 newspapers and magazines to Australia in 1906, while the Canadian-Australian line delivered 87,272 - the bulk of these being American materials. Kudos for quotes and extracts were given in the same manner as for the English magazines. Gordon and Gotch carried a variety of weeklies and monthlies from America about one third to one half the size of the English list in this period.

One means by which America exerted an effect upon Australia was achieved through the syndicated materials appearing in the Saturday supplements of the larger Australian journals. Much of it appeared trivial. For example, at the end of 1895, serious criticisms of American plutocracy and racialism could appear side by side with praise of America's reformed consular system, the electric tramways and attempts by Peary to reach the North Pole. The gradual adoption of the 'Australian Ballot' and the 'Torrens Land Titles System' in American States was noted with recurrent satisfaction amongst this miscellany. Much of these materials was considered lively but inconsequential. They added colour and entertainment to more meaty matters.

More practical papers in agricultural districts took a profound interest in American rural developments. Christopher Crisp's Victorian protectionist weekly, the Bacchus Marsh Express was among the foremost of these. In the course of a normal year, he published hundreds of helpful hints on subjects from 'Virginian turkeys' to 'Californian

---

¹Official Yearbook, ibid.

²E.g. Our Boys and Girls Own Newspaper, claiming the largest list of subscribers in Australia ran Louisa M. Alcott's 'A Christmas Turkey & How It Came', 15 Dec. 1895.

³A sampling of these syndicated 'fillers' can be found in Queenslander, 7, 14, 21, 27 Dec. 1895; Southern Cross, 13, 20 Dec. 1895; Sun (Melbourne), 21 Dec. 1895; Champion, 21 Dec. 1895; Ballarat Star, 11 Dec. 1895; Record, 14 Dec. 1895; Capricornian, 28 Dec. 1895; Maryborough Chronicle, 23 Dec. 1895; Brisbane Worker, 14 Dec. 1895. Brief notes on the above newspapers appear in the Appendix.
'clover', taken from a very wide array of American journals. Nonetheless the United States' press was taken seriously and its views given due consideration and adequate coverage in the Australian press. In 1895, most attention was given to the New York press, especially the World of Joseph Pulitzer, the Journal of William Randolph Hearst, the Sun of Charles Dana, the Tribune of Whitelaw Reid, the Evening Post of E.L. Godkin, the Times of Adolf Ochs and the Herald of J.G. Bennett. No one newspaper dominated the group as did the London Times in Britain and throughout the period the 'tawdriness and vulgarity' of sections of the press prevented the adoption of American-style journalism in Australia until two decades after the end of 1908. 'We may Americanise our institutions, but not our newspapers' commented the Sydney Morning Herald following the American press ebullition of the Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute. The American press was attacked for lack of restraint, bad taste, jingoism, Anglophobia and control by interests. Stead's constant attack on the 'Yellow Press' as irresponsible incendiari sm continued from 1895 to 1907 and was echoed throughout by the Australian dailies.

Outside of New York, the main journals referred to from the northeastern section of the country were in Philadelphia, the second largest city until 1892. Here the Public Ledger, Public Record and Evening Item were the most important, though the Star, Inquirer and Times, the

---

1 The Bacchus Marsh Express: a paper count for the two months 11 Jan. to 14 Mar. 1895, showed the following two dozen papers quoted (in order), presumably from syndicated sources: The Atlantic; Chicago Tribune; New England Homestead; Chicago Mail; Rural New Yorker; The American Cultivator; Kansas City Star; St. Louis Post Despatch; New York Tribune; New York Journal; Southern Cultivator; New York World; Boston Transcript; Chicago Record; Rochester Post Express; Brooklyn Eagle; American Gardening; St. Louis Republic. As well, Eliza Archard Corner served as occasional American correspondent on things rural.


3 Sydney Morning Herald, 28 Mar. 1896. See also Maitland Mercury, 31 May 1900; Warnambool Standard, 14 Dec. 1898.

4 E.g. Review of Reviews, Jan., Mar. 1896, July-Nov. 1907.
latter edited by Alexander McClure, were sometimes referred to. Elsewhere the Baltimore Sun, Washington Post and Washington Evening Star (edited by T.W. Noyes) were sometimes referred to. Boston's journals were quoted for their tone rather than their circulation. Here Charles Taylor's Boston Globe; the Herald and the Boston Evening Transcript were the most prominent. From the South, the paper that Henry Grady made famous, the Atlanta Constitution was important, as was the Charleston News and Courier, the Columbia State, Louisville's Courier-Journal and Times and the New Orleans Picayune.

Chicago, which ranked as America's second largest city after 1892, dominated the papers of the Mid-Western section. Here the Chicago Tribune edited by Robert W. Patterson and James Keeley was one of the best papers in the country. The Daily News founded by Melville E. Stone was also important, while the Mail, Post and Times-Herald, a newspaper chain dating from 1895, were also referred to. Herman Kohlstaat who edited the latter, also edited the Inter-Ocean after 1891. William Rockhill Nelson and William Allen White were making the Kansas City Star famous at this time, while also in the mid-west Pulitzer's St. Louis Post-Despatch was gaining over its rivals: the St. Louis Republic edited by Charles Jones and the Globe-Democrat. In Detroit the Scripps' family was building a newspaper chain based on the News, but were soon to own the Cleveland Press, St. Louis Chronicle and Kentucky Post. The Bowles' family was increasing the prestige of the Springfield Republican - a paper often quoted as independent, bold and high-minded by the Australian press. Occasional mention was also made of J.R. Hawley's edited Hartford Courant and Murat Halstead's Cincinnati Commercial Gazette as well as that city's Enquirer and Evening Post - the latter another Scripps' journal.

Of those newspapers further south and west, the Dallas News; Salt Lake City Tribune; the Cowles' Spokane Falls Weekly Chronicle and Denver's Rocky Mountain News; the Republican and Fred G. Bonfil's infamous Denver Post were sometimes cited. On the Pacific Coast, Harvey W. Scott had established the prestige of Portland's Oregonian, Hearst had boosted the San Francisco Examiner, Fremont Older had established the fame of the Bulletin in that city, while the De Young family had built up the San Francisco Chronicle into one of the most oft-quoted of America's newspapers on the Australian scene.
Among the magazines, the Atlantic Monthly and the North American Review were the oldest and still exerted a wide influence. Of the newer journals, Forum and Arena were establishing themselves, while Harper's Monthly, Century Magazine, Lippincott's and Scribner's were among the attractive illustrated magazines. Puck, Life and Judge were quoted for their humour. After 1901, 'muckraking' magazines became more popular. Australian editorialists often quoted Collier's, Cosmopolitan, Everybody's and McClure's, especially the latter. In all, the impact of the American press was second only to the British.

Most Australian press developments would have been impossible but for the rapid growth of many forms of communications. Six lines of mail steamers kept Australia in contact with Europe and America. The P. & O. line had carried mail from Singapore to Sydney via Adelaide, since 1852. In 1888 that line and Orient Pacific contracted a weekly service that was subsidised by both the British and Australian governments. After 1905 the service was fortnightly. These lines took from 20 to 30 days to communicate from Marseilles or Naples. Mail discharged at Adelaide was sent on by train to Melbourne in $17\frac{1}{2}$ hours; from Melbourne to Sydney in $17\frac{2}{3}$ hours; from Melbourne to Hobart by sea in 17 hours and from Adelaide to Brisbane by rail in three days.¹

There had been agitation for a sea route to London and New York via Panama since the early 1860's. Until 1869 when a rail link across America to San Francisco made that western terminus more feasible, mail had gone by rail across the Panama isthmus to link the Atlantic and Pacific. A monthly service started by the Union Steamship Co. in conjunction with the Pacific Steamship Co. ran from Sydney to San Francisco via Auckland in 20 to 21 days and was subsidised by New South Wales and New Zealand. These subsidies were reduced after 1890 and shortly following federation a press battle ensued regarding the efficacy of raising them again.² This centred on resentment toward an American monopoly of Pacific shipping. The three-weekly service brought


London within 35 days of Sydney, though Spreckles of the Oceanic line constantly aimed at 27 days. The renewal of the mail contract ran into difficulties after 1906.¹

Coming into more favour after 1901 for its 'all British' connections was the monthly service from Sydney to Vancouver which ran on times similar to the United States' link-up. This ran via Wellington,² across Canada by C.P.R. to Liverpool. After 1899 the route ran from Brisbane. The Canadian-Australian lines' subsidy was renewed in 1903 and 1907 when the New South Wales government paid £26,626 for the service. In that year £126,141 was paid in subsidies to Orient Pacific. In 1906 the Messageries Maritimes French mail service and the Norddeutscher Lloyd German mail service ran monthly services which were heavily subsidised by their own governments. In 1906, the German line delivered 5,554 newspapers to Australia; the French, half that amount. Both sets found their way to editorial offices (as well as to nationals of those countries) where translators often checked them for attitudes on America, among other things. European newspaper and magazine references to America found their way into editorials, press cables and magazine reviews.

Except for Western Australia where it doubled, railway mileage did not increase much beyond the 1891 levels reached in all colonies in this period. By 1901 there was 13,821 miles laid. Sydney and Melbourne had been linked since 1883. By 1908 only Perth remained unlinked to the other State capitals by rail. An agreement on special interstate mail vans for the carriage of English mails was reached in 1890. Only the break of rail gauge slowed intercolonial transit.³ Before 1901 newspapers had been carried free of charge in New South Wales, Western Australia and Tasmania. After 1 November 1902 a uniform


² For James Mills' negotiations on behalf of the Union Steamship Company see Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 10 Dec. 1901; Sydney Morning Herald, 9 Dec. 1901; Official Yearbook, op.cit., pp.611-6.

³ G. Blainey, The Tyranny Of Distance (Melbourne, 1966), Ch.11; Coghlan and Ewing, op.cit., p.454.
rate of 1d per 20 ozs was imposed for the carriage of newspapers. The ratio of one railway mile per 294 inhabitants in 1901 placed Australia on a par with Canada in this respect and ahead of the United States.

Much has been written on the telegraph and cable services which linked Australia internally, and with the rest of the world. Even by 1891, all the colonies were well served with telegraph links. In the ten years to 1901, the mileage of line in New South Wales increased from 11,697 to 14,272 and in Western Australia it tripled to reach 6,173 miles. The other colonies remained fairly stationary so that in that decade, the amount of line increased from 39,176 miles to 45,108 in the whole of the Commonwealth.

Telephones had been in existence since 1878 in Victoria and were more firmly established there in 1883. In Queensland exchanges were established in 1880, in New South Wales in 1881, in South Australia and Tasmania in 1883 and 1890 in Western Australia. In this period, phones cost £2.10.0 to £3 to instal. Of the 52,000 phones in use by 1906, 35,000 were in New South Wales and Victoria and for that year there were 1,786 telephone exchanges. The advantages of this form of communication for the press are obvious.

By the early 1890's most colonies had amalgamated their post and telegraph offices and by the time of federation had inaugurated travelling post offices, long distance, parcel and express delivery services. More uniformity was achieved following federation by the establishment of a Post Master General and with the many faceted Post and Telegraph Act. The Australian colonies had been admitted to the Universal Postal Union of 1874, in 1891.

In 1901, 9,530,347 telegrams were sent through 2,568 telegraph offices. Many of these were 'press' telegrams which went at the special rate of 6d within the state and 1s 6d interstate for 25 words and at a cost of 6d per 50 words over 100. Between 1896 and 1908 Australian wireless telegraphy was still in an experimental stage. The Post Master General took a special interest in it after 1905.

---

1 Sydney Morning Herald, 10 Apr. 1901; Daily Telegraph, 17 Dec. 1901; Maitland Mercury, 13 Dec. 1901.


In 1905, there were five means of cabling overseas to Britain. The oldest cable was 12,296 miles long from Perth to London via Banjoewangie. The route from Adelaide to London, opened with such fanfare in 1872 consisted of a 1,973 mile overland link across the 'Dead Heart' of Australia to Darwin. Able to service all the colonies at last, it cost the South Australian government £480,000 and ran 13,125 miles to London, also via Banjoewangie. Traffic on the Morse operated line had increased to the point where, in 1899, a second strand was needed. In 1891 an agreement was made with the Eastern Extension Company (which laid and owned most of the submarine cables in the area) to reduce the rates from 2s 8d per word for press messages to 1s 2d per word, with the colonial governments to make good half the losses incurred on a proportional basis.¹

Two other lines, little used, ran 14,319 miles from Perth to London via South Africa (opened 1900) and from Sydney to Newbiggen (England) - 17,932 miles via Hong Kong and Russia.

The most important cable development after federation however, was the 'All Red' Pacific Cable. The scheme got under way in 1887 and 1893 in conference - the latter in Brisbane, attended by Mackenzie Bowell and Sanford Fleming representing Canada. An 1894 Ottawa Conference decided on mutual Australasian Colonial - British and Canadian subsidies for the line, which was considered to have strategic value. An Imperial Act of 1901 authorized the line's laying. It passed through Fanning Island (not Neckar) which was annexed in 1888 for the purpose. The line was anchored at Southport in Australia and Vancouver Island in Canada. From it, links were made to Norfolk Island, Fiji and New Zealand. The first message was sent 31 October 1902 and the line, 14,323 miles long, across 7,320 miles of ocean cost £2 million and ran at a loss until well after 1908.²

Since 1869 Tasmania had been linked by a cable of the Eastern

1 A.R. Cameron, Story Of The Overland Telegraph (Adelaide, 1933); Frank Clune, Overland Telegraph (Sydney, 1955); Sydney Morning Herald, 22 Nov. 1971: 'Australia Talks To The World'.

2 George Johnson (ed.), The All Red Line (Ottawa, 1903); Charles Bright, Imperial Telegraphic Communication (London, 1911); G.L. Lawford and L.R. Nicholson, The Telcon Story (London, 1950). See also C. Brunsdon Fletcher, The Great Wheel (Sydney, 1940), pp.64-5 for a personal memoir.
Extension Company, the 170 miles to Melbourne. This was subsidised by the Tasmanian government by £4,200 per annum. The Australian-New Zealand cable had been laid in 1876. It was 1,191 miles long and linked Botany Bay with Wakapauka. It was subsidised to the amount of £10,000 by the governments of New Zealand and New South Wales. In April 1892 a French cable company linked Bundaberg, Queensland and New Caledonia. This received a largely French subsidy of £12,000. In 1905 the Commonwealth received 176,411 cables from all these overseas cable sources and despatched 182,262. All told, Australian cable subsidies amounted to £13,207 at the time of federation.¹

Of monies borrowed by Australia by 1901, £121.7 million had been spent on railways and £3.3 million on telephones and telegraphs. By the time of federation the public debt on communications was around £30 per inhabitant—a heavy price, but one considered worthwhile in order, among other things, to keep the country as well informed as any on the progress of overseas events.² The public response in the Australian colonies to events of Empire such as Mafeking Day (17-18 May 1900) and other overseas happenings such as the long drawn out Dreyfus Case (1894-1906) give an indication of how closely such events could be followed and what intense interest they could arouse.

In the two decades 1873-93, the six Australian colonies passed Education Acts committing them to establish national systems of education entirely supported by central government funds and under Ministerial control. Passed in 1873 in Victoria; 1875 in Queensland; 1878 in South Australia; 1880 in New South Wales; 1892 in Tasmania and 1893 in Western Australia, these so-called 'free, secular and compulsory' acts helped assure that developments toward the greater dissemination of information would not be wasted.³

This policy bore fruit immediately. Out of every 10,000 children aged 5 to 15 years in 1871, only 5,981 could read and write. In 1891, 7,565 were literate. By 1898, the number of illiterates had dropped to one fifth of the 1871 figure and mostly consisted of non English-speaking immigrants. In 1903 the Commonwealth had 7,206 schools, 15,716 teachers and an average attendance of 451,340 scholars.

¹Official Yearbook (1908), op.cit., pp.630-2.
²In President McKinley's last speech, the day before he was shot (5 Sept. 1901) he said: 'Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. The same important news is read...the same day in all Christendom. The telegraph keeps us advised of what is occurring everywhere and the press foreshadows...the plans and purposes of the nations....' See J.D. Richardson ed., A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents (N.Y., 1905) Vol.XV, p.6619.
daily. After 1906 the number of state secondary schools increased greatly and meetings of state directors of education from that date further improved the overall quality of Australian education.2

Developments in communication so reduced the special handicap of Australian isolation, that throughout the period 1889-1908, the most remote parts of Australia were only one, at the most three, days behind the rest of the world in their knowledge of overseas events. 'Here in Australia we know almost as much about America as the Americans themselves', boasted the Argus in 1908.

We know what they are thinking, we know their ideals, we are interested in the great facts of their social and political life, we read their magazines and their books ...not only "America" but the Americans are understood here. Naturally we know a great deal more about the Americans than they know about us.

Some Australians might feel confident that they knew American attitudes because of the excellent correspondents' letters in the newspapers, travellers' accounts and the amount of editorial space devoted to American affairs, which supplemented other literature which entered the country directly and which was widely disseminated.3

By 1890 almost all of the large metropolitan morning dailies and a considerable number of large provincial newspapers received correspondents' letters from either New York or San Francisco - usually the former. These were between 2,000 to 4,000 words in length and dealt on a monthly basis with facts and projections of social, economic and political events, in an order of priority related to their relevance to Australia and their general newsworthiness. Such supplementary materials collated from newspapers and experience had been sent by competent journalists since before the overland cable in 1872. After that date they fleshed out daily cables and detailed editorials with supportive fact and opinion. One such correspondent, organized by J.W. Finlayson (editor of the South Australian Register) during a visit

1Coghlan and Ewing, op.cit., p.455; Coghlan, op.cit. (1904), p.27.
3Argus, 29 Aug., 1 Sept. 1908.
to the United States, was W.L. Alden of the New York Times.

Though newspapers either read or shared each other's correspondents' impressions, it became a mark of prestige for a newspaper to boast one's 'own special' correspondent in the great capitals of foreign countries despite the complicated and costly nature of this form of news service. Due to the astuteness of his judgements, the New York correspondent of the Sydney Morning Herald was widely admired during this period and his judgements noted by a large number of metropolitan newspapers. Often the correspondent's letters in the Argus and the Age published monthly and sometimes tri-weekly, provoked letters to the editor from members of the American community living in the city with comment of their own to add. Ship captains and visiting businessmen were traditional sources of information on American affairs by press and populace.

Having a special place as leaders of opinion in their communities were those Australians who had visited the United States and conveyed their impressions. These could be such astute observers as the artist Garnet Warren, who recorded his visit in sketches to the Queenslander in 1898 or they could be businessmen like the Maitland beekeeper, W.S. Pender (1899) or J.C. Williamson, the Melbourne theatrical entrepreneur (1907), who disseminated views by letter or interview. They could be sportsmen like John Young, a Sydneysider who took a bowling team to America in 1901, or regular teams such as the baseballers visiting California in 1897, or the cricket team visiting the eastern United States in 1893.

There were some who went to learn from American irrigation in the 1880's such as Dow, Deakin and Cunningham, or from the railways (Richard Speight, 1889) and other American industries. Some were curious visitors on their way to or from Britain via the United States.

1 The names of these correspondents are difficult to find as the information in newspaper libraries has been either misplaced or lost. Hartley Grattan suggests that the name of the American correspondent to the Sydney Morning Herald at this time was Rothman (Seminar, A.N.U., Sept. 1971). Newspapers were proud of their correspondents' achievements. The Daily Telegraph's correspondent scooped the world press by announcing German plans to annex New Guinea. The Sydney Morning Herald had sent correspondents as far afield as Yonkin and Bulgaria. Martin Donohue of the Evening News became Paris correspondent for the London Daily Chronicle.
such as politicians George and Robert Reid, George Dibbs and Frank McColl, or colonial governors, such as Lord Brassey, or newspapermen acting as travelling correspondents among other things, such as S.V. Winter (1898). Some like Inglis Clark visited the United States to further associate with American intellectuals, or admire republican institutions, or place their children in American schools (1897). A woman like Alice Henry who went to study American trade unionism as applied to women (1906) stayed on to become an important executive of the Chicago Branch for over a dozen years. A large number of articulate miners on their way to, and at the Yukon, gave their impressions of America and the Americans after 1896 in interesting letters that were frequently published in the Australian newspapers. The San Francisco earthquake revealed how many scores of Australians were visiting relatives or studying in California in 1906. Though hardly original, those impressions were valuable as they brought 'things home to the ordinary newspaper reader in a manner that perhaps never struck him before'.

A particular example of the impact to be made by an intelligent observer was Miss C.H. Spence, champion of women's rights; a writer and philanthropist from South Australia, who was Victoria's delegate at the International Charities Conference at the Chicago World Exposition in 1893. Her impressions of America appeared in Harper's Magazine July 1894 and were repeated in the Australasian edition of the Review of Reviews in September of that year. Her comments were typical of the ambivalence characterizing Australian attitudes toward the United States at the time. She criticized the delusions of Americans regarding Australia and especially some Americans' concept of Australia's relationship with Britain. (Some seemed to believe that Australia suffered under an aristocratic-monarchical political system.) She held further that though 'socially the United States are more democratic than the Australian Colonies...politically, Australia is more democratic

1 Sydney Morning Herald, 6 Dec. 1901. See also Maitland Mercury, 25 Mar. 1899; Queenslander, 12, 19 Feb. 1898.


than America' noting particularly, the growth in centralised executive power of the President and the Senate at a time when the direct power of the British government was decreasing in Australia. She objected also to the power of money, corporations and lawyers and the conservatism of Americans that made them cling to an overly rigid constitution. On the other hand, she praised the versatility and frankness of Americans in general and the acuteness, culture and home-making capacity of the women in particular. A dozen years later, another Australian woman was to provide a series of letters to the Age with valuable impressions such as these, especially on the social scene. ¹

British, American and other travellers such as Sydney and Beatrice Webb, Rudyard Kipling, Henry George, Mark Twain, Josiah Royce, George Parkin, Herbert Hoover, Moreton Frewen, M. Ballou, Jack London and Max O'Rell to name a few, were among the varied economists, philosophers and writers visiting Australia in the period 1889-1908 and who left behind some of their acquired cultural baggage in the form of impressions of the United States. ²

How much space was devoted to America in the leading metropolitan dailies? To gain an impression of this the Age has been selected for detailed examination. 'If any of the four great morning dailies can be considered the leader during at least the greater part of this period it was the Age', wrote H.M. Green. 'It was on the whole the brightest of the four, and its leading articles were generally admitted to be the best written and the fullest of ideas....'³ For that reason, the Age, has been chosen as the best single sample, though obviously variations will exist from one newspaper to the other. ⁴

¹ For 'An Australian Woman in America' (1905) see last chapter of this thesis. Vida Goldstein's letters, held in the Victorian State Library are also a valuable source of impressions. In general, see N. Mackenzie, 'Vida Goldstein, the Australian Suffragette', Australian Journal of Politics and History, 1960, Vol.6, No.2, pp.190-204.

² As an example of the impressions they took with them, see H. George, 'Australia', Cosmopolitan, X, January 1891, pp.359-61; J. Royce, 'Impressions of Australia', Scribner's Magazine, IX, January 1891, pp.75-87.

³ Green, op.cit., p.838; Green refers roughly to the years covered by this thesis.

⁴ One commentator held that by 1906, the better paper was the Argus. See Montague Grover, 'Held Over', Lone Hand, 1 Sept. 1914, p.266.
This chart based on a study of the Age, 1889-1908 reveals the number of editorials written primarily on the U.S. (both domestic and foreign). Taking 1898 as a mid-point, it is clear that more editorials appeared after 1898 than before it. Preceding the Spanish-American war, 126 editorials appeared in the nine years 1889-97. After the war, 172 editorials appeared in the nine years 1899-1907, or close on 30 percent more. Most interest during the period 1889-1908 focused on the war itself - the year in which America emerged as a world power. Thus 1898, with 43 editorials devoted to America, commanded as much as ten times the editorial interest compared with some years preceding it such as 1894. After 1898, the number of editorials appearing in any one year never dropped below double the 1894 figure. Whereas in the period 1889-94 there were only two years (1890, 1892) when the number of editorials topped twenty, there were six years when this occurred in
the period 1899-1907 (i.e. 1900, '01, '02, '05, '06, '07). The year of the visit of the Great White Fleet (1908) marks the other highest point of interest (29 editorials). The average number of editorials appearing in the nine years before 1898 is 14, after 1898 the average for the nine years 1899-1907 is 19.1 - clear evidence of greater interest in America following its rise in international status.

These charts based on a study of the Age for the years 1889-1908 illustrate the relative percentages of editorial comment devoted to overseas matters in the Age during the three years 1889, 1898 and 1908 at the beginning, middle and end of the period under discussion. Australian comment always dominated the editorial columns and took up 79.6 per cent in 1889, 70.5 per cent in 1898 and 76 per cent in 1908. On the average, three quarters of the editorials were taken up with local or national matters throughout this period.

Imperial concerns occupied 8.7 per cent in 1889, 7.6 per cent in 1898 and 11 per cent in 1908. Therefore, less than 10 per cent of editorials on the average, were devoted to these concerns. General abstract topics occupied 3.2 per cent in 1889, 6.9 per cent in 1898 and 7 per cent in 1908 - a clear increase in both cases.
Foreign overseas matters occupied 8.7 per cent of the total editorials in 1889, 15 per cent in 1898 and 6 per cent in 1908. An average of 10 per cent of the editorials was thus devoted to foreign comment, though a full 5 per cent swing on either side of this figure made it highly unpredictable from year to year. The number of editorials devoted to foreign overseas affairs was 68 in 1889, 102 in 1898 and 42 in 1908. This indicated almost double the editorial interest in foreign matters in the Age toward the end of the century as at the beginning of the 1890's or at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. The total number of editorials remained fairly constant, averaging a little over 700 per year. In 1889 there were 780, in 1898 there were 666 and in 1908 there were 700. This indicates a slightly higher total number of editorials at the beginning of the 1890's than were written two decades later.

The extraordinary increase in interest toward the United States among those Age editorials devoted to overseas foreign comment in the period 1889-1908, is illustrated in these three charts.

That increase assumes an upward linear form. In 1889, 20 per cent of the foreign editorials had the United States as their subject. In
1898 the figure had almost doubled to 38 per cent and in 1908 had almost doubled again to reach 72.5 per cent of the total comment. Though numerically more editorials were written on the United States in 1898 than in 1899 or 1908, the overall total number of editorials being greater in that year, reduced the percentage. The 50 editorials on foreign overseas matters written in 1899 contained ten on the U.S.A.; the 113 editorials written in 1898 contained 43; the 40 editorials on overseas affairs in 1908 contained 29 on America. In this way the relative proportions became greater, while the overall number of editorials on overseas affairs declined.

Germany, with an average of 13 per cent of this comment, evoked more consistent interest than any other foreign power outside of America (1889 - 20 per cent; 1898 - 8 per cent; 1908 - 12.5 per cent). Concern with France declined as precipitously as interest in America increased (1889 - 20 per cent; 1898 - 16 per cent; 1908 - 5 per cent). Interest in Russia declined to the extent where by 1908 its place had been taken by Japan at around 5 per cent of the editorial space. Except for the period of exceptional interest in Spain with regard to Cuba in 1898 (9.7 per cent), interest in smaller European states declined in non-crisis years to around 4 per cent of the space for Italy and Austria-Hungary. In 1898 China's importance equalled Spain's in the news with a total of 12.4 per cent of the editorials. Interest in the Pacific in 1889 centred on Samoa. Later it merged with other interests. Not only was the editorial attention paid toward the U.S.A. the most consistent of any of the foreign affairs Age editorials throughout the period, it was also the only foreign country to increase that attention and it did so in a remarkable way. This interest coincides with America's emergence as a world power.¹

Newspaper editors of this period were not modest in claiming for themselves a leading role in opinion formation. Ernest C. Sommerlad in Mightier Than The Sword wrote, looking back upon these years:

The influence of the press for good or ill is incomparably great...before the advent of the "new journalism", the leader was the ultimate power and glory of the paper.

Further,

¹See Chart following page.
NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF AGE EDITORIALS UPON WHICH PRECEDING CHARTS ARE BASED

### CHART 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1889</th>
<th></th>
<th>1898</th>
<th></th>
<th>1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Empire</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>780</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>666</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHART 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1889</th>
<th></th>
<th>1898</th>
<th></th>
<th>1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Aust./Hung</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aust./Hung</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Spain/Cuba</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These divisions are based on editorials that show clear priorities in subject matter.*
the editor who appreciates fully the power of the instrument he possesses should lead public opinion and not follow it as a mere recorder of what others are making happen. He should march with the columns not "well in the rear" but at the head...The notable achievements of many Australian newspapers, both metropolitan and provincial, which do not hesitate to use their editorial columns with a primary regard for the public interest, provide ample reinforcement for the policy of strong and judicious use of the leader column.

The towering position of David Syme up to 1908 in the history of Victorian politics is testimony to this effect. W.T. Stead, credited with having begun the 'new journalism' himself did much to promote this sort of editorial attitude in Australia through the pages of the Australasian Review of Reviews from the time of his 'Government by Journalism' (1886) until his death in 1912.

In 1938 W. Macmaham Ball complained of the deterioration in the quality and persuasiveness of editorials on foreign affairs, especially on America, following the depredations of the 'New Journalism'. Many of the changes he advocated were designed to return the press of his day to the position of power and independence that had existed from the 1890's to the early years of the new century with increased influence in public opinion formation regarding overseas developments. J.D. Pringle, editor of the Sydney Morning Herald in the 1950's expressed a similar distress regarding inadequate and ineffectual press coverage of foreign affairs.

There were those who had little respect for the leader-writers of this period. In 1914, one of Australia's first expenons of the 'new journalism', Montague Grover, editor of the Sydney Sun, stressed the importance of accurate, attractively presented news over opinions on that news expressed in editorials:

It is obvious to any person with common sense [he wrote], that ninety nine persons out of every hundred buy a paper, not for its opinions, but its news....In all probability not one newspaper reader in ten ever looks at the leading article and the tenth man only troubles to look at it when the subject is one in which he is personally interested.

---

1 E.C. Sommerlad, Mightier Than The Sword, pp.4, 91, 94.
3 W. Macmahon Ball, op.cit., pp.24-31; K. Inglis, op.cit., p.163.
4 M. Grover, Lone Hand, 1 July 1914, pp.188-9.
Though Grover criticized the Australian editors of the period for their disparate avocations as barristers, school teachers, university graduates and clergymen, he neglected to recognize the richness, depth and earnestness of purpose they frequently brought to their work. This gave it a quality superior to much of the shallow, neutral commercialism of the journalism being ushered in during his own time. The 'conservatism' of these editors, so criticized by Grover, often stemmed from a desire to preserve the 'best' values of the press as a bold, disinterested, serious and educative medium. In his Looking Back Gaily (1927), Benjamin Hoare claimed that though during this period perhaps not one in ten read the editorials, 'we solaced ourselves with the conclusion that it was the one that mattered'.

Editorialists were in monopolistic control of almost the only medium of communication on overseas events. Such a responsibility had a noticeably sobering effect on them, given the increased public interest in foreign affairs and the authority with which they were quoted. In the years 1894-98, 4.8 per cent of the members in the New South Wales' Legislative Assembly were journalists. Between 1891-98 the number of journalist-proprietor M.L.A.'s rose from 4.9 per cent to 7.2 per cent. In 1891 there were eight journalists; in 1898, nine journalist-proprietors in the New South Wales parliament. The figures are even more impressive in Western Australia and for the federal parliament. A plentiful number of premiers, cabinet ministers and many community leaders, were journalists. Such men were concerned with maintaining the integrity and reputation of news reporting. From the 1890's most of Australia's journalists were native-born. One English observer's objection to them in 1907 was their informality, a characteristic that in Australian society probably gave them greater acceptability. Though the status of individual journalists was mixed, 'the press' as a general abstract entity undoubtedly rose in prestige. By 1908, it had already achieved that 'mature stage of political and financial power' described by Clive Turnbull.

---

2 H. Mayer, op.cit., pp.189, 190.
3 A. Buchanan, The Real Australia, 1907, pp.49-50, 51.
What complicated distinctions in attitudes between newspaper editors in the 1890's was the fact that the idea of 'liberalism' in Australia, as elsewhere in the English-speaking and European world was undergoing transition. The importance of this lay in the fact that the great majority of newspapers in Australia lay in the centre of the ideological spectrum and advocated some form of liberalism. Most of the Australian press was in the process of moving away from older concepts of liberalism as meaning increasing freedom from government interference in economics and society. Especially was it moving away from the utopian, moralistic 'free-tradism' of the Manchester economists Cobden and Bright. However, it largely retained political and social concepts pertaining to popular sovereignty, state secularism, continuing general progress and the individualism expounded by John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. Nonetheless, meliorative liberalism, which posited some degree of interference in the operations of politics, economics and society in order to regulate life in the interests of greater freedom and opportunity for the individual - especially the worker in industrial society - had become increasingly popular since 1850.

Those Australian newspapers which echoed some free-trade, laissez-faire and elitist political, economic and social attitudes have, during the course of this thesis, been consistently classified as 'Conservative-Liberals'. Those Australian journals advancing more protectionist, meliorative and democratic economic, social and political attitudes have been consistently classified in this dissertation as 'Liberal-Conservatives'. In this classification, the most prominent feature of the journal's ideology appears at the beginning of the description, while the modifier appears second. None of the vast number of Australian newspapers occupying the central ideological ground can be referred to as solely 'liberal' or 'conservative'. The degree of 'conservatism' in the 'liberal' description and vice-versa here refers to the overall amount of either backward or forward-looking revealed in the paper's

---

1 This discussion is especially pertinent to the classifications of the Australian press to be found in the Appendix.

expression of its liberalism.

Such modified newspaper classifications, operating in a situation where the term 'liberal' was undergoing change through time are complex, and lines between the two types are fine enough to be sometimes blurred. Some elements in a free trade organ for example, might mark it out as inconsistent in its 'Conservative-Liberal' editorial policy. Newspapers might often agree on liberal ends but differ in the means to be employed to gain them. Therefore, there was sometimes some inconsistency even within the overall classifications.\(^1\)

If a single-all inclusive term can be used to describe radical-liberal-conservative Australian editors and proprietors of this time, it is 'progressive' - a descriptive term much used in American historiography and, making allowances for some differences, one that can be usefully employed in the discussion here.\(^2\)

The managers of and writers for almost all of the great metropolitan dailies and the country press - that is, the bulk of Australian newspapers - believed in some form of progress. They especially believed in some concepts of widening political freedom and social justice. Their public-spirited, crusading tone and their predominantly white Anglo-Saxon middle-class, well-educated, reasonably affluent, urban-Protestant backgrounds makes them easily comparable as a group with similar 'progressives', (particularly those connected with the press) which operated in the United States and elsewhere during the period 1889-1908.

As the next chapter illustrates, even by the early 1890's, these editors were as deeply critical of abuses of America - social, economic and political - as they were concerning similar problems in their own country.

\(^1\)E.g., G.A. Wood stated in August 1917 - 'There are no Tories, though there are some who would like to be Tories'. See, G.A. Wood, Australia and Imperial Politics', in M. Atkinson ed., Australia: Economic and Political Studies (Melbourne, 1926) p.402.

The broad spectrum of their outlooks, ranging from radical to conservative, but most often liberal-conservative, makes them comparable with the confused and often contradictory ideological outlooks of their American newspaper contemporaries, united however, in their general desire to combat 'evil' and promote 'good' for the society as a whole.

These attitudes and reactions were the fruit of a newly dynamic fin de siècle liberalism in a society that promised more than most, the opportunity of improvement upon older models.

The bold advances of Australia's urban-based Labor journals were the most obviously 'progressive' in their radical-socialist approach to the solution of society's problems. But even 'reactionary' journals at the other end of the spectrum, belonging to remote elitist-rural groups, could agree with Labor journals on key issues such as the need for selective white immigration or express a desire to return to some past standard of purity (both widely subscribed to by 'progressives'), while disagreeing with them on many other issues. The concept of 'liberal-imperialism' - 'the transmission of the superior culture of one nation to the backward, oppressed communities of the world' - similarly attracted progressives of the far left and the far right in the same way that certain other issues led to the bizarre political coalitions of Liberals and Conservatives in political parties of the time throughout the English-Speaking World.

The term 'progressive' when applied to editors is eclectic enough to encompass both radicals and reactionaries. But it applies especially to the vast bulk of Australian editorial attitudes either slightly left or slightly right of centre in the 1890's: that grey area of 'conservative-liberal' or 'liberal-conservative' attitudes so difficult to classify clearly.

'Progressivism' was evident in the newspapers' concept of their own role. One editor put it in 1882, regarding the Australian press:

...that its influence is destined to supersede that of the pulpit and Parliament as a means of advancing the moral and

---

1 Sandi Cooper, Preface to W.T. Stead, Americanization, op.cit.

2 Tory-Unionists a case in point (1895). Joseph Chamberlain is a representative type of the person who could simultaneously hold attitudes from radical to reactionary in suspension. He would have been comfortable with the title 'Progressive'.
material welfare of humanity and spreading the blessing of civilization; that by its potent force as an educational agent it will ultimately bring about the golden age of universal conscience and of opinion which optimists, who believe in the perfectibility of human institutions, imagine will at some distant time secure our happiness.

Benjamin Hoare, looking back to the period under discussion wrote:

I still regard the Press as the great engine to which men must look to purge out the savage from society. It is the Press which, in spite of its shortcomings, ventilates, disinfects, fumigates the moral atmosphere we breathe. The Press, in so constantly holding selfishness up to scorn, deodorises the social environment: that was its great mission in the past. 2

The Ballarat Star claimed in 1905:

It may be asserted with confidence that throughout Australia during the past twenty to thirty years, more political "leading" has been done in the columns of newspapers than by any of our professional statesmen. The aim of this 'leading' was to 'benefit...communities by injecting thought and comment into the minds of active reformers'. 3 Referring to Robert Ross Haverfield, an early editor of the Bendigo Advertiser, George Mackay wrote, 'the impress of Mr. Haverfield's pen will be found in the history of every local institution and in every progressive development of the colony itself'. 4 Looking back during its fiftieth anniversary, the Ballarat Courier wrote:

At the time when the Courier came on the scene, the spirit of reform natural to a community which had left other lands to find a fuller and freer life in a new country was in the air. There was a general desire to do away with objectionable conditions which had been brought here and to prevent others from coming, while there were also a set of problems of local growth to deal with. 5

Names like C.A. Saint and Frank McKillop, the latter thirty-five years editor of the Mt. Alexander Mail, were well-known in the district of Castlemaine for local leadership and public benefaction. Most other

---

1 Quoted by K. Inglis, op.cit., p.160.

2 K. Inglis quotes this editorial, op.cit., p.160; B. Hoare, op.cit., p.249.

3 Ballarat Star, 23 Sept. 1905.


5 Ballarat Courier, 11 June 1917.
centres large and small could provide examples of their own and names like Hackett, Bonynghon, Clark, Fairfax and Wilson immediately suggest themselves. Newcastle's only public statue to an individual is dedicated to the philanthropic activism of James Fletcher, editor of the Newcastle Morning Herald. The manifesto of the 1890 conference of the New South Wales Country Press claimed '...the ascension of the fourth estate in New South Wales to the place it was destined to occupy among the forces which fought for the freedom and welfare of the State'.

'Journalism has throughout been intimately and honourably associated with the progress of Australian colonisation', wrote the Brisbane Courier in 1896. Why should Australia, in the words of the Age in 1902, pride itself in 'being one of the most go ahead communities on the surface of the globe?'. The Argus, writing a year later, believed it knew:

The country which is not up to date is lost. That may be taken as an axiomatic truth...the ceaseless stress of competition among the individuals of a community is paralleled by a competition between the nations. The battle is to the strong. The chance of survival is to the fit. If a country cannot "keep up with the procession" to employ an expressive idiom from the language of New York, the modern world has no use for it.

Referring to Victoria's bourgeoisie (in 1889) Geoffrey Serle has recently written that they were 'all...bemused by the notion of the inevitability of progress'.

The attack on 'abuses' whether performed by a populist demagogue like John Norton in the Truth; a pungent radical satirist such as Jules Archibald in the Bulletin; intelligent liberal-conservatives such as Frank Ward in the Daily Telegraph or Langdon Bonynghon in the Advertiser; a conservative-liberal such as Charles Brunsdon Fletcher in the Sydney Morning Herald or an even greater conservative such as Charles Ellis Davies in the Hobart Mercury, all believed in 'progress' according to

---

1 Review of Reviews, 1 Sept. 1906.

2 Courier, 20 June 1896.

3 Age, 2 June 1902.


5 G. Serle, The Rush To Be Rich: A History of the Colony of Victoria 1883-1889 (Melbourne, 1971), pp.270-1. I would not suggest however, that Serle's concept of 'progressives' is the same as my own.
their own lights, especially political integrity and social justice. As the case of the Speight libel case against David Syme illustrated, some editors were prepared to push their attacks to the point of litigation.

These attitudes animated 'progressives' in the United States during the same period. Progressives in America and Australia had both been inspired by the early crusading zeal of British journalist W.T. Stead and his 'Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' (1885) - a spectacular expose of London vice that landed him briefly in jail. Confronted by common problems in roughly similar modern materialist societies, editors assumed an aggressive role in Britain, Australia and America that won them political power, loyal readership and a salve for their consciences. The names of Americans Ray Stannard Baker, Lincoln Steffens and Ida Tarbell who wrote for McClure's and American books such as Thomas W. Lawson's Frenzied Finance, David Graham Phillips' Treason of the Senate, Upton Sinclair's The Jungle, Frank Norris's The Octopus and The Pit and Jack London's The Iron Heel were well known at different times in Australia during the general period 1889-1908 particularly to editors (who quoted them). Theodore Roosevelt gave a general 'lift' to progressivism in all countries by his prestigious intercession, though the more restrained variety of Australian progressive would have agreed with his concept of the limits of 'muckraking'. Australian progressive editors never expressed the same degree of thoroughgoing, trenchant criticism of their society as was the case in America, where real abuses and journalistic competition were more intense.

Because they shared similar societies and due to a feeling of familiarity engendered by language, Australian editors felt free to praise or criticize aspects of American experience sometimes with more fervour than they attacked their own. In this they were given a lead by British and American journalists. As a human laboratory, America attracted fascinated interest and Australia intended to learn from her triumphs and mistakes. As the Bendigo Independent put it in 1908 when it noted the parallels:

between the settlement of a new country like America and of a very new country like Australia [which are not to be found in crowded and long-peopled Europe]...We can aspire to be as wealthy as the United States in the evolution of affairs...and we can also, while the tree is green, take measures to prevent many of the gnarls, knots, blemishes
and noxious parasites which have grown and fastened upon the American tree.¹

From active disapproval of much of America's domestic and foreign diplomatic developments from 1889 to 1895 a short, but significant step was taken toward approval of that American society which seemed to be actively cleansing itself internally as well as promoting peace and security abroad in the period 1901-1908. When American imperialism was approved of by Australian editors, it usually appealed to their paradoxical mixture of progressive instincts.

The question of ethnocentrism which involved race loyalty on one hand and race rejection on the other, will be more fully discussed later.

What needs to be noted here is that the defensive, conservative nature of Australian editorial attitudes on race and empire were not inconsistent with more positive, contemporary progressive attitudes. As the historiography of American progressivism and a study of Australian editorial attitudes reveals, a radical, liberal, progressive stance on particular issues at this time could be compatible with more conservative, even seemingly reactionary attitudes on other matters. The latter stemmed in part from xenophobia and insularity as well as from the Social Darwinist theories current during 1889-1908. Editors could therefore claim kinship with America; align themselves sympathetically with that country against the Chinese and Japanese; applaud American defeat of Spanish in the Caribbean and welcome American entry into the Pacific to combat Japanese, German, French and Russian intrusions there, because it calmed their racial anxieties and brought closer the long-hoped for Anglo-Saxon naval-political union of the United States and the British Empire.

Whereas it had been easy to criticize the faltering and intermittent extensions of the traditional Monroe Doctrine at an earlier period (1889-97), the unprecedented, bold and successful overseas imperialism of the United States (1898-1908) aroused mainly enthusiasm as it channelled American aggression away from its traditional British orientation and toward 'coloured' peoples - Spanish, Filipino and

¹Bendigo Independent, 26 Aug. 1908.
Japanese - in the name of 'humanity' and 'civilization'.

When Australian editors criticized America, they often did so, especially as the failure of the 1897 arbitration treaty was to show, because they believed that America was not fulfilling its racial obligations to other English-speaking peoples. As early as 1893, Miss C.H. Spence in her article for Harper's wrote, 'I think that Australia, which is a great country in the making, feels more nearly of kin to America than even England can do'. In the Australian press America was not characterized as 'cousin' Jonathan so much as an older brother, sister or uncle. These expressions of racial solidarity were especially noticeable during the visit of the Great White Fleet, when the 'mystic union of blood' replaced the earlier 'blood is thicker than water' shibboleth and were based on perceptions of American 'power', British 'neglect' and Japanese 'menace' in the Pacific.

Most Australian editorialists, themselves subscribing to fashionable and sometimes extreme racial sentiments of their own, usually supported American racial and imperial actions, especially when they either morally supported or did not conflict with Australian concepts of their 'interests'.

Gabriel Almond's observations on the attitudes and reactions of the American people toward foreign affairs provide interesting clues to the Australian situation. In materialistic societies as similar as Australia and America, he claims that the overriding attitude of the populace toward foreign affairs is one of indifference as major energies are absorbed in private material pursuits. The replacement of a policy of unstructured 'drift' with periods of simplistic overreaction during crises, reasonably reflects the Australian situation even as far back as the 1890's.

The distrust of intellectualizing international developments, the shifts of mood from euphoric to dysphoric, accompanied by withdrawal reactions following rebuff; the irritation and impatient suspicion at the selfish interests of the central Government and cyclical waves of idealism and cynicism can be traced as parallels in American and Australian reactions during 1889-1908. Those marks of national

---

1 Gabriel Almond, The American People & Foreign Policy (New York, 1950), Ch.III, 'The American Character and Foreign Policy', pp.29-68.
immaturity - alternation of attitudes of superiority and inferiority, confidence and doubt - produced ambivalent reactions from one ambiguous people (the Australians) toward another (the Americans).¹ The character of this ambiguity is nowhere better evident than in the Australian editorials on America during the period 1889-1908 when one country emerged as a united federation and the other emerged as a world power.

¹John G. Stoessinger, Nations In Darkness (New York, 1971), illustrates how perceptions of one country by another can be completely misleading.
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'THE GREAT REPUBLIC': A STUDY IN AMBIGUITY, 1889-1895

By the beginning of the 1890's the image of America especially as it was perceived through the media of the Australian press, had been developing effectively for around a generation. While acknowledging in the main that the United States was akin and held similar traditions, aspirations and problems and that it was an optimistic, innovative, democratic country which had much to teach Australians, commentators also noted that anomalies existed.

These were the product of developing industrial and commercial societies in general, and had to do with crowding, unemployment, the cities and allied difficulties. But despite the special idealism of America, in the inspiration it had given to liberalism around the world since 1776, it was believed that there existed evils peculiar to America itself. Social, economic and political objections toward American developments were made by Australian editors during the first half of the 1890's. They shed light on allied Australian rhetoric and action in this period.

One ready guide to pro-American attitudes in Australia was the fourth of July editorial material appearing annually in a great many liberal-conservative organs. To take only two examples, the Herald wrote in 1889:

Our American cousins are at the moment quietly and calmly celebrating the anniversary of the birthday of Freedom, as they have the best right in the world to do, since it is to them that the nations owe that great development of liberty which is the glory of the nineteenth century.

To us Australians especially the date is a significant one, since had the American colonists failed to maintain the principle for which they contended, our present independence would have been impossible. The Australian colonies would have been founded by British noblemen under great Crown grants as those of America were and the colonists would have remained in semi-feudal subjection for many and many a day...but for the American Revolution the Empire would be our master and not our partner....

...But the British people in Australia as in Great Britain herself, owe America even more than this for her example has shown and continues to show, that a nation may be great, powerful, influential and respected without a foreign policy
and without a standing army...we must...thankfully recollect that the policy of non-intervention which teaches us that no good can be done by extending the area of strife, is a lesson that British statesmen have learned from America [sic]

...Therefore, for these and many other reasons of kinship, connection and mutual good-will, we join heartily in the thankfulness with which every American salutes the fourth of July....

The Standard's offering a year later (1890) is along the same lines:

...The political folly (of our forefathers) in endeavouring to enforce outrageous exaction by tyrannous force robbed England of that which would have shone as one of the brightest jewels in its brilliant crown....

...in his own country, Brother Jonathan has achieved results which command the praise and are the envy of the rest of the world and no less renowned is he abroad. He is ubiquitous and wherever he may be his characteristic energy and enterprise always assert themselves. Born in the blood of kith and kin America has, nonetheless, set a noble example to the rest of the world in the pursuit of the industrial arts, allied with peace and amity toward the rest of mankind. Her internal struggles have been desperate, but they were inevitable and unquestionably the terrible carnage of the Civil War was attended with beneficial results.

The American nation is today in the proud position of having the smallest standing army in the world in proportion to the population. She courts no favour and fears no frown; she stands aloof from senseless quarrels; the secret machinations of courtly cliques who play with men's lives without any concern beyond the accomplishment of their personal purposes do not trouble her in the least; she is contented to work out a glorious destiny on the lines of peace; still her valorous sons have shown that they can "beware the entrance to a quarrel", but being provoked it can "make the opposed beware of [them]". While other people may not share the Americans' enthusiasm on this their national day, they can all with the utmost sincerity congratulate the great western nation on their material progress and the happiness and prosperity which prevail among the sixty-six million human beings spread over their vast continent.

For Australia, as for any nation attempting to assess the national image of another country, the procedure involved the operation of a 'two-way mirror'. To understand the kindred American society, the progressive Australian commentator had to clarify and reveal, consciously

---

1 Herald, 4 July 1889.

2 Standard, 4 July 1890.
or not, the standards, values and aspirations of his own society.\(^1\)

Anti-American sentiments in the early 1890's (which were for Australia as much as for America, a historic watershed) co-incidentally revealed much of what Australians hoped for their own nation internally. Their perceptions in the late 1890's reveal much of their future power aspirations abroad.\(^2\)

At the opening of the 1890's, the liberal-conservative press stressed the kinship of race, sentiment, language, institutions and intercommunications and projected the United States as the paradigm of freedom, liberty, material prosperity and the absence of imperialism. During America's turbulent 1890's - referred to by Richard Hofstadter as a decade experiencing a 'psychic crisis'\(^3\) - the United States departed considerably from these older admirable ways and ideals. As it did so, the country generated much criticism of its own. Australian colonial editors, mindful of the powerful influence American precedents set in social, economic and political affairs, whose base lay in ethnocentrism, took up these criticisms to stress the fact that progressive societies such as Australia's should act to prevent these evils from taking root in their own newly-emerging nation.

As the *Argus* expressed it in mid-1895 with reference to the American experience:

> Progressive civilization has everywhere to face the same perils and progressive civilization is likely to do well in proportion as it fights its own battles against reactionaries on the one hand and revolutionists on the other, acquiring new strength by each exertion.

And the *Age* added at the end of 1895, regarding acceptance or rejection of American precedents:

> Our new Commonwealth must build on the wisdom of the ages and it has a clear site for its foundations. The


\(^2\)Henry Steele Commager, *The American Mind* (London, 1950) and Harold U. Faulkner, *Politics, Reform and Expansion, 1890-1900* (London, 1959), are typical of those who see the 1890's as a watershed for America. Almost all Australian historians see the 1890's as a turning point, due to new impulses in labour and federal developments.

\(^3\)Hofstadter's 'psychic crisis' idea is discussed at a later stage.

\(^4\)*Argus*, 17 June 1895.
larger and quicker our conception of the State, the truer must be our federal course.

Australian editorial attitudes and reactions towards what they frequently referred to as 'The Great Republic' in the period c.1889 to c.1895, were clearly ambiguous. On a general level, these attitudes were approving at the beginning of the 1890's. As the decade advanced however, an increasing chorus of disapproval suffused Australian newspaper comment on specific social, economic and political happenings in the United States. Such a change of tone and emphasis set in from 1889 that an ambivalence approaching a 'love-hate' relationship animated some Australian newspaper attitudes and reactions by the end of 1895.

Alongside the distorted image of the 'typical' Englishman as a 'Haw-Haw' eye-glassed oddity, there had grown up in Australian colonies a caricature of the American as a 'Cheap Jack'. This type - usually in business - talked glibly while he cleverly swindled his patrons. Another unpopular stereotype however - the opposite to the first - was the Puritan New Enganderer. This laconic, wintry, hard-working, formally religious individual, was considered to be the unattractive antithesis of the hedonistic, sunny, emerging Australian national character.

But the first American type was considered to be the more common of the two. Shrewd, and full of what were referred to as 'cute Yankee notions', he was considered by his critics a bumptious parvenu rejecting European (and British) precedents. His only virtue seemed to be his business skill, based on energy and opportunism. Colonel Bell, one of Cleveland's new civil service appointments seemed to convey something of this national image when he announced upon landing in Sydney to take up his post as United States Consul in 1893: '[America's] opportunities have developed the highest genius the world ever saw, the most tireless industry...the richest gifts...our progress has no parallel'. Some Sydney-siders believed that another pushful American had arrived. In this case the Consul's genuine charm overcame the initial impression of Bell as a Dickensian Jefferson Brick, but other Americans arriving here were

---

1 *Age*, 21 Dec. 1895.

2 *Standard*, 4 July 1890 (see Appendix); *Argus*, 15 Mar. 1890 (see Appendix); *Age*, 17 May 1893 (see Appendix).

3 A character from *Martin Chuzzlewit*. 
not so fortunate. Many retained and reinforced the distorted image of the 'smart' American who spoke in loud superlatives.

Though many Americans were either too vivid or too dreary for Australian taste, there was expressed a paradoxical irritation at the American habit of considering Australians — indeed, most Englishmen — as foreigners. Professor E.E. Morris, speaking at the Bankers' Institute in Melbourne in 1890, was perplexed by the fact that the affection of Britons toward Americans was not reciprocated. Australian travellers who had been in America complained on returning home, of the blank ignorance of things Australian in the United States. They were affronted by the fact that even to the most cultured and cosmopolitan Bostonian, Australia was still terra incognita. This seemed to confirm the irony of Americans as being not only arrogant concerning themselves, but ignorantly parochial concerning others.

Local branches of large American insurance offices as well as dentists, barbers, druggists, large and small business managers and operators of public utilities were well known in Australian cities and towns, while there were a number of miners and farmers in the country areas of the various colonies. Americans comprised the sixth largest group of foreign-born peoples in Australia (after the Chinese, Germans, Scandinavians, Polynesians and Indians) — 6 per cent of Australia's total foreign population. Of a total Australian population in 1901 of 3,771,715 they comprised 7,881 people, or just under .2 per cent of the total. Of these, the largest number were in New South Wales — 3,130 of which 2,384 lived in Sydney; 2,141 lived in Victoria — 1,311 in Melbourne; 1,315 lived in Queensland, 1,035 in Western Australia, 523 in South Australia.

---

1 Age, 16 May 1891, 16 Nov. 1893; Herald, 25 May, 15 June 1896 (see Appendix); Argus, 19 July 1892.

2 Edward E. Morris, an Oxford graduate and for a time schoolmaster at Melbourne Grammar School, later occupied the Chair of English, French and Germanic languages and literature from 1884 to 1902. Into that time, he 'crammed an immense amount of literary and teaching activity'. See, G. Blainey, A Centenary History of the University of Melbourne (Melbourne, 1957) p. 101.

3 Argus, 4 July 1890; Age, 22 Aug. 1890; Standard, 3 Dec. 1890.

4 The American flair for self-advertisement can be sampled in publications as remote as Queensland's Wild River Times, 5 Dec. 1895, and West Australia's Geraldton-Murchison Telegraph, 6 Dec. 1895.
and 237 in Tasmania. Nonetheless they did make an impact on the Australian scene and 'American Communities' were referred to in the Australian press. Their noisy 4th of July celebrations, a hang-over from the 'spreadeaglism' of the American commercial adventurer Francis Train in the 1850's were often criticised, though sometimes in a spirit of good-natured envy.

'The canker of American civilization', wrote one widely quoted English journalist in 1893, 'is the rooted disbelief in the honesty and good faith of anybody'. Such criticisms of American civilization were common among journalists in the 1890's and had been for some time. Australian critics felt as qualified as any to join in. But the American reception of these judgements was condemned for its morbid sensitivity. Victorians pointed by way of contrast to the spirit in which they accepted the criticisms of Dr C. Strong and others on 'Barbarous Melbourne' and the fortitude with which the Age published 'warts & all', the comprehensive report on Victoria sent to America by Frank McCoppin, the American Commissioner in charge of Australian arrangements for the Chicago World Fair. The feeling was that though younger, Australians as a people were more mature in this respect, and did not suffer from, to use the words of a later United States Consul-General, Pierrepoint Moffat, a 'national

1 Coghlan, op.cit., p.545; Census of N.S.W. (1901), pp.276-83; Census of Victoria (1901), p.15. These figures exclude Aboriginals.

2 E.g. Two Americans - Mr Hopper, a Chicagoan of meat-preserving fame and Mr Badger, the Manager of Brisbane Tramways Company, proved their value in Queensland society; Brisbane Evening Observer, 12 Apr. 1901.

3 Argus, 6 July 1889. For Train's career see first footnote in Introduction.

4 The journalist was William Thomas Stead (1849-1912), from 1883 to 1889 editor the Pall Mall Gazette. He founded the monthly Review of Reviews in 1890. He echoed Dickens's criticism from American Notes, published in 1842. In general, see H.S. Commager, (ed.), America In Perspective, The United States Through Foreign Eyes, (N.Y., 1947), p.79.

5 Charles Strong (1844-1942), preacher and founder of the Australian Church 1885, was a champion of social justice and a bold critic of Australian abuses from the time of his arrival in Australia (from Scotland) in 1875. See P. Serle, Dictionary, op.cit., pp.374-376.

6 Age, 23 Apr. 1889, 24 Feb. 1890; Argus, 18 Jan. 1890.
inferiority complex.¹

There existed a definite desire on the part of Australians not to be overawed by the American experience. The U.S.A.'s very bigness was mocked. 'The citizens of the great republic are never satisfied except when they are doing things on a bigger scale than everybody else,' chided the Argus in 1889.

Their fortunes are more colossal and are more quickly amassed and dissipated; their railway accidents, explosions and disasters are more appalling, their blizzards are more destructive than in any other nation. This kind of deflation was common.²

If America tried to develop the reputation that it could 'lick all creation' (to use American slang current at the time) Australian editors often tried equally hard to appear unimpressed. An Australian widow had publicised that in her experience, hours of work were longer and work was easier to lose; standards of comfort were lower and costs of rent higher in the United States than in Australia. Another published statistic put the average Australian wage ahead of that in the States. Another of the University of Melbourne's luminaries Professor Jenks, speaking to the Bankers' Institute of Australia had it that by placing utility before beauty; mercenary ahead of cultural considerations, the much-vaunted American 'progress' was a sham. Affirmative arguments for the oft-conducted debate: 'That the discovery of America did not benefit mankind' had it that the United States had siphoned off the best of the European migrants and investment capital of the Old World and by following selfish economic policies, had given little in return.³

Even in its oft-praised organizational and mechanical talents, America by the 1890's was being considered by the Australian press as a faulty precedent. The importation of expensive American 'experts' to help with colonial problems concerning railways, postal and telephone services and wheat storage was no longer considered necessary. By 1890,

²Argus, 29 May 1889, 31 Mar., 12 Apr. 1890. See also, Herald, 1 June 1889, 29 July 1890, 23 Sept. 1893; Standard, 1 June 1893, 2 Aug. 1894.
³Herald, 16 Aug. 1890; Age, 29 Aug., 12 Oct. 1892.
according to the press, the Australian should have considered himself, in
terms of general adaptability and inventiveness to be the American's equal.
In some items such as writers, statesmen, girls and products and in more
general matters such as the degree of lawfulness, tranquility, freedom,
intelligence and tact, some Australian editors were beginning to consider
Australia as superior to America. Given the sense of Australian national
identity emerging in the 1890's, the promise of Australian life and the
means of realizing it did not suffer in Australia by comparison with
estimates of America's prospects.

In one aspect at least, most Australian editors agreed they were
clearly ahead of American society. That was in the absence of what they
referred to as the 'coloured question'. The disruptive influence of
America's eight million negroes with the prospect of ten times that number
existing in America within a century was considered 'appalling' by a large
number of organs of the Australian press. As the Argus put it in 1889,

Racial incompatibility is the worst evil which can affect a
nation and in the United States we have the spectacle of an
ignorant, indolent, semi-savage people growing in strength
day by day in the midst of a civilization to which they are
in most respects abhorrent.

The press noted the negroes' travails. From 1890 onward, the Negro
was rigorously disenfranchised. 'Jim Crow' laws ensured segregation in
Southern States and this received the blessing of the Supreme Court in the
case Plessy versus Ferguson in 1896. In 1892, 155 Negroes were murdered
extrajudicially in a slightly higher than average year for lynching.
These were conducted by mobs seeking revenge for crimes real or supposed.

With race hatred so evident, a race war seemed imminent. Australian
editors, while condemning the excesses of fellow whites, nonetheless
considered the problem insoluble. Migration was impracticable and
miscegenation ruinous, given the belief current at the time that an
'inferior' race absorbed a 'superior' one. Due to the Americans' seeming

1See comment in Bendigo Independent, 29 June 1889, 18 Dec. 1893 (see
Appendix); Ballarat Courier, 8 Mar. 1895 (see Appendix); Herald, 13 Dec.
1893, 5 Jan., 17 Sept. 1894; 18 Jan., 21 Dec. 1895; Age, 21 June 1894,
June 1894.

2Geoffrey Serle, referring to the years 1885-1891 has written, '...In these
boom years, the utopian assumption of Australia's destiny as another United
States, peopled by a chosen white race, superior to the Old World and free
from its vices, held sway as never since'. From Deserts The Prophets Come
(Melbourne, 1973) p.60.

3Argus, 27 Dec. 1889.
reluctance to educate their former slaves away from the sort of irresponsibility that had produced the horrors of Haiti and the failures of Reconstruction, America's racial future seemed clouded, with prospects of continued repression, confrontation and even bloody revolt.¹

Racial tension was also deplored following the lynching in New Orleans of eleven Italians acquitted of murder (April 1891). This outrage, which revealed considerable racial prejudice, had brought America to the brink of a diplomatic breakdown with Italy.²

The ultimate press indictment of American humanitarianism concerned the brusque brutality with which 'Manifest Destiny' had shunted aside the American Indian. The natives' long agony at the hands of greedy and dishonest Commissioners and trigger-happy troops reached its denouement at Wounded Knee in the massacre of 280 Sioux in 1890. The Indian had aroused admiration in the Australian press due to his dignity and fighting qualities. His slow passing aroused a species of sympathy that ironically, the less well-publicized passage of the unwarlike Aboriginal, dying of whisky and white-man's diseases, did not.³ Such press observations revealed the race prejudice of many editors in Australia.

An extension of these prejudices against those 'strangers in the land' of America was some of the Australian editorial reaction toward American immigration. It generally held that 70 years of unrestricted immigration had strained America's political institutions and social policies. Other editors noted with dismay that of the 15 ¹/₂ million people entering the United States in that time, only one and a half million were English-speaking. The rest were considered the 'refuse of the nations' and deserved the harsh reception awaiting them at Castle Garden, New York. Restriction of pauper, degraded and illiterate immigrants was approved of in the main, by a highly ethnocentric Australian press.⁴

¹See editorials in Age, 13 Aug. 1889, 23 June 1890, 9 Apr. 1892, 13 June 1893; Standard, 10 Feb. 1890; Herald, 3 Nov. 1894, 5 Oct. 1895.

²Argus, 13 Apr. 1891; Age, 17 Mar. 1892.


⁴Age, 25 Nov. 1890; 23 Feb. 1892; Argus, 29 Dec. 1890.
The *Age* for example, described the 579,000\(^1\) immigrants for 1892 — unlike the earlier cream of the North European stock — as 'brutal, ignorant outcasts...a huge mass of indigestible and undesirable rubbish, threatening to interfere with [America's] future prosperity'. The 'vices and vermin' which they imported were considered to be political as well as biological. Most of the industrial unrest, particularly the Chicago Haymarket riot and bombing (1886); and other anarchism was laid at their door, as was much of the organized murder in the cities: the work of the Camorra and the Mafia.\(^2\)

Germans\(^3\) appeared to threaten the English language itself within cities like New York, due to their flourishing independent press, while Scandinavians clearly dominated the culture of whole areas of the Mid-West and Italians whole sections of the cities. The courting of the votes of the illiterate immigrants was a long-recognized scandal as was the famed 'twisting of the lion's tail' diplomatically, in order to court the large Irish-American vote. Slavs, arriving in vast numbers, were particularly resented for their lack of sympathy with Anglo-Saxon traditions.\(^4\) As the *Age* put it, 'the scum of the earth...pollute [America's] fair fields with their undesirable presence'.\(^5\) The clear implication was that as long as this was the case, the quality of American life and the promotion of American ideals would be retarded.\(^6\)

The fact that by mid-1894 a reverse migration back to Europe had begun, proved to some Colonial observers how mistaken America had been to allow in such low-grade intruders in the first place and how badly

---

\(^1\)The 1892 figure was the highest until 1902 i.e., following economic recovery of the U.S. In 1898 it reached the low figure of 229,000. Even by 1895 the numbers entering had halved.

\(^2\)*Age*, 5 Jan. 1893.

\(^3\)Well over 100,000 Germans arrived annually until 1892 and 30,000 to 40,000 thereafter.

\(^4\)The Immigration Restriction League protesting against these supposed 'evils' was formed in 1894, though legislation did not come until the 1920's.

\(^5\)*The Age*, ibid.

\(^6\)A.T. Yarwood, 'The "White Australia" Policy. A Re-interpretation of its Development in the late Colonial Period', *Historical Studies* (Melbourne, Nov. 1962), pp.257-70 shows how 1896 was a turning-point in Australian perceptions of their own immigration problem.
they had fouled the American nest with their encouragement of political corruption, industrial unrest, anarchism, low wages and crowded, unsanitary conditions. The real physical suffering of the tens of thousands of unemployed left behind, following the effects of the depression of 1893, was seen as a logical extension of this reprehensible unrestricted immigration policy. By voicing such criticisms, Australian editors did much to reveal their own nativism and their developing attitudes on immigration.

So lawless had the United States become that more than one Australian paper described them as a 'Murderers' Paradise'. This was based on the published statistics revealing that from 1888 to 1892 the number of murders doubled to reach 4,290 in the latter year. The carriage of guns was deemed partly responsible for the 14,770 murders in the five years 1884-1889. In 1889 it was deplored that the number of lynchings (176) outnumbered those formally executed for crimes (98). Not only was intimidation common, as in the murder of the New Orleans' police chief that precipitated the popular retaliatory Italian lynchings mentioned, but American criminal law procedure was considered by Australians as 'monstrously slow and curiously uncertain'. It appeared to frustrate justice rather than promote it (as in the Durrant murders of 1899) and in United States Justice Martine's words made murder 'the safest crime one can commit'.

Resentment was felt at the harbouring of dangerous alien dynamitards by the United States - especially the Irish, who openly plotted to disrupt the Empire with some outrageous act. Police corruption in New York was regarded by the Ballarat and Bendigo papers as the result of the 'criminal apathy of an otherwise uncriminal public'. The growing American tendency toward political assassination such as that of Chicago's mayor

---

1 Argus, 23 June 1894.


in 1893 and which in one generation had claimed two presidents (and was soon to claim a third) gave rise to several odious comparisons of America with conditions of political crime existing in Czarist Russia. Aliens were often blamed by editors for much of this violence.¹

To some Melbourne editors, proper legal methods in America had been replaced by a form of primitive savagery. Continued lynchings illustrated in what light regard life was held. Leaders condemned the gala atmosphere in which human victims were, in American phraseology 'jerked to Jesus'. If some white Americans revealed themselves impatient with formal legal procedures, then equally, some Negroes appeared openly frustrated to the point of incorrigible barbarity with United States' society. United States' procedures were bringing European legal standards into universal disrepute. Britain's murder rate for the 1890's, often quoted as one-hundredth the United State's figure, was taken as an indication of the greater general respect for the civilized values of law and order. These were values in which most Australian editors were eager to claim a share.²

The scramble for the 'almighty dollar' by which phrase American acquisitiveness was described by the press in Australia and elsewhere, had given publicity to a number of plutocrats. They were the super-rich American industrialists and businessmen considered to possess inordinate political influence. Those like railroad builders Daniel Drew, Jim Fisk and Jay Gould³ of the 'Erie Ring' were condemned as cynical and greedy unregenerates. But reactions to semi-philanthropists such as Leland Stanford, Collis P. Huntington and Andrew Carnegie were at first cautiously ambivalent, then often praised, especially as Stanford's brother was a well-regarded citizen of Melbourne.

Publications such as Carnegie's well-read Triumphant Democracy (1886) and magazine articles such as 'The Gospel of Wealth' (1889) had done much to provide capitalists with a respectable Social-Darwinist rationale for

¹Age, 7 Oct. 1891.
³For Jay Gould's career and an assessment, see Review of Reviews, Jan. 1893, pp.18-35.
their position in society. ¹ Carnegie however, usually managed to irritate the Australian conservative press with provocative predictions such as the coming Republic in Britain to follow the death of Queen Victoria.

The irony of his boasted employment of a contented, self-restrained work force was rudely revealed in the violence that attended the strikes at his Homestead steel works in Pittsburgh in 1892 - put down by the mercenary strike-breakers of the Pinkerton Agency. The Argus commented:

Nowhere else in the civilized world is industrial strife so bitter as in the United States; nowhere else are strikes so vast and destructive and nowhere do they so swiftly lapse into crime and bloodshed.²

Thereafter, for his part in the affair, Carnegie's judgements were increasingly suspect and the various evils of monopolistic capitalism given more publicity even by the more conservative newspapers of the Australian colonies.

Most damaging in this period was the exposé by the brilliant American 'muckraking' journalist and author, Henry Demarest Lloyd³ whose 'A Strike of Millionaires Against Miners' (1890) made the point that great wealth was acting collusively to suppress the legitimate demands of needy coal miners. The useless accumulations of an Astor and the ostentatious, but uncomfortable gilt surrounding a Rockefeller brought the narrow class of plutocrats into further disrepute. Their insensitivity to the plight of starving workers in 1894 caused many of them to be condemned root and branch by more radical elements of the Australian press as cold-blooded inhuman tyrants, exacerbating the coming class war many journalistic observers predicted, in which they richly deserved deposition.⁴

¹ 'Wealth' was run in the North American Review, June 1889. In December of that year the same magazine ran Carnegie's 'The Best Fields for Philanthropy'. At Gladstone's request 'Wealth' was reprinted by W.T. Stead in Pall Mall Gazette under the title 'The Gospel of Wealth' (1889) - not in 1900 as is often held.
² Argus, 30 July, 27 Aug. 1892, 10 June 1893.
³ Henry Demarest Lloyd (1847-1903) was a U.S. author and fearless social reformer who had a marked influence on the 'Progressive' movement of the turn of the century in America. Following his exposé of the ruthlessness of the Standard Oil Company, he travelled to Europe and Australasia studying experiments in the fields of voluntary co-operation, public ownership and social legislation. He urged similar solutions to the problems faced by the U.S. See Caro Lloyd, Henry Demarest Lloyd (2 Vol., N.Y., 1912).
⁴ Ballarat Courier, 10 Sept. 1890; Herald, 8 Feb. 1893; Age, 28 May 1892.
For some Australian editors, a survey of private fortunes told the story: in 1892, 120 Americans possessed assets equivalent to the British National Debt. The number of millionaires - 4,047, most of them 'new' - greatly exceeded the British. One-thousandth of the population virtually owned the country, though 75 per cent of them were revealed as curmudgeons. By 1895, all elements of the Australian press viewed them in the same light as Lloyd in his scathing Wealth Against Commonwealth (1894) and that image was not flattering. At best, they represented the new crude rich of a raw democracy. They had shown pecuniary skill without commensurate taste with which to enjoy it, or wisdom to preserve it. In these comments Australian editors were generally revealing some of their socialist, anti-monopolistic attitudes.

An intense focus for many complaints against America was brought to bear on Chicago - the city chosen for the Columbian World Exposition of 1893, which celebrated, a year late, the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus. A number of criticisms found voice: the site chosen was considered a corrupt political decision, given the current Democratic ascendancy in Congress. Chicago was considered a dull venue: too hot, too remote and too poorly serviced to be a success. The American Exposition was regarded as pretentious - certainly it was considered as unlikely to approach the showing of that in Paris in 1889.

A general editorial disenchantment with fairs as artistic failures and financial fiascos stemmed from Australia's embittering experience with their own 1888 Centennial Exhibition. This had cost the Victorian government which held it in Melbourne, ten times the originally projected amount. The government, affected by the 1891 depression and in a retrenching mood, viewed with disfavour the £30,000 now estimated as needed to advertise the colony in Chicago. It was held by the Age in particular that acting in isolation, the various colonies could do little to impress America or Europe or even the denizens of Chicago, for Australian wool, wheat and wine were products already well known overseas.

---

1 E.g. Argus, 8 Apr. 1893, 1 Feb. 1894.

Nonetheless, Chicago and the Fair was to impress Australia and not at all favourably. Sir George Dibbs the New South Wales' Premier, while in New York in August 1892, had publicly 'damned Chicago' and the rest of the colonies were later inclined to damn it with him.\(^1\) The cause of condemnation in this case was the seizure by a Chicago sheriff of £10,000 worth of New South Wales' mineral exhibits - mostly gold - in trust for the impounding for glanders of the horses of Sell's Chicago Circus upon their arrival in Sydney. The matter threatened to assume the proportions of an international incident when the Agent-General, Sir Saul Samuel, alerted the Colonial Office who, through the Foreign Office, had the British ambassador in Washington settle the matter.\(^2\) The *Age* condemned the seizure as 'the height of ingratitude and unfriendliness'.

The work of the brilliant British journalist W.T. Stead, who had begun his influential Australian edition of the *Review of Reviews* in 1892, thus fell on ready ears. His book, *If Christ Came to Chicago*, based on investigations of the city during the Fair, was described by the *Argus* upon its release in Australia as 'the most daring and plainspoken indictment not merely of a whole city, but in a sense of a whole type of civilization, published in modern times'.\(^3\) Stead relentlessly catalogued the corruption and greed of millionaires and aldermen at the expense of an impoverished working class. The great Chicago Pullman Strike of mid-1894, which pitted troops against workers and paralyzed the nation's transportation coincided with the arrival of the book in Australian editorial circles and seemed to confirm the author's predictions of anarchism and violence on a huge scale.\(^4\)

1. When Sir George Dibbs met Colonel Campbell, who was handling Australia's entry to the World Fair, in New York on 11 August 1892, Dibbs said rudely: 'I don't care a damn for your country, and I am sorry I came....Damn Chicago! It has caused New South Wales' to squander £20,000 by the failure of the World's Fair Executive Committee to keep the promises made with regard to space for the colony's exhibits.' See *Australian Star*, 12 Aug. 1892. Dibbs was returning home from a visit to England, where he had been knighted. For Dibbs, see *National Dictionary of Biography* (Melbourne, 1972), Vol.4, pp.65-9.


3. *Age*, 17 May, 1, 4, 14 Nov. 1893.

4. *Argus*, 2 June, 10 July 1894, 17 June 1895.

5. *Herald*, 10, 14 July 1894; *Standard*, 9, 13 July 1894.
Pullman Strike presented the conservative members of the Australian press with two names for their pantheon of society's enemies: John Altgeld and Eugene V. Debs.¹ For most Australian editors, Chicago seemed to represent all that was most contemptible in American urban developments.

There were other, more general complaints against America, of a social nature. Women, it was held, were nowhere more powerful and assertive than they were in the Republic. Whether involved in liquor reform, entering the professions, forming their own communities or governing others, they appeared as an incorrigible lot to Australian conservatives. Others noted the anomaly that though nowhere were women given more open deference, nowhere were they in such financial subjection to their husbands. Also, the political rights of women in America did not appear to be as advanced as those in Australia or Britain. As Max O'Rell pointed out, female suffrage was not prominent in the election platforms of 1892 or 1896. On the other hand, American women were considered by Australian editors as being too receptive to the vicissitudes of clothing fashions and easy divorce.²

American journals also came in for their share of criticism. Most editors considered them too gossipy, too personally vilifying and too prone to unreliable sensation-mongering. Cables from American sources were suspect, for more than once tales of vast American tragedies had been rescinded later, as a joke on overseas readers. The Melbourne Herald considered the literary and moral drift of the American journals as reflecting either depraved taste or some ugly social malaise.³ Australian editors refused in the main to identify a separate American literature or to endorse the many new American sayings and spellings entering the language and being constantly anthologized.⁴

¹ For a portrait of Eugene Debs, see Review of Reviews, 20 Sept. 1894, pp.114-32. For the Review of Reviews see Appendix.
³ Herald, 12 Jan., 17 July 1893, 8 Feb. 1896.
⁴ E.g. Argus, 6 July 1889, 23 Sept. 1893, 7 Dec. 1895; Age, 18 June 1892.
A number of other items were objected to: polygamous Mormonism, faith healing; religious sects; bogus University degrees and electrocution as a form of death penalty - tried with little success on Kemmler in 1890. The list included inadequate fire precautions (a fire in a New York hotel in 1892 killed seventy guests); the allowance of corrupt lotteries; the Jack Cade quality of Coxey's rabble labour army marching on the White House in 1894; the tremendous financial burden of bogus and genuine Civil War Army pensions - an open political bribe costing taxpayers $23 million a year from 1890 and finally, the public apathy that tolerated such abuses. As the Herald put it: 'to be humourously patient of a great public scandal is a marked American characteristic'.

'All things' were supposed to happen in America. They very often did. The touring Australian cricket eleven of 1893 were beaten in their first game in Philadelphia by a scratch American team played during their return home from England. An exasperation with American sporting luck, conditions, style of play and fairness of refereeing was thereby enhanced as a tradition. Yet, despite this, Australian relations with the United States were more than usually amiable by the end of 1895 largely due to Australian sporting victories. The 'fastest cyclist in the world', America's Zimmerman, who was outraced by his Australian opposition, was drawing crowds of over 30,000 from early November in Australia's major cities. The week before his appearance in Sydney another American entertainment, the comedy One Of Our Girls was being hailed as 'a mark in our theatrical history...' revealing 'that between this country and that of the Stars and Stripes there is a link which nothing in the world can sever'. While Zimmerman was in Ballarat and Melbourne, the veteran

1 See editorials in Age, 22 Jan. 1890, 10 Feb. 1892, 12 May 1893, 2 May 1894; Argus, 23 Apr. 1894, 11 June 1896; Ballarat Courier, 28 Feb. 1890; Standard, 7 Aug. 1890, 1 June 1894.

2 Herald, 15 Sept., 4 Oct. 1893.

3 Melbourne Punch, 2 Jan. 1896, p.2 (see Appendix). This rider claimed to be a great grandson of Franz Zimmerman, one of the earliest voyagers to and commentators on Australia - was nonetheless a disappointment. On his first visit to Sydney's Cricket Ground (23 November 1895) he completed only two laps in a five mile race before retiring. He was beaten twice in Melbourne (21 Dec. 1895). Occurring at the peak of the western world's 'bicycle craze', the results were greeted in Australia with intense jubilation.

4 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 18 Nov. 1895.
American actress 'Maggie Moore' - really Margaret Virginia Sullivan, wife of the great American entrepreneur of the Australian stage, J.C. Williamson - was also appearing in those centres for the twentieth successful year in the American play *Struck Oil*, as ever to packed houses. With equal success a recently arrived team of 'Chicago Minstrels' was touring Queensland's coastal towns.

Trade between the U.S. and Australasia, which usually represented between 30% to 40% of the share of all foreign trade had by 1894 (probably due to the effects of the depressions in the U.S. and Australia and the McKinley Tariff of 1890), fallen to as low as 22% of the total share of foreign trade. The value of that trade, as the table on the following page indicates, was £1,043,634, or less than a sixth of what it had been in 1891, and less than a quarter of what it had been in 1889. By 1896, that trade was back toward its highest figures - £6,033,116. The explanation would appear to be the extra intake of goods from Australia by the U.S., especially gold and wool.

Gold in the form of bullion and specie was exported in large amounts to overcome the currency crisis reaching its climax in 1896 with the effects of the depression in the U.S. since 1893, and the fiscal panic accompanying the possible election of William Jennings Bryan.

Wool, which had been placed on the 'free list' by the Wilson-Gorman tariff (of 1894-97) reached, in 1896, the figure of £441,049 or double the value of the 1894 sales. Relaxation of other U.S. duties on imported Australian coal and kauri gum, especially the former, and New Zealand flax, brought sales for the year to 38% of the total foreign trade. This had only been surpassed in 1891, when wool sales were up to £514,551 and when the total value of imports plus exports amounted to £6,189,376, or 40% of the total foreign trade. One factor of importance in these figures would have been the speculative and panic buying of Australian wool before the McKinley tariff of 1890 imposed a duty of between 1¢ and 2¢ per pound on raw wool.

Nonetheless, Australian traders and wool producers had cause to feel

---

2 Mackay Mercury, 7 Dec. 1895. These performances are notable given the depressed condition of the entertainment business. See Age, 14 Dec. 1895. Brief notes on the above papers appear in the Appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>IMPORTS</th>
<th>EXPORTS</th>
<th>TOTAL (£ sterling)</th>
<th>WOOL</th>
<th>% SHARE OF FOREIGN TRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>£2,847,089</td>
<td>£1,658,587</td>
<td>£4,505,676</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>£2,656,354</td>
<td>£2,073,147</td>
<td>£4,729,501</td>
<td>£189,237</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>£2,920,115</td>
<td>£3,269,261</td>
<td>£6,189,376</td>
<td>£514,551</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>£2,220,148</td>
<td>£2,316,641</td>
<td>£4,536,789</td>
<td>£302,921</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>30%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>£1,575,203</td>
<td>£815,594</td>
<td>£1,043,634</td>
<td>£228,040</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35.4%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>£3,346,460</td>
<td>£2,686,656</td>
<td>£6,033,116</td>
<td>£441,049</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>£5,239,607</td>
<td>£3,297,119</td>
<td>£8,536,726</td>
<td>£319,128</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>£7,269,499</td>
<td>£3,892,955</td>
<td>£11,162,454</td>
<td>£273,933</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures compiled from T.A. Coghlan's 'A Statistical Account of the Seven Colonies of Australasia,' several vols. published during 1890's in Sydney.

*Figures calculated from Yearbook, Vol.I, Melbourne, 1908, but based on Australian figures only.
some satisfaction in 1895 at the jump in trade with the United States following disappointment at the steady decline after 1891. Free traders in Sydney who had sent a message of congratulation to Cleveland upon his election as President in November 1892, felt vindicated in their theories concerning the efficacious effects of a lower tariff. Protectionists pointed out in their defence, that the new Cleveland tariff, while having some good effects in Australia and elsewhere, was doing so at the expense of America. In reality, as a revision of the old tariff, that of 1894 was a mere 4 percent below the overall relatively high tariff levels of 1889. With the intake of Australian goods by the U.S. in 1896 approaching three times the levels of 1894, the long-awaited revival in Australia's economic fortunes seemed imminent.

Wool growers had for long been the most anxious among Australians concerned with American economic developments. Even their best year - 1891 - had seen the United States purchase directly a mere 2.1% of the crop. The year before it had been 1%. By 1901 it was only 1.6%. But the figures are misleading. Due to cheaper shipping rates from London to the United States, much wool was purchased by Britain for shipment to America. In 1891 for example, though 8,106 bales were purchased directly in Sydney by U.S. buyers, a further 98,000 bales were bought on the London market by Boston importers.

Most annoying for Australian wool producers and marketers was America's clear need for fine Australian wool to replace the 'shoddy' being used in the clothing of those in extremely cold sections of the U.S.. A particularly powerful wool lobby in Congress, which posited itself as the keystone to the whole United States' protectionist edifice, continued to annoy the Australian producer. One particularly obnoxious

---

1 This meeting offers congratulations to the American people on the triumphant re-election of Mr Grover Cleveland as President of the United States and regards that event as the opening up of a new epoch of freedom and human progress'. See Lloyd G. Churchward, 'Australian-American Trade Relations, 1791-1939', Economic Record (June, 1950) p.76.


3 Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Sept. 1895; Geelong Advertiser, 14 Dec. 1895.

4 L. Churchward, ibid.
item appeared in the Republican party's campaign literature during the election of 1892. It falsely charged that 'convict shepherds' were making cheaper the cost of production of the wool of the Australian colonies, and that Australian woolgrowers had sent money to the U.S. in order to bribe Congressmen to vote for lower wool tariffs. Worse, it was suggested that after having captured a large share of the American wool market with a cheap, high-quality product, Australians would then hold the American public to ransom by raising prices. 1 Though it was not as short-lived as U.S. wool-producers would have hoped, Australia's wool prosperity in the American market received a new set back with the 1897 Dingley tariff. By 1901, the value of wool marketed directly to the U.S. was back around the figure of 1894.

The value of Australasia's imports of United States' goods had more than doubled between 1894 and 1896, to reach £3,346,460 in the latter year. Only in 1891 had exports been greater than imports. In 1896, imports exceeded exports by around £660,000. That year, breadstuffs had swollen the import bill, following crop failures in South Australia. Sydney received most imports, due to the generally lower N.S.W. tariffs and the development of shipping services to California. Only Tasmania shared little in the trade.

One of the most successful U.S. imports was footwear. The value of imported boots and shoes rose from £1,227 in 1890 to £218,343 by 1900. American timber and timber products, tobacco, kerosene, fruit, flour and other provisions had a trading advantage. Some lines such as axes, were better adapted to Australian conditions and like denim material, were preferred to less suitable British products. Galvanized iron, fencing wire, windmills and pumps, lamps, padlocks, mowing machines, reapers and binders, disc ploughs, harrows and garden rakes were also popular U.S. items. 2 Between 1886 and 1906, these manufactures of metals showed the greatest advance of any U.S. import item, until by the latter date, around 40% of Australia's needs came from America. Animal foods,


2 L. Churchward, op. cit., pp.74-5.
paper and stationery, apparel and textiles, jewellery, timepieces, fancy goods and leather manufactures were also important import items. 1

From 1892 to 1895 the balance of payments continued to favour America. This did not please Australian merchants and politicians, especially when the chief Australian export was gold bullion. Most Australian newspapers in the metropolitan areas agitated for a better trade balance. Though the total value of Australia's overseas trade was a fifth that of America's, the value of that trade per head of population was four times the American figure. 2 These facts were often quoted in a misleading way to help give point to Australia's criticisms of American plutocracy and to promote a feeling of Australian economic superiority. 3 By 1901, the total value of Australian trade was triple the 1889 figure. This new upward trend began in 1895.

An active agent of this new prosperity was a bright and versatile Virginian - Colonel George W. Bell, the American Consul in Sydney who had since 1893 reinstated himself in the eyes of the press. Cosmos called him '...the best known and most popular foreigner in Australia'. 4 It was agreed by both the Free Trade and Protectionist presses that he had changed opinion in Sydney from one of ignorance about America to one of warmth. Chambers of Commerce and businessmen in other colonies, where he travelled widely, echoed this praise. Thus the Storekeeper: he has 'thrown himself heart and soul into the noble work of promoting closer and larger commercial relations between Australia and the United States'. 5 Defending his many activities as publicist to Edwin F. Uhl, the Assistant American Secretary of State, Bell wrote: 'though neither people knew or cared much of, or for, the other....I assumed the duties at the Consulaté with a determination to change the impression regarding

1 Official Yearbook of Australia, No.1, (Melbourne, 1908) Import table p.517.

2 Yearbook, op.cit., pp.501-6. Australia's trade in 1901 was £92,149,305 cf. America's - £527,979,000. Value of Australian trade: £24.4.6 per head cf. £6.16.0 per inhabitant for the U.S.

3 E.g. Queenslander, 7 Dec. 1895; Evening News (Melbourne), 18 Dec. 1895; Geelong Advertiser, 10 Dec. 1895; Monitor, 20 Dec. 1895; Darling Downs Gazette, June 1895.

4 Cosmos, Dec. 1895. See also comment in Australian Star, 4 July 1895; Sydney Trade Review and Prices Current, 5 July 1895.

5 The Storekeeper, 15 Feb. 1896. The Illustrated American cited him as an example of the beneficial improvements wrought by Cleveland in the Civil Service '...one happy instance of the right man in the right place'; Cosmos admired him as able, temperate, courteous and patriotic.
our people..." Though exaggerating his own role, Bell's business diplomacy nonetheless did much to promote the good feeling that existed between America and Australia in 1895.

Metropolitan newspapers at the end of 1895 made much of the socially exciting news of mid-December concerning the lavish Churchill-Vanderbilt wedding in New York - the third of a noble Churchill to an American bride and the 138th of an American woman to a titled foreigner. Its cost (£80,000) was variously condemned or gushed over by editors. The *Sydney Morning Herald* detected in the American opposition generated, 'another expression of the anti-trust, anti-monopoly feeling growing in the States and the desire for reform against business selfishness'. Such American events highlighted growing Anglo-American amity, while American abuses did much to help formulate a 'progressive' attitude among Australian editors.

Over-powerful multitudinous American cartels, combines, rings and trusts were held up to constant editorial abuse. Though the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 was meant to control them, it was quickly viewed as no more than a paper tiger. Following the test case of *United States-vs-Knight* in 1895, it was recognized that the United States government would offer no obstacle to having *laissez-faire* operate regarding business combinations. This strangulation of competition, the monopolistic fixing of prices and the political corruption that sustained the system, was ceaselessly attacked by all progressive organs of the Australian press.

Fluctuation following a steady decline in the price of silver on

---


3 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 21 Dec. 1895.


the international market after the passage of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890 and its repeal in 1893, unsettled Australian silver miners and businessmen in general. A bi-metallic currency standard to be imposed on the world by a United States government acting alone, was a continuing spectre. Such a decision, it was frequently held, would bring in its train massive debt repudiation, deal a mortal blow to the gold standard and British economic supremacy and, by the introduction of cheap money bring about a fearful world-wide depression.  

Nonetheless the chaotic and crisis-ridden currency of the United States, with its lack of centralised controls, unbacked paper and depleted gold reserve was presented by editors in the Australian press as a fiscal example of what Australian nation-builders should strive to avoid.

If the census of 1890 had officially declared the United States' frontier to be closed, few in Australia appeared more aware of it than the number who listened to the lecture of an obscure young historian, Frederick Jackson Turner, at the Chicago World Exposition in 1893. The tumultuous movement of a hundred thousand settlers into Oklahoma Territory in 1889 and 1893 was deplored by more orderly developing colonies such as South Australia and Victoria, especially the latter, whose own land 'booming' was having such an unfortunate aftermath.

Any United States' land shortage was belied by the entry to statehood of North and South Dakota, Montana and Washington in 1889, Idaho and Wyoming in 1890 and Utah in January 1896. A feeling that


3 Among the works comparing the Australian and American frontier experiences, perhaps H.C. Allen's Bush and Backwoods (Michigan, 1959) is best known.
these States had been too hastily admitted into the Union; that their overall political power in the Senate and Electoral College was inordinate; that they were the private domains of silver and cattle interests and prone to currency faddism and social anarchism, was sometimes voiced by Australian editors.¹

At a lighter level, J.L. Dow - one of the freelance journalists who were self-styled specialists on American agriculture - admitted at the end of 1895 to an amused audience of protectionists at Wangaratta in December that he had faked his 'American' articles to the Age on Californian irrigation, written a decade before, having composed them in Honolulu en route to the United States.² 'I wrote them before I got to America,' he said, 'When I got there, I was surprised to find how good they were.'³ Not only were rural Australians highly receptive to American materials, but they were gullible as well - a fault not uncommon in isolated communities.

Farmer distress in America, culminating in the political challenge to Eastern financial interests in the United States' elections of 1892 and 1896 had aroused considerable sympathy for over a decade, especially among papers and spokesmen in rural areas of the Australian colonies. The planks of the Populist platform, the writings of James Baird Weaver, Ignatius Donnelly and William H. Harvey were as readily received in some quarters - especially socialists both rural and urban - as had been the writings of Henry George, Edward Bellamy and Laurence Gronlund.⁴

Many radical and socialist editors in Australia identified, as before, the same numerous abuses existing in Australia's cities,

¹ E.g. Argus, 29 May 1889.
³ Nonetheless the articles on Californian irrigation written at the same time by E.S. Cunningham and Alfred Deakin were genuine contributions in every sense. See J.A. La Nauze, Alfred Deakin, Vol.1 (Melbourne, 1965), Ch.4.
industry, agriculture and countryside.\(^1\) Now however, it was more often conceded that America was worse off. Because of this, United States' trade unions, in particular the Knights of Labor, which had done so much to inspire Australian unionism, were roundly criticized.\(^2\) This was not only for indulging in an excessive number of unsuccessful strikes, but for giving up the struggle to reform the political and economic system from within. Its membership in the nineties had declined precipitously especially after unsuccessful recourse to violent, illegal methods. This development was especially distressing at a time when 'Yankee' ingenuity and industry had achieved an extraordinary degree of successful inventiveness and adaptation in other areas and had, since 1894, established the United States as the world's leading manufacturing nation.

On the level of domestic politics, there was other evidence of annoyance with American developments. The huge cost of an American presidential election ($20 million in 1888), spent largely on bribes to secure the votes for a succession of mediocre candidates, and followed by the greedy crush of well over 100,000 office-seekers - many of them like the Irish-American diplomat to Chile, Patrick Egan, considered less than equal to their tasks - was a quadrennial spectacle that never ceased to provoke harsh comparisons with the less expensive, more orderly continuity of the British system.

As James Bryce\(^3\) had revealed to Australians when his much-quoted classic critique of United States' institutions, The American Commonwealth, reached the colonies in 1889, successive Congresses,

---


\(^3\) James Bryce (1838-1922) paid his first visit to the United States in 1870. His book, begun in 1883 and finished in 1888 has been called, 'the most authoritative work on the structure and working of the American constitution'. He wrote with the sympathetic eye of a historian and lawyer, and friend of the American people. He was ambassador to Washington for Britain 1907-13. See N.A.L. Fisher, Lord Bryce, (London, 1927). 2 Vols.
elected with such fanfare, were not addressing themselves adequately to the country's most pressing problems. Legislation which was subject to the uncertainties of lobby, committee and veto as well as the pressures of Upper and Lower House, was considered by editors as too devious and complicated by Australian colonial political standards.\(^1\)

Bryce's observation on the two political parties in America - one which was to become famous - was that they were like two identically labelled bottles - both empty. An electoral system that was to choose only one Democratic candidate for the Presidency between 1865 and 1912 was considered to be malfunctioning even by 1890, especially when the ascendant Republicans had resorted to what were termed 'low partisan tricks' as in the Hayes-Tilden disputed election of 1876, and the dismissal of the British diplomat Sackville-West, during the election of 1888.

James Bryce had noted in his book that 'the government of cities is the one conspicuous failure of the United States'. The Australian press agreed. The open corruption of political organizations such as New York's Democratic Tammany Hall aroused an extreme repugnance. Most concurred with the Forum's description of it as 'a conspiracy for the acquisition of public plunder'. Wire-pulling political bosses such as John Y. McKane were loathed for the form of oriental despotism which they exerted over civic and municipal affairs and jubilation at their demise or groans over their ascendancy periodically echoed throughout editorials of the liberal-conservative press.\(^2\)

As a result of such evil publicity at the local, state and federal level, a determination not to accept at face value the precedents of American constitution-makers grew up in Australian editorials circles and among politicians. The need for a system less open to abuse and more adapted to Australia's special circumstances and requirements was constantly aired in leaders and letters to the editors. The disintegrative nature of State and local interests in the United States,

---


\(^2\)E.g. Editorials in Age, 4 July, 11 Nov. 1892; Herald, 10 July 1894; Argus, 4 July, 3 Aug., 3, 7 Nov. 1892, 9 Mar., 2, 23 June, 28 Dec. 1894, 17 June 1895.
commented upon by the Age's travelling correspondent in 1892, challenged the lasting qualities of that federation. The special class, industrial, racial, rural and currency strains and the divisiveness of Congress, President and Supreme Court also cast doubtful light on the viability of United States federalism. If the President was considered too powerful, the influential Senate was singled out for its unrepresentativeness and for being a mere 'club of millionaires': more conservative and obstructive than the British House of Lords and less amenable to pressure.  

More apocalyptically, some believed with Professor J. Tyndall, a critic of Herbert Spencer, that both the action of free American institutions and the violent appeal of socialism had palpably failed to solve America's myriad problems and that the country was headed for a future bureaucratic or militaristic despotism - a victory of conservative forces. Stead's 'The Labour War In America' refuted this view and posited the ultimate confrontation of despairing labour against entrenched capital, as taking place in America before the end of the century.  

Though fewest anti-American attitudes and reactions were expressed by Australian newspapers concerning foreign affairs, Australian editors were exasperated by several international irritations. Longest lasting had been the failure to recognize the copyright on materials written in Britain and her Empire, despite forty years of negotiations to prevent such piracy by American publishers. Australian pressmen were equally annoyed by America's failure to consider adequate reciprocal extradition arrangements. This had led to a number of opportunists and criminals from America seeking fresh fields in Australia, while making awkward and expensive the extradition of Australian criminal escapees to America.  


2 E.g. Editorials in Age, 23 Aug., 1 Sept. 1892, 6 July, 6 Sept. 1894; Herald, 9 Sept. 1890, 13 Apr. 1895; Argus, 17 Apr., 25 Aug. 1894, 13 July 1895.  

3 Age, 29 Jan., 6 May 1890, 7 Jan. 1891; Argus, 6 July 1889.
American coercion of Canada to persuade that country to join the United States in either an economic or political union was considered by most of the Australian press, with perhaps the single exception of the *Age*, as one of the most damaging aspects of American foreign relations with the Empire.¹ The McKinley Tariff of 1890 and the so-called 'plot' of certain Canadian liberals in 1891 to negotiate to bring the depressed country within America's economic orbit, were considered the two pincers of this movement. Open discussion of Canadian annexation in Congress in 1890 fired further Australian resentment, especially when suggestions for purchase were put forward — seeming to place Canada on the level of Alaska, as a mere piece of real estate and source of raw material, regardless of sentimental and real Imperial ties.²

Secretary of State James G. Blaine's First International American Conference in Washington (1889-1890) was sometimes referred to cynically as a piece of self-advertisement, designed to establish a United States' economic hegemony over the Latin-American countries of the south.³

Exciting more resentment from 1890 to 1893 was the renewed Bering Sea fishery controversy, concerning sealing in the vicinity of the Pribilof Islands off Alaska. American claims for a 'closed sea' and their belligerence toward Canadian sealing vessels were considered preposterous and unwarranted. Australian editorial satisfaction at the arbitration award granted Britain probably reflected earlier press resentments against American sealers as much as it affirmed the justice of British-Canadian claims. The non-payment by America of that award became itself a source of outrage during the following five years (1893-98) especially in the light of the honourable payment by Britain of the scandalously inflated Alabama claims following the Civil War, the excess of which, though unclaimed, had not been returned.⁴

¹ *Age*, 11, 20 Feb. 1891, 30 Apr. 1892.
² For editorials, see *Argus*, 7, 18 Oct., 7 Nov. 1890, 14 Feb., 9 Mar. 1891, 22 Feb. 1892.
Blaine's jingoism, as well as that of President Harrison was further derided during the Chilean imbroglio - an international crisis lasting from May 1891 to early 1892. America's warlike stance following the discourtesies to American officials on the Itata, and the sailors of the Baltimore was considered a shameful blow aimed at a small nation just emerging from the throes of a civil war for the principle of parliamentary responsibility. Such a struggle would have been a grossly uneven war of 'sulks and temper' as one Australian paper described it - fought only to preserve a nebulous United States' prestige. ¹

Little animosity however, motivated Australian attitudes toward American interests in Samoa. These came to a climax with the greatly destructive Apian cyclone (16 March, 1889) which did much to clear the air of the intrigue and rivalry of Germany, England and the United States. The assertion of an Australian or New Zealand or British interest was naturally desired, but in matters of control America was preferred to Germany, and the United States was only criticized on the same level as Britain for not rebuffing those German pretensions more vigorously. With Britain, America was made by the Australian press to bear her share of the responsibility for the periodic outbreaks of tribal warfare and the many administrative failures of the tripartite condominium which followed the Agreement of Berlin in 1889.²

The American-inspired attempted revolution at Hawaii in 1893 created some criticism in Australia for its transparent promotion by the island's sugar interests and the crude rejection of the rightful claims of Queen Liliuokalani to the throne. For, despite the long-standing high degree of American commercial interest in Hawaii, it was recognized that with a mere two per cent of the total population, those American claims were somewhat tenuous when considered beside those of Britain or Japan, while New Zealand's objections were not to be ignored.

¹ E.g. Editorials in Age, 3 Nov. 1891, 28 Jan., 17 Mar. 1892; Argus, 4 Nov. 1891, 9, 28 Jan., 5 Feb. 1892.

As a reversal of traditional isolationism, some considered it an expensive mistake, given America's lack of naval preparedness to defend such an acquisition. Cleveland's rejection of the annexation proposals cast a further shade on their legality. Future American selfishness regarding use of Samoa and Hawaii as strategic coaling stations for war or commerce was feared, as was the economic exclusiveness of the American tariff system, once extended to the islands.1

As a result of his indiscretions whilst visiting Hawaii in mid-1894 on a return trip from Britain and the United States, Victoria's Minister for Defence, Robert Reid, was blamed for the failure of the Pacific Cable venture to gain Necker Island as a station. The total withdrawal of United States' co-operation in the scheme for a time following this, was an example of American cantankerousness that agitated Australian editors on the east coast, anxious for the cable's completion.2

The year 1895 was to be one of special significance for the Australian colonies in foreign developments. In mid-year, the Tory-Unionists came to power by defeating the Liberals in Britain. The new government contained Lord Salisbury as returned Prime Minister and in charge of the Foreign Office, with the capable and progressive Joseph Chamberlain as Colonial Secretary. An early impression was made on the colonies through the latter's Trade Circular of November, 1895. In it, he sought information from the Australian and other colonies as to how their trade with Britain might be better expanded and facilitated. Such a commercial impulse was well received by the Australian metropolitan press, which anticipated in it a variety of guaranteed future trade prospects with the mother country - a form of imperial protection.3

1See editorials in Argus, 31 Jan., 20 Feb. 1893, 10 June 1894; Brisbane Evening Observer, 31 Jan. 1893; Standard, 21 Feb. 1893, 12 Jan. 1894; Merze Tate, 'Australasian Interest in the Commerce and the Sovereignty of Hawaii', Historical Studies (Melbourne, 1965), pp.499-513, due to too small a newspaper sample, mistakenly believed there was no Australian press opposition to the United States annexation of Hawaii.


Such concern and initiative it was hoped by the metropolitan presses, might now apply at the foreign policy level through joint Salisbury-Chamberlain action, to secure more vigorous protection and promotion of Australian colonial interests in the Pacific. Revivified European imperialism in the Pacific had witnessed French annexation of Tahiti in 1880 and the French move more firmly into the New Hebrides by 1886. Germany had obtained some exclusive rights in Tonga in 1876 and in Samoa in 1879 and proclaimed a protectorate over New Guinea in 1884. By 1886 Germany and Great Britain had divided the Pacific into spheres of influence between them.

These events were to have a momentous impact on the Australian colonial impulse toward federation after 1889. Since 1870, various organs of the Australian colonial presses had regarded control of most of the south-western Pacific possessions as part of their own future destiny as a federated power. Editors and politicians were therefore deeply disturbed by the European invasion of the Pacific. From 1884 to 1886 this feeling bordered on hysteria. Australian colonists felt neglected. The British government was sluggish. The French recidivist menace in the New Hebrides and the German militaristic foothold in neighbouring New Guinea was offensive.¹

It was in this atmosphere that after 1889, many Australian editors came to relax their hostility toward nascent American imperialism in Samoa² (concerning which, annexation impulses had been strong since

2 See editorials in Australasian, 26 Jan., 22 June 1889; Brisbane Evening Observer, 1, 5 Feb., 9 Mar., 1, 18, 23 Apr., 17, 22 June 1889, 12 Jan. 1895; Herald, 14 Jan., 1 Feb., 1 June 1889, 29 Apr. 1895; Age, 12, 19 Jan., 28 Feb., 1 Apr., 3 June 1889, 1 May 1894; Argus, 16, 25 Jan., 2 Feb., 6 Mar., 2 Apr., 16 May, 24 July, 24 Aug. 1889, 3 May 1894. A very well written and researched set of articles on Samoa were despatched from 'Vagabond' (J. Thomas) of the Age in the Saturday editions of the last three months of 1889. Most provocative was the despatch of 9 November, 1889: 'Rome In Samoa', which attacked the politically mischievous role of the French priests in the island. This view received a prolonged defence in letters to the editor sent by D.F. Barry, O.S.B., of Manly, N.S.W. See Age, 15, 22, 24 Feb., 29 Mar., 19 Apr. 1890. Robert Louis Stevenson's strongly anti-German attitude influenced editorialists. See interview Argus, 1 Mar. 1893 on arrival in Sydney and article 13 Mar. 1893; balanced by interview with Baron Von Pilsach, Argus, 20 June 1893. All reprints from Sydney Morning Herald. See Argus editorials 26 Apr. 1892, 20, 21 June 1893. Also, R.L. Stevenson's A Footnote To History: Eight Years of Trouble In Samoa (New York, 1960). F.R. Dulles, America In The Pacific: A Century of Expansion (Boston, 1938) 2nd Edn. gives a good general account.
in the remote northern Pacific, where since 1868, the Australian press had recognized a growing sphere of U.S. influence. By 1895, in both cases it was quite clear that Australian editors preferred an American presence to that of any other foreign power as the best chance of preserving Australian colonial interests in trust. The example given by the Calliope, the British warship and only vessel to escape destruction during the cyclone at Apia in 1889, which at the time had been cheered on by American sailors whose own ships were sinking, created a legend for those editors desirous of promoting Anglo-American harmony. These attitudes mitigated much of the criticism of the United States and suffused much of the debate over American actions in the Pacific.

Colonial editorial attitudes toward China had been somewhat modified by 1895. The long-standing 'Yellow Peril' paranoia of all sections of the Australian press regarding dangers presented to the Australian 'way of life' by the cheap labour and inferior genes of a possible massive influx of Chinese immigrants had undergone a climatic upheaval in 1888. This took the form of anti-Chinese legislation in most of the colonies, a result of re-awakened fears following the visit of several Chinese Commissioners to the major centres of Chinese population in the colonies (25 April to 3 August, 1887). Anti-Chinese Leagues, Trades Hall Councils and sinophobes such as the Bulletin, Daily Telegraph, Age, Newcastle Morning Herald and Ballarat Courier, to name a few newspapers, aroused hostility to fever pitch. Most opposition centred on the possible removal of the Poll-Tax on Chinese immigrants. Responsible conservative-liberal opinion such as the Argus and liberal-conservatives such as the Advertiser, were

---

1 See editorials in Argus, 21 Aug. 1889; Herald, 10 Dec. 1890, 17 May 1895; Age, 21 Nov. 1892, 31 Jan. 1893; Standard, 13 Feb. 1893. The complicated story of moves by Americans to annex these islands in the period 1889 to 1895 is well presented in the following: Sylvester K. Stevens, American Expansion In Hawaii 1842-1898 (Harrisburg, P.A., 1945); William A. Russ Jr., The Hawaiian Republic 1894-98: Its Struggle To Win Annexation (Pa., 1961) and Merze Tate, The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom (Conn., 1965).

alike concerned that the British Foreign Office might feel compelled to choose between the friendship of China and the good-will of the colonies. The Sydney Morning Herald led a few newspapers in insisting that a modicum of Chinese friendship be preserved in order to secure future sales of wool, wines, oil, manufactured goods and business skills for Australia. But the Queensland press led by the Courier, was overwhelmingly hostile. With the Queensland Times, it viewed the Commissioners as the advance agents of forcible Chinese immigration despite their disclaimers. Xenophobia and racial nationalism won the day. The colonies and their presses entered the 1890's firm in their opposition to the Chinese.

The 'awakening giant' of China with its vast population, had long been viewed by Australian editors as a potential invasion threat. By 1889, it was realized that the government of China had a growing concern for its overseas population and a desire to begin a modern navy. These factors put China in the class of a potential world power.

But all the underlying Australian newspaper prejudice regarding Chinese social and political decadence and military ineffectualness was revived following that country's abrupt and humiliating defeat at the hands of Japan in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95. China even lost her small trade in tea with the Australian colonies, during the struggle. As Jack Shepherd put it, ...'fear of China as a great power vanished with her defeat in 1895'.

The Inter-Colonial Conference of

---

1 Argus, 28, 30 May, 11 June, 3 Aug. 1887; Advertiser, 20 June 1887.
2 Sydney Morning Herald, 5 May, 14, 20 July, 4 Aug. 1887.
3 Courier, 6 June, 25, 26, 27 July 1887; Queensland Times, 19 July 1887.
4 The above two paragraphs are indebted to the researches of T.P. Buggy, whose M.A. Thesis, 'Australian Attitudes To China, 1887-1909' is at present being completed at Macquarie University, Sydney. When completed, the thesis will valuably supplement this dissertation.
6 Sydney Morning Herald, 6 Apr. 1888; Robert Thomson, Australian Nationalism (Burwood, N.S.W., 1888) pp.106-7.
7 Jack Shepherd, Australia's Interests and Policies In The Far East (New York, 1940) pp.4, 16.
the following year pressed for a uniform policy of excluding Chinese. a policy which reached fruition in the Immigration Act of 1901.¹ The legislation revealed the contempt for China's power status that set in after 1895. Only concern that some avaricious Power might close China's 'Open Door' to trade with the Australian colonies remained.²

When it was realised that the United States was proceeding along roughly similar policy lines of restricting Asiatic immigration and preserving equal opportunities in Chinese trade, Australian editors warmed toward United States movements in the Far East, especially when they worked in tandem with those of Great Britain.³

After 1895, the Chinese question moved into the background. In its place there appeared a much more serious preoccupation with Japan.⁴ This concern was political and military. The political concern stemmed from the proposed Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty of 1894. One clause which caused much editorial heartburn in the colonies permitted the signatories unrestricted immigration into each other's country. Following much newspaper and political debate, all the Australian colonies with the exception of Queensland decided not to participate in the treaty. The colonies had been desirous of Japanese trade and especially the sale of more wool, hides and leather. But they were not interested in encouraging a flood of Japanese immigration and accompanying miscegenation; the influx of numbers of cheap Japanese goods, nor the further encouragement of Japanese imperialism.⁵

Ambivalence also concerned military affairs. Many Australian editors had at first supported the plucky Japanese in their military

---

¹ Myra Willard, History Of The White Australia Policy (Melbourne, 1923) Chapter I; Clunies Ross (ed.), Australia and the Far East (Sydney, 1936) Chapter I.


³ W. Levi, American-Australian Relations, p.86.


efforts as a check to the larger and more traditional Chinese and Russian invasion menaces. But the unguarded statements of some Japanese spokesmen and the energy and aggressiveness of the Japanese displayed after the war, were seized upon by colonial militarists to gradually fan into life again the nationalistic fears that had been earlier aroused by the movements of European powers in the Pacific.¹ By the end of 1895, though some praise and encouragement for the Japanese as a people and as traders remained, newspaper opinion was coming to view the emerging world power of Japan as a replacement for Russia in potential aggression.²

Both rational and irrational elements now served to make Japan one of Australia's most central concerns. A rapport with U.S. actions, based on the ethnocentric and progressive elements of America's attitudes on defence and immigration regarding the Far East, was building up in the Australian press. From 1895, as Levi put it, 'Australians began to pay attention to American policy in the Pacific'.³ For, as Jack Shepherd has written; 'Since 1895 most Australians have regarded the Far East with mingled feelings of hope and fear'.⁴

This did not mean that Australians turned the focus of their attention entirely away from political developments in Western Europe. Rather, after 1895 they had a dual perspective. As one cautious commentator has it,

Quite logically, in respect of political and military matters, Australians looked to Europe in the settlement of their international political and security problems, even when circumstances forced them to deal directly with any given area in the neighbourhood, for in the nineteenth century, such circumstances were usually created by Western powers.⁵

¹In general, see the thesis of D. Sissons: 'Attitudes to Japan and Defence, 1890-1923'. Unpublished M.A., University of Melbourne, 1956.
⁴J. Shepherd, op.cit., p.16.
Security and defence were largely in the hands of the British navy and despite periodic colonial objections demanding a greater say, foreign affairs were essentially in the hands of the British Foreign Office. To prevent accusations of either ingratitude by Britain or internal Empire weakness by foreign rivals, Australian colonies, backed by their presses, were periodically prepared to unequivocally back British interests in times of extraordinary pressure. Such a circumstance prevailed at the end of 1895. Within a few months of their taking office, the government of Salisbury and Chamberlain were 'called upon to face the most serious, because the most complicated, crisis within the memory of living Englishmen'.

During one of the hottest summers in the history of the Australian colonies - 500 people died in N.S.W. alone, where temperatures reached 122°F at Euston and amid the distractions of Gippsland bushfires and cricket mania, the crisis broke. With the Enabling Act being passed in New South Wales in December 1895 after two years of deliberation, federation of the Australian colonies proceeded toward its final phases after December 1895. Ironically, at the precise time when Australian editors were assessing their own country's image and future role, they were forced by events to reassess America's.

---

1 S.H. Jeyes, op. cit., p.385.
4 Shortly after N.S.W., the States of South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria also passed similar measures providing for ten Convention delegates from each colony to meet in 1897 in Adelaide to finalise the details of federation.
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The overseas excitement regarding American actions involving Samoa, Hawaii and Chile having died down in the Australian press, the Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute crisis caught editors in the antipodes off-guard. In August there had been some intimation that America might invoke the Monroe Doctrine to protest against British gunboat diplomacy in the 'Corinto Affair' involving Nicaragua. These fears had proved groundless and when Joseph Chamberlain, the forceful new Secretary of State for the Colonies sent Maxim guns to British Guiana to strengthen border defences against Venezuelan enroachments such as had taken place in November 1894 and January and November 1895, it was believed that America would not take offence at what was a domestic policing action.¹

Editorial attention was focused on other trouble spots: the 'Moroccan', 'Egyptian' and 'Eastern' questions as well as trouble in West Africa, the Congo, the Transvaal, the Mekong and Shan States. In the two weeks before Christmas, these alternate problems were to assume the status of minor irritations when compared with the new trouble with America.²

²Age, 13, 27 Dec. 1895; Ballarat Star, 6 Dec. 1895 (see Appendix).
The controversy between Venezuela and Great Britain dated from 1814 when the British took over that possession from the Dutch. In 1840, a survey made by Sir Robert Schomburgk, a British engineer, was rejected by Venezuela and the dispute remained unsettled. The disputed region did not become a troublesome issue until gold was discovered there. Venezuela pressed its case based on prior Spanish claims before America's State Department in the hope of winning sympathy from the Americans. Then, in 1887, it severed diplomatic relations with Great Britain. The United States offered to help the two countries arbitrate the boundary, but the British refused this tender of good offices. There the matter rested until Cleveland returned to the White House and announced that he would resume urging arbitration of the matter. Great Britain remained cool toward the proposal (20 February 1895). Meanwhile, public opinion in the United States began urging a firm stand by America against Britain and became partial toward Venezuela. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge warned:

If Great Britain is to be permitted to...take the territory of Venezuela, there is nothing to prevent her taking the whole of Venezuela or any other South American state. If Great Britain can do this with impunity, France and Germany will do it also...the supremacy of the Monroe Doctrine should be established and at once - peacably if we can, forcibly if we must. 1

Probably to frustrate the momentum of the Republican opposition, the Anglophobes of his own party and

expansionists of both sides, Cleveland had his new Secretary of State, Richard Olney, draw up a note offering American mediation - a position based on a broad construction of the Monroe Doctrine. This 'twenty-inch' gun as Cleveland called it, was fired off to Salisbury's new government on 20 July 1895. It stated that British pressure on Venezuela would be regarded by the United States as a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that peaceful arbitration (with United States' intercession toward that end) was the only way of settling the controversy. The despatch was not only intemperate, it was inaccurate, and by maintaining that the three thousand miles of the Atlantic Ocean 'made any permanent political union between a European and an American state unnatural and inexpedient', it ignored British rights to Canada and her islands in the West Indies. Further, it was openly belligerent:

Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition. Why?...It is because, in addition to all other grounds, its infinite resources combined with its isolated position render it master of the situation and practically invulnerable as against any or all other powers.1

Lord Salisbury, who was Foreign Secretary as well as Prime Minister since his re-election as Leader of a Tory-Unionist Government in June 1895, rejected the American offer of arbitration, asserting that the Monroe Doctrine was not applicable to the boundary dispute, in a belated reply which was too late to be incorporated into Cleveland's State of the Union Message (2 December 1895). This fact, plus the note's supercilious tone, enraged Cleveland. In a special message delivered to Congress on 17 December 1895, the President placed the diplomatic correspondence before Congress together with a sharp message written by Olney and himself requesting $100,000 to establish an independent investigating commission to determine the boundary line.

Melbourne Punch, 2 January 1896.
When such report is made and accepted [he said], it will...be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power, as a wilful aggression upon its rights and interests, the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela.¹

In effect Cleveland was recommending that after fixing a boundary line the United States should, if necessary, uphold it by going to war. With the grave observation that he was 'fully alive to the responsibility incurred, and keenly realize[d] all the consequences that may follow', the President concluded:

I am nevertheless, firm in my conviction that...there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows from a supine submission to wrong and injustice, and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honour, beneath which are shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness.²

Cheering and applauding, Congress unanimously voted the appropriation for the investigating commission and with Salisbury seemingly intransigent toward such a proposition, the scene was set for another Anglo-American war.³

Australian press attitudes toward the disputed area had to be formed quickly, but were based on a deep-seated prejudice and bias. At first there was a search for authorities. One of the first in this respect was the well-known travel writer W. Somers Somerset (Land Of the Muskeg)

¹ Foreign Relations, op.cit., pp.564-5.
³ How important was the crisis? Recent texts are reassessing it and giving it far more space than formerly. E.g. Arthur S. Link and Stanley S. Coben, The Democratic Heritage (Massachusetts 1971), p.334, call it '...what might have been one of the most serious international crises in American history'.


whose article in November's *Nineteenth Century* gained added circulation when it reappeared in the December *Review of Reviews*. His estimate of Venezuela was unflattering. Socially it consisted of a moral and refined aristocracy supported by a penniless but contented half-breed population. Politically, it was a mass of violence, fraud and corruption and utterly untrustworthy. Another influential travel writer, the American Richard Harding Davis, whose article, 'The Paris of South America' appeared in the November edition of the widely-read *Harper's Magazine* (and also reissued by Fitchett), reinforced this bad image. Davis viewed Venezuelans as

...no more fit for a republican form of government than...for an Arctic expedition...a lot of semi-barbarians...a nuisance and an affront to other nations...better for some strong hand over them to keep them in order.

Such observations met a ready response in Australia.¹

Other papers quoted more obscure sources. The *Bega Gazette* for example, claimed a General Baret de Nazis as its correspondent.² His estimate of prodigious auriferous deposits in the disputed Yuruari valley and in the Colleo mine in particular was verified by the several interviews with Tasmania's Governor, Lord Gormanston - a former Governor of British Guiana.³ The latter's opinion of Guiana's difficult climate countered that of de Nazis¹ who claimed it ideal. Gormanston's belief that the Guianan gold deposits could rival Australia's (then the world's foremost producer) and that the 2,400 newly settled English miners had to be protected, was widely believed due to his credibility as an opinion leader.

Later articles by H. Whates in the *Fortnightly Review* (February 1896) and David P. Chalmers, former Chief

---

¹ *Review of Reviews*, 20 Dec. 1895.
³ *Australasian*, 28 Dec. 1895 (see Appendix)
Justice of British Guiana, in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, both re-quoted in the May 1896 edition of the *Review of Reviews*, reaffirmed these initial impressions. In their immediate need for information, most frankly used the current edition of the *Stateman's Year Book*, presenting relative statistics of the two areas in terms of their own colonies. Editors were familiar with the views of the London Times correspondent at Demarra, though not all accepted his assessment of the situation.

Guiana was consistently viewed as holding reasonable prior claims demarcated by the Schomburgk decision. As a colony similar to those in Australia, it was bound to be defended by Britain against any outside interference—even American. Without a vigorous rebuttal all of Britain's colonies became vulnerable to such demands as the United States was making. British Guiana's bright economic future needed to be safeguarded against Venezuela's repressive backwardness, it was held. Queensland's own tropical weekly, the *Capricornian*, was sure that 'Venezuela is a torpid country...compared with it, British Guiana is a bustling, energetic place, busily developing its resources as becomes a British colony'. Nothing better illustrates Anglo-Saxon prejudice against Latins as colonisers as it existed at this time.

Venezuela by contrast was 'restless and despicable' in the eyes of the *Kyneton Observer*—a typical reaction. Barcaldine's *Western Champion* claimed that Venezuela had already cribbed 181,000 square miles from its neighbours and was 'crowing like a cock on a dunghill, preening its feathers for a brush with the English rooster' only because

---

1 *Review of Reviews*, 20 May. 1896.


3 Though the *Coolgardie Miner*, 1 Jan. 1896, warned of a serious sugar slump adversely affecting Guiana's economy. For the above newspapers see Appendix.


5 *Kyneton Observer*, 31 Dec. 1895.
of traditional American backing which, the paper claimed, had similarly emboldened the Republic in 1810, 1824 and 1888.¹ To the Launceston Examiner as to others, it was a 'pestilential little Republic [where]...fighting appears to be as essential to existence as "blowing" is to the typical Yankee' - one that should be brusquely shown its place in the international power pecking-order as Nicaragua recently had been.²

Even early criticisms of British greed and bullying of Venezuela standard to catholic and labor sections of the Australian press were later replaced by concern for adequate Empire defence arrangements as well as by intense annoyance at the arrogant and remote republic which had caused such an alarming international disruption over what was increasingly disparaged as a 'strip of jungle'. Peppery and partisan pre-judgements seemed confirmed by events.

Those in Australia who applauded British actions, did so because they believed that Britain's aim was not to acquire new territory, but rather to confirm ownership of that already settled. British national honour seemed to demand from Venezuela reasonable and appropriate apology and redress for the outrages committed.³ Those radical papers which were unsympathetic like the Brisbane Worker⁴ and the Champion⁵ thought they detected the hand of the

¹Western Champion, 25 Feb. 1896.

²Launceston Examiner, 9, 21 Dec. 1895 (see Appendix).


⁴Brisbane Worker, 11 Jan. 1896.

⁵Champion, 11 Jan. 1896.
'Company Monger' in Tory actions - an attitude carried over from similar criticisms of developments in the Transvaal. When rumours arrived of a British Chartered Company's activities in the disputed area with news of the Jameson Raid, the Hobart Mercury predicted that such high-handed action in the face of hostile American opinion and Venezuelan claims would undoubtedly bring matters to a climax.¹ The Bulletin viewed such action as typical of the new Salisbury government 'which began its existence by serving ultimatums on all its weaker enemies in all parts of the earth'. It believed that previous negotiations had failed because 'Britain always insisted as a basis from which to start, that Venezuela should recognize something like three fourths of its claims and arbitrate about one fourth only...¹ But the journal admitted that:

It was impossible to say that either party [was] wholly right or wrong, for the trouble had no definite starting point and the trouble [was] over the delimitation of a frontier that never really existed.²

The comment pointed out one of the difficulties which all papers encountered - the dearth of reliable and recent maps of the area, and this lack tended to make any discussion of claims confused and confusing.³

Several attempts at determining America's reasons for sudden hostility were made in the Australian press. They included a desire to protect the projected Canal; the operation of commercial or fiscal reasons and the assertion of the Monroe Doctrine. Other motives believed to be prompting America were those involving the relief of growing jingoism at home, which gave vent to incipient Anglophobia and achieved personal political ends. Beside incidentally contributing to an ongoing historiographical debate, this intense questioning of American motives amounted to nothing less than a reassessment of America as a whole by

¹Mercury, 3 Jan. 1896.
³Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 21 Dec. 1895, published the first clear map, but it was in Spanish. A better map in English was not available until 20 February 1896 when the Review of Reviews published one on p.160.
Review of Reviews, 10 February 1896.
the Australian press. 1

Did American sensitivity over Venezuela have anything to do with the proposed Nicaraguan canal? Given the vast expense involved (an estimated $134 million) and Britain's former lack of interest, the Launceston Examiner typified those deriding Senator Morgan and New York reporters who believed that Britain was about to tamper with the joint agreement reached in the 1850 Clayton-Bulwer Treaty regarding ownership of the projected Nicaraguan Canal. 2 The Catholic Freeman's Journal of Sydney was not so sure that British designs, following so close on the Corinto affair were really innocent in intention. It wondered with suspicious Americans like Senators Lodge and Chandler, whether 'England was feeling her way to find out how much British interference on American soil the United States would suffer'. 3 The new pretensions of the Monroe Doctrine, the Foreign Affairs Committee and Senator Davis however, caused Langdon Bonython in the Adelaide Advertiser to complain:

It amounts to saying that no European Power has any interests or duties on the American side of the Atlantic, and that the United States' Government are not bound to keep their word when such good faith would involve an acknowledgement that such duties and interests exist. 4

1 Beside the standard works of Bemis, Pratt, Bailey, De Conde, H.C. Allen, A.E. Campbell, E.R. May, W. La Feber, W.A. Williams, D. Perkins, C.S. Tansill, A. Vagts, A. Nevins, A.L. Dennis, H. James and A.B. Hart on the dispute mentioned in the bibliography, the article literature of La Feber, G.B. Young, N.M. Blake, J.A. Sloan, T.C. Smith, P.R. Fossum and W.S. Robertson has been equally important in raising questions and attempting answers regarding the nature of American motives. See bibliography for references.

2 Launceston Examiner, 27 Nov. 1895, 28 Jan. 1896.

3 Freeman's Journal, 28 Dec. 1895. (See Appendix).

4 Advertiser, 27 Jan., 8 Feb. 1896.
The paper believed America's new claims might lead to a controversy more troublesome and dangerous than the Egyptian question over Suez. ¹

Free trade journals like Victoria's Australasian, whilst welcoming Chamberlain's recent 'forward' commercial colonial policies which promised to assist trade within the Empire, viewed America's actions in South America as a defensive means to achieve the same end: trade advantage. America had been inhibited in its degree of South American commerce due to its protectionism, its silverite policies, its lack of merchant marine and the abrogation of the 1889 reciprocal trade arrangements with certain South American republics.² New South Wales' leading free trade journal, the Sydney Morning Herald believed America acted from motives of commercial jealousy '...and not upon any aggressive act of which the British Government had been guilty'. It held that as with the Germans, Americans seemed wedded to a semi-military trading philosophy conducted by force for selfish advantage. Such a business attitude - that states could be prosperous of themselves - had to be abandoned by Australian colonies as well as America the paper warned, for as Venezuela's case illustrated, any disturbance would harm all traders equally.³ This American motive was also arraigned by protectionists for a lack of logic and consistency.⁴

Many papers, baffled by Cleveland's actions, devised a complex rationale involving America's long-entangled fiscal structure. Both the free trade and protectionist press agreed that Cleveland's second administration had,


²Australasian, 8 Feb. 1896.

³Sydney Morning Herald, 8 Jan. 1896.

since 1892, resulted in a worsening of United States' finances with depression, strikes, riots, a general currency shortage and demands for more silver coinage being widely felt. 1

Therefore Cleveland's action had been prompted by a desire to 'awaken the national mind once and for all to the dangers of a depleted gold reserve', by showing how dependent on Britain America's finances really were, claimed the Adelaide Advertiser and others. 2 When American railway, cotton and wheat stocks all dependent on British investment, fell by £200 million in the week after 17 December and gold reserves slumped to £8 million below the pegged limit, many papers claimed that such losses represented an actual war situation and were going altogether too far in making their point. 3 At the very least, the loss of confidence in America imperilled the fragile returning prosperity of Australia and through the proposed increase in American tariffs to offset debts incurred, affected Australian wool - deplorable developments in Australian eyes. 4

Protectionist newspapers such as the Age blamed the financial situation on Cleveland's addled economic policies and condemned the artificial international crisis as a gambit to divert attention away from self-created domestic problems. 5 Some were unkind enough to suggest that the

1 See editorial comment in, Courier, 9 Dec. 1895; Capricornian, 14 Dec. 1895; Barrier Miner, 10 Dec. 1895; Launceston Examiner, 18 Dec. 1895; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 6 Dec. 1895; Argus, 23-26 Dec. 1895; Advertiser, 28 Dec. 1895; Sydney Morning Herald, 30 Dec. 1895; Herald, 23 Dec. 1895.


3 Coolgardie Miner, 15 Jan. 1896; West Australia Record, 21 Dec. 1895. The Week, 3 Jan. 1896, noted that Australian gold production led the world in 1894 at £8,352,000 worth and that in the same year Australian silver production contracted by 2 1/2 million ounces.


5 Age, 24 Dec. 1895.
disturbance had been deliberately engineered so that a few opportunist capitalists could create a 'corner in war' on the American stockmarket.¹

Most papers however, preferred to believe that America's massive economic losses had dampened their enthusiasm for war. A general satisfaction was expressed in the fact that the New York Chamber of Commerce had quickly withdrawn its support for Cleveland's belligerent stand. A cablegram was sent by the Melbourne Stock Exchange on Christmas eve to the London and New York Exchanges hopefully wishing them both peace and goodwill. This middling Australian stance was significant largely for the impartiality displayed at a time when loyalties were being tested.

The scare had been sobering to Anglo-Saxons everywhere and many were claiming that without the financial panic there would have been war. The very magnitude of the losses reassured many Australian editors that 'war between Great Britain and the United States is impossible'. Others gained renewed confidence in the strength of America's finances illustrated by the swift subscription of the £20 million emergency loan by the Rothschild-Morgan syndicate. With this restored stability, Australian government securities on the London market made unprecedented recovery coinciding fortuitously with the breaking of Australia's drought in the middle of February.² But the Australian silver boom so widely predicted in New South Wales country papers as remote as the Grenfell Record and the new Merriwa and Cassilis Standard did not materialise.³ Indeed, far from encouraging bimetallism, Cleveland's fiscal efforts had been directed

¹E.g. Geelong Evening News, 30 Dec. 1895; Herald, 8 Jan. 1896; Ararat Advertiser, 31 Dec. 1895. For all further notes on newspapers consult Appendix.


toward establishing a sound gold standard. As the election of 1896 was to show, none of these actions discouraged Cleveland's fiscal critics, if that had ever been his intention.

It occurred at an early stage to the more contemplative weekly journals such as the *Sydney Mail* and the *Australasian* that Cleveland's motive for speaking in such 'dictatorial tones' in his first Message to Congress (2 December 1895) may have been for domestic political gain, pure and simple. Once articulated, this suspicion was amplified by the Australian press into what they considered to be the single most obvious motive for American intransigence. As the former paper suspected, Cleveland might covet a third term and was 'hunting around for catching phrases and sensational headlines' to promote it. It quoted a November *Century* article in which the Republican foreign policy spokesman, Theodore Roosevelt, indicted the feebleness of Cleveland's foreign policy — such as it was — in Hawaii, Nicaragua and Venezuela. The *Sydney Mail* concluded that:

Mr. Cleveland is to be accused next year of failing to maintain 'national self respect'. It can be seen therefore, why [he] watches straws to see how the wind blows [and thus] should have jumped at the opportunity to wave the American flag at this moment.

As 'low partian tricks' and 'campaign ingenuity' had once before been identified with a Cleveland campaign in 1888, with the shady circumstances that preceded the dismissal of the British Minister to Washington, Lord Sackville West, ostensibly to appease the Irish vote, the

---

1 *Sydney Mail*, 14 Dec. 1895.
4 *Sydney Mail*, ibid.
5 The Sackville-West Incident, said to have cost Cleveland the election of 1888 through its alienation of the anglophobe Irish vote, occurred when a 'planted' letter revealed that the British diplomat was pro-Democrat. Too late, an embarrassed Cleveland asked him to leave the country — a discourtesy that long rankled the Australian press.
Sydney Morning Herald was at first inclined toward an indulgent outlook. It surmised that when the two countries better understood each other...

...an outbreak of bitter denunciation of perfidious and grasping Albion will be looked for in the political sky of the United States at regular quadrennial periods, and we shall think that something has gone wrong with the stellar system if the expected manifestation fails to make its appearance.¹

This bantering tone changed to something more serious after 17 December. Especially was this so in the protectionist press which accused Cleveland of appealing directly to the Irish 'Clan-na-gael' and other 'hoodlum' elements for election purposes.² To the Age it was an attempt to anticipate the Republicans with a Blaine-like attempt at a strong foreign policy.³ Protectionists gave wide publicity⁴ to the views of the well-known English silverite protectionist, Moreton Frewen whose views appeared in both the National Review and the Review of Reviews.⁵ Frewen, who had lectured in Australia in the early months of 1895⁶, made the point that Cleveland, by a 'weak' and 'criminal' act, was attempting to heal the divisions in his own party, 'enfeebled, demoralised and split' as they were by the corrupt and forceful methods employed on its membership, to implement his 'sound money' and 'tariff reform' policies. But not even all protectionists accepted Frewen's views —

¹Sydney Morning Herald, 6 Dec. 1895.
²Geelong Advertiser, 20 Dec. 1895.
³Age, 20 Dec. 1895.
⁴Leader, 28 Dec. 1895; Advertiser, 11 Feb. 1896.
⁶For Frewen's lectures in Australia on the silver issue see Age, 1, 4, 7 Feb., 8 Apr. 1895; Argus, 4 Apr. 1895.
many of them considering his occasional brilliance to be tempered by otherwise eccentric judgements.¹

Even Cleveland's former free trade advocates on the Australian scene were critical. The Telegraph condemned his political machinations against the Republicans as 'callous cynicism...the ugliest feature of the sudden storm'. Worse, 'it is anything but safe to believe that the Republicans will stand quietly by and see the foundations cut from under their political prestige'. It seemed more likely '...they will go one better and try to hasten war while public fever remains at the heat to which it has been fanned'. Thus war would come, brought about 'by mere political exigencies, the temporary necessity to buttress a falling party with something attractively heroic'.²

The Argus claimed that only 'national madness' could have resulted in a combined vote of the two houses of Congress, 'unanimous for the first time in modern history' in authorizing Cleveland's Commission.³ Taking its usual centrist position, Melbourne's Herald bemoaned that now both protectionists in America with their excessive McKinley tariff (1890) and free traders 'whose statesmanship has been lauded by the British press' were shown to be capable of proving themselves equally bad friends.⁴ The Australasian blamed both American political parties for this:

¹This judgement of a famous relative of the Churchills is borne out by the author's knowledge of his talented, if obscure eldest son, Hugh Moreton Frewen, whilst he was living in Dorrigo, N.S.W., 1961-63. See Shane Leslie (Frewen's cousin): Studies In Sublime Failure (London, 1932), p.272. A more recent study is Anita Leslie, Mr. Frewen of England, London, 1966. Chapter 18. According to the author, Frewen wrote from Melbourne that Australians were 'very nice, more old-world than the Americans and yet with some dash'. Through his friend Lord Kintore, the Governor of South Australia, he founded Suplhides Corporation and purchased for a consortium of which he was a member, the Central Broken Hill Mine. He owned shares in the original Ashcroft patent for separating lead from zinc. Typically, he allowed the huge fortune earned from these ventures to slip away from him. A. Leslie, op.cit., pp.145-146.

²Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 19 Dec. 1895.

³Argus, 23, 27 Dec. 1895.

⁴Herald, 23 Dec. 1895.
The fault of the system is that false issues are invariably raised before every Presidential election. Democrats and Republicans are not separated from each other by any definite barrier; each party makes up its own policy as it goes along and it asks rather what will sweep the polls rather than what will tend to the national advantage. Thus the election is fought out in an atmosphere of falsehood and make-believe.\footnote{Australasian, 21 Dec. 1895. See also, Launceston Examiner, 28 Dec. 1895; Morning Bulletin, 6 Jan. 1896; Queenslander, 6 Jan. 1896.}

Taking a line from Dickens' \textit{American Notes}, the \textit{Windsor and Richmond Gazette} philosophized on the situation: 'Directly the acrimony of one election is over, the acrimony of the next one begins, which is unspeakable comfort for all politicians.'\footnote{Windsor & Richmond Gazette, 28 Dec. 1895.}

Operating in a society containing considerable vocal Anglophobes of its own - especially catholics and radicals - the Australian press was well aware of a similar feeling existing in America, despite bland assurances of the quiescent nature of this feeling from the British press. The virulent Anglophobic ebullition from that country in late 1895 was variously explained in Australia. Some saw in it a desire to create jobs and places in a refurbished American military structure; others to capture business diverted from Britain. But more pervasive than economic reasons were those referring to kinship jealousy. The \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} however, suspected a motive more sinister: alien races in America with their narrow prejudices and different backgrounds were unable to share in the traditional 'intellectual' union that brought the two Anglo-Saxon peoples together. Long-standing covetousness of Canada was again advanced as a reason.\footnote{Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Dec. 1895. See also, Sydney Mail, 21 Dec. 1895; Newcastle Morning Herald, 20 Dec. 1895.}

The \textit{Bulletin} attempted an out-of-date sectional explanation: New England (Eastern) States still begrudged
the moral support that Britain had given Southerners during the Civil War. Further, it believed a general anti-monarchism animated the country - a view not unusual for a 'Republican' organ such as Archibald's was.¹ The Bulletin's assurance of friendly British sentiment existing in the Western section of the United States was simultaneously countered elsewhere; in one place, by the scathing tone of 'Argonaut's' correspondence - sent from San Francisco to the Geelong Advertiser. His rabid Anglophobia, which he claimed to be typical, was based on a deep aversion to British bullying and avarice concerning the developing gold areas of the world.²

Yet in British colonies where patriotism was a genuine emotion, most continued to find such American hatred of Britain difficult to explain. John Gunning, editor of Launceston's flourishing Daily Telegraph thought that '...to deny that such feeling does exist is wilfully closing our eyes to palpable facts'.³ The London correspondent of the Argus admitted himself mystified at its occurrence,⁴ though he was probably aware that the Spectator - to name only one journal - had openly admitted that England was 'the most unpopular nation in the civilized world'.⁵

The Adelaide Observer mitigated this harsh judgement. Britain's popularity it believed, 'varies with current moods and changing circumstances'. Behind Britain's 'bluff and haughty demeanour' she was sensitive to criticism. In fact, British pluck, integrity and generosity were widely admired,

¹Bulletin, 28 Dec. 1895.
³Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 24 Dec. 1895.
⁴Argus, 27 Dec. 1895.
⁵Yet the Spectator may not have enjoyed much prestige as an opinion leader within Britain. The Speaker for 4 March 1893 criticized it in a series on 'The Modern Press' as 'disappointing...slipping'.
it claimed. Fellow Anglophiles agreed with this defence. The Melbourne Punch considered Britain's rule incomparably benignant - it was human nature to envy such a record. Even protectionists considered it unfair that countries should hate a commercial society so selfless and open in its trading policy. Loyalists considered that the love returned by Britain's colonies would compensate for this Anglophobia, so obviously not confined to American alone.

The danger appeared to reside in the American politicians' regular kindling of this fire for their passing purposes so that 'when great and high-spirited peoples are brought into strained relations some unforeseen circumstance, perhaps trivial in itself, may precipitate anger into war', wrote Buzacott's Courier. But all observers found something disquieting in the definiteness of Senator Lodge's six points published in his influential Concord Monitor. They asserted that not only was a defensive Anglo-American war imminent, but it would be precipitated by British encroachments and would be fought by America with Russia as ally and Canada as prize. William Fisher, editor of Devonport's North West Post, ignored this as 'mere electioneering bounce' - a further presumption on overtaxed British tolerance toward America. American papers such as the Pittsburgh Chronicle were similarly criticized for their unprompted biting tone. Free traders in Australia singled out for special criticism the openly belligerent comments of silverites such as Senator Stewart and protectionists such as Henry C. Carey. The Courier was distressed by the Anglophobia of more intellectual critics such as G.F. Fearing and G.D. Buchanan and in particular, the supposed distortion and exaggeration of historic events involving Britain in American school texts.

---

2 Melbourne Punch, 9 Jan. 1896.
5 North West Post, 4 Jan. 1896.
One extraordinary, if more frivolous reason for the Anglophobic resurgence was presented by the sports-loving Australian press. It concerned the ill-will that had been generated during the 1895 America Cup Yacht race during which Lord Dunraven in Valkyrie III had withdrawn following interference from spectator craft. Far from bringing the two peoples together, the event had all too obviously been divisive. Most Australian papers had taken sides on the issue and many accused America of foul play and ruthless tactics in response to American charges of Dunraven's 'madness'.

The Argus made most of the incident and noted that during the Guiana-Venezuelan crisis the London Exchange had cabled New York: 'Keep a clearer course for our admirals than you did for our yachtsmen', to which New York had replied: 'We hope your warships are better than your yachts'.

The Sydney Morning Herald thought it '...just possible that some of the ascerbity over the Venezuelan question was in a measure due to this dispute'. If so, the Argus held that 'history records no more dramatic example of a high sounding and tragical dispute [the Venezuelan] kindled by such childishly inadequate causes'.

There can be no doubt that the press of Australia experienced difficulty in explaining and accepting incipient American Anglophobia and was as prepared to seize on the trivial and immediate as to explore the significant and long-term in its effort to come to grips with the phenomenon.

Obviously allied to Anglophobia in Australian eyes was the recrudescence of the jingo spirit in America. Many

---

1 Sydney Morning Herald, 21 Sept. 1895.
3 Sydney Morning Herald, 11 Feb. 1896.
4 Argus, 28 Dec. 1895.
papers in Australia and the Goulburn Herald was one of them - took pride in their anti-jingoism and their reliance on the quiet and unassuming strength of the Mother Country, recently reaffirmed by the new Salisbury-Chamberlain government. Arch-American jingoos such as Senators Chandler, Sherman and Lodge were caricatured as Dickensian 'Jefferson Bricks' considered 'insignificant representatives of American feeling' by the Melbourne Leader and others.

In this serene mood, the Australian press faced the cabled news of jingoism following Cleveland's 17 December message. Sydney's Evening News called it 'ludicrous and pitiable', against the 'good sense of the great body of the American people' - bound to be put down by the better sections of the press (such as the New York Herald and New York Times) and the 'firm and dignified attitude' of the Marquis of Salisbury. An outraged international opinion would similarly restrain irresponsible American jingoos from embarking on 'one of the most unwarrantable and disastrous wars that could happen'.

Who were America's jingoos? To the Melbourne Methodist they were both the unemployed, ready for any adventure and the Irish, at least the Anglophobic element of it. To the Newcastle Morning Herald they were opportunists of all kinds hoping for good fishing in troubled waters. To the Queensland Times they were profiteers and other followers of 'the great God Mammon' seeking gains from Britain's losses.

---

1Goulburn Herald, 27 Nov. 1895.
2Sydney Morning Herald, 6 Dec. 1895.
3Leader, 28 Dec. 1895.
5Howard K. Beale ably discusses the jingoos in America in Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power (New York, 2nd printing, 1965), pp.31-63 passim.
6Methodist (Melbourne), 27 Dec. 1895, 4 Jan. 1896.
7Newcastle Morning Herald, 30 Dec. 1895.
8Queensland Times, 2 Jan. 1896.
In all, the Sydney **Evening News** believed that America's jingo leaders needed to take a leaf from the 'circumspect and little provocative [sic] ... public men here'. George Reid, the New South Wales' Premier, spoke at the New Year's Eve Commercial Travellers' Banquet with such effect. He deprecated the thousands of Americans who were ready to plunge two nations into the most disastrous and wanton war of the present century all over a few leagues of fever-breeding jungle to which no sane man in the forty-four States would consign his pet dog.¹

Though the same occasion had been used by another speaker, Lord Hampden, to press the necessity for federation, the weekly **Sydney Mail** showed it derided the jingo rationale for unity when it attacked General Hutton on similar grounds. Admitting that even though the most modern of great nations, the United States, had twice passed through a baptism of fire - once with a foreign, once with a civil foe - gaining in national cohesion each time, the paper held that such experience was not necessary for an Australia which had a common continent, common interests and common institutions to give it unity. For, 'the elements of national greatness are with us already and we do not need to build upon the uncertain foundations of military glory'.²

But the jingo spirit in Australia, so quiet at the beginning of December, was to leap suddenly to life in January, following news of the Jameson raid and the Kaiser's telegram to Kruger. Nonetheless, the reanimated domestic Australian variety came in for the same degree of criticism as had the more general international type. John Farrell branded the British Empire jingo-type as a 'public nuisance'.³ Others scoffed at the excesses and gaucheries surrounding military manoeuvres in Western Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales.⁴ This press reaction was at first in definite contrast to its English, Russian, French and American

---

¹ **Evening News**, 1 Jan. 1896.
² **Sydney Mail**, 4 Jan. 1896.
³ **Daily Telegraph** (Sydney), 14 Jan. 1896.
counterparts—roundly criticized for their sales-seeking sensationalism in their promotion of a warlike ethos.¹

A significant change of tone in reactions became evident following Chamberlain's rousing speech at the London farewell dinner for Lord Lamington, the new governor of Queensland, at which the 'National Anthem' and 'Rule Britannia' were twice sung spontaneously. J.L. Brient in the Daily Telegraph of 23 January now noted that

...it is in England indeed, that jingoism is at its hottest...and while national enthusiasm [in the United States] has been receding from President Cleveland ever since he spoke, in England, the fervour of it has grown daily and gathered strength.²

Enthusiasts such as the Melbourne Punch were quick to respond.

Were the Empire in danger tomorrow, [it wrote] not a colony of the many that owe their birth to England but would freely and gladly strip itself, if need be, of men and money to beat back the country's enemies.³

The Bulletin was swift to ask the Punch man whether he was going to sacrifice himself and his money for the glorious empire or [was] he only willing to float a loan and sacrifice someone else? This (being) the great jingo problem in a nutshell.⁴

The Bacchus Marsh Express thought 'a warning against excessive jingoism appears to be internationally needed just now, but the journalists who should give it are in need of discipline themselves'.⁵ Especially was this the case with the journalists of the Argus and the Age thought the anti-establishment Catholic Melbourne Advocate; for the partisanship of these papers blinded them to the fact that


⁵ Bacchus Marsh Express, 25 Jan. 1896. Author's emphasis.
an action could be 'wicked and jingoistic' or 'praiseworthy and patriotic' depending on the point of view.  

Present dangers had now made it 'the fashion to be a jingo' asserted the Bowral Free Press. Thus the comment of the Socialist Trenwith in Victoria's colonial Legislative Assembly that 'the less belligerent we are in policy and action the less likely we are to be attacked', was itself assaulted by the normally peace-loving Ballarat Star and others as not squaring with Britain's previous experience.

With many Australian newspapers' awareness that they had shared in a general jingo phenomenon, comment at the end of January focused on the overseas aspects of the outburst. Edison's imaginative and diabolical gadgetry to be employed against England was everywhere vetoed as a set of 'sensational tales' made up especially for the crisis. The Bendigo Independent observed:

One of the most remarkable developments of the close of the nineteenth century is the growth of the military or jingoistic spirit throughout the United States...an arrogance which bodes ill for the continued peace of the continent.

So all-pervasive was the development, that thousands of church military organizations using real weapons existed throughout the nation, it believed. American millionaires fanned this atmosphere of violent confrontation by retaining bodies of armed men themselves - to forestall a possible revolt against their money-power. Thus:

the Republic is believed by some to be growing drunk and giddy with the contemplation of its own paper and resources[ which ...]may expend

---

1 Advocate, 25 Jan. 1896.
3 Ballarat Star, 24 Jan. 1896. See also Newcastle Morning Herald, 24 Jan. 1896; V.P.D.L.A., 1895-96, Vol.LXXX. The argument was often used by Socialists, pacifists and republicans in the various colonial parliaments.
4 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 8 Feb. 1896; Advertiser, 30 Jan.1896.
5 Bendigo Independent, 14 Mar. 1896.
itself in a conflict with some European power on some such trivial pretext as the boundary lines of Venezuela.¹

To the Argus it was obvious where the jingo spirit was being re-directed: toward Cuba and Spain — satisfactory alternatives to Britain

...in as much as the worst result of the present trouble could only be a little war, whereas the other would be the most terrible calamity that could befall civilization and the English-speaking races.²

In this way, jingoism as it revealed itself in America was judged by the Australian press to be no transitory phenomenon, but one likely to produce dire results sometime in the near future.³

At the base of the dispute lay conflicting concepts of the Monroe Doctrine.⁴ With an early perception, the Sydney Morning Herald thought that 'practical politics, patriotic speeches, party interests and the voices of the newspapers during the last seventy years have all combined to place an interpretation of their own upon the Doctrine'.⁵ The Sydney Morning Herald led the conservatives in considering that the current controversy involved an 'arbitrary stretching' of the traditional doctrine. It declared itself against those countering views of the American

¹Bendigo Independent, ibid. The Edwards' paper often quoted Harvey's Coins¹ Financial School (1894) and Donnelly's Caesar's Column (1892) where it had obviously derived some of these ideas. See J. Pratt, Expansionists of 1895 (Baltimore, 1936), p. 32.

²Argus, 3 Mar. 1896. See also Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 10 Mar. 1896.


⁴The Monroe Doctrine (1823) was defined by the Argus, 23 Oct. 1895, as declaring 'that no European Power would be permitted to interfere in the affairs of any independent state in North or South America'. Of course, it implied much more than that. See Armin Rappaport (ed.), The Monroe Doctrine (New York, 1964) and especially Dexter Perkins, A History of the Monroe Doctrine (2nd ed., London, 1960).

⁵Sydney Morning Herald, 28 Oct. 1895.
editor Albert Shaw of the Review of Reviews and the English editor of the same magazine, W.T. Stead (in the Contemporary) who had both interpreted British actions as violating the Doctrine.1

Following Cleveland's first message to Congress, Lt.-Col. Reay, editor of the Melbourne Herald, believed that Australians subscribed to the views of the anti-imperialist editors of the New York Evening Post - Edwin L. Godkin and Carl Schurz - that the Venezuelan question was not a matter concerning the United States and that the Monroe Doctrine '...would have nothing to do with it, even if the Doctrine was an accepted part of international law as it is not'.

This, thought the Herald, was a commonsense attitude...[for] Brother Jonathan's solicitude for the Monroe Doctrine we respect [but] the point to be kept in mind is that the British Government is not asking Venezuela for anything inconsistent with the most devout regard for the Monroe Doctrine.2

Cleveland's 'loud-mouthed' proclamation of that Doctrine could only be explained by the fact that he 'deliberately seeks a quarrel'. Writing on the same day, Davies' Hobart Mercury thought the new use of the Doctrine 'would considerably astonish its reputed author' and had to be rejected because it had no warrant in the precedents established by diplomacy; cannot be sustained by any process of reason and yielding...would be an admission that the United States has the right to interfere in all questions that arise on the continent of America.3

This would leave unsettled the exact application of the Doctrine to territorial disputes between European powers.

---

1 Sydney Morning Herald, Ibid. See also, Daily Telegraph (Sydney) 4 Oct. 1895.
2 Herald, 5, 7 Dec. 1895.
3 Mercury, 6, 7 Dec. 1895.
and South American governments, argued other papers. ¹

Striving for understanding, the Launceston Examiner could only perceive the Doctrine as a 'dogma...an excellent shibboleth for screening patriots'. Given American annexationist impulses in Hawaii and possible interference in Turkey, 'It may be necessary for the United States to demonstrate more clearly what the Doctrine does mean'.² Bonython's Advertiser defended the Doctrine along traditional lines. He maintained that the powers of Europe knew perfectly well what the Doctrine meant—that it was a modest declaration that America was terra cognita in the fullest sense and no longer ground for Europeans to discover and colonise. Also, despite Canning's oratory, the New World had no intention of having itself redress the balance of the Old, but desired both to let the Old World balance itself without interference and for America to be allowed to do the same.³

Fairfax's Sydney Mail was one that disagreed with the notion of the Doctrine as a general claim, believing it applied to only one particular nation, regarding specific territory.⁴ Other conservatives agreed and marshalled the arguments of Mark M. Dunnell in the American Law Review as well as the cabled views of prominent American jurists to back their position. The 'blanket' application of the Doctrine by the American historian John B. McMaster was refuted by the Courier who preferred Dunnell's more discriminating 'threat to peace and safety' principle.⁵ As well, the new capacity to insult the Great Powers with impunity, given to 'half savage' South American republics hiding behind the skirts of the 'new' Monroe Doctrine, was widely derided. A more reasonable interpretation of the Doctrine could provide the

¹E.g. Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 6 Dec. 1895.
²Launceston Examiner, 9 Dec. 1895.
³Advertiser, 12 Dec. 1895.
⁴Sydney Mail, 28 Dec. 1895.
⁵Courier, 29 Jan., 14 Feb. 1896.
foundation for a new Anglo-Saxon alliance many believed, taking up a point in London's *Spectator.*

Following Cleveland's second Message, objections to the 'new version' of the Doctrine became even more vocal. What appeared to be the case to many was that the United States had expanded its boundaries to include all of South America. Even so, it was difficult for most to conceive how Guiana could menace American security and to claim that Canada did so appeared to be complaining a generation too late. Many newspapers proclaimed the new Doctrine 'egomaniac' and refused to take it any more seriously than a 4 July oration. Papers had carried brief descriptions of the Doctrine for weeks so that criticisms of the 'new' Doctrine by most of the Continental European press as well as by Americans such as Pulitzer, began to take effect.2

A.T. Mahan's interpretation of the Doctrine, as it appeared in *Harper's Magazine* articles, appeared to signal to Australians, the intentions of America toward more active intervention in the Pacific and South America. By a clear exercise of strength, America seemed determined to 'fight for the enforcement of any portion of the Monroe Doctrine which it deemed might be expedient to apply', as one paper put it. Clearly, according to Australian press opinion, America seemed to be orienting herself toward a repressive and unpopular interfering role in South America - one that was to prove inoperable due to the sheer burden of attempting to police it (against France regarding the

---

1 See comment in, *Australasian,* 14 Dec. 1895; *Geelong Advertiser,* 28 Dec. 1895; *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 29 Jan. 1896. Somerset's article, op.cit., also decried U.S. support of South American 'tyrannies'.

Brazilian border for example). With news of possible American acquisition of the Danish West Indies - St. Croix, St. Thomas and St. John - this new career seemed about to be launched. That it would encompass Nicaragua, Honduras and other proximate territories appeared inevitable. With just as much justification it was claimed, could Britain declare a counter 'Doctrine' objecting to American interference in the affairs of her American colonies; or might Australia declare her own 'Doctrine' objecting to encroachments by European imperialists in her own immediate vicinity. What was most reprehensible was that America's pretensions would involve an ultimate clash with British colonial interests, when previously the Americans had employed their Doctrine for 'defence, not defiance'. To admit an American right of interference with British colonies on the basis of a version of the Monroe Doctrine was 'intolerable tyranny' in the opinion of the Brisbane Evening Observer. Consensus on a new version of the Monroe Doctrine relying no more on vague tradition and sense of principle, was now agreed to be an urgent need.

Arriving by sea-mail a month after the height of the crisis, were relevant British newspaper materials which helped deepen discussion of the issues. Sir Donald McKenzie Wallace, the Times' foreign editor and a wide range of knowledgeable correspondents contributed learned basic

---


2 Brisbane Evening Observer, 8 Jan. 1896.

materials, but most important, appearing in the 18 December (1895) edition of the London Times were the diplomatic despatches which had passed between Olney and Salisbury. On these materials the Brisbane Courier remarked:

the new Monroe Doctrine would only have to be stretched a little further to break up England's Colonial Empire. Mr. Olney's idea lays a covenant basis for the seizure of Canada by the United States.  

Most papers now agreed that the rebuff of Cleveland's policies administered by Salisbury had been necessary, if the dignity, high-spirits and interests of the Empire were to be maintained.

By the middle of March, many were coming to welcome Cleveland's 'upstart' Commission as providing both an immediate safety valve to relieve the situation's mounting pressures and as the basis for a renewed and lasting understanding based on agreed concepts of a new 'Doctrine'. After the event, the storm's wreckage was picked over by Australian commentators for its 'rash and partisan speech, acute technicality and clumsy diplomacy'. Others however, hoped that 'good may ultimately come out of what appeared at the time an unmitigated calamity to both nations'.

1. The Stirling Brothers' Inquirer and Commercial News (Perth) agreed with McClure's estimate of the London Times as the 'World's Leading Newspaper', 27 Dec. 1895. It was this common attitude which gave the paper its prestige as an opinion-leader. In the three months 20 Dec. 1895-20 Mar. 1896, it published 112 letters from correspondents on the dispute.
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At the most general level, Australian editorial reactions centred on answering three questions: first, would there be war? Second, if so, would Australia stand by the Empire? Third, what did Australia consider was its own interest in and possible performance during the crisis?

Throughout the first half of December 1895, the general European war scare generated by the critical nature of the Turkish situation regarding treatment of the Armenians and the movement of Russians on the Indian frontier and in China, following the Sino-Japanese war, dominated the thinking of Australian editors on foreign affairs. James

---

1 Armenia and the Turks: in October 1895, Sultan Abdul-Hamid ordered massacred in excess of 80,000 of his Christian Armenian subjects on the grounds of subversion. This followed a belated attempt by Britain, acting with the lukewarm support of Russia and France, to press on the Sultan the need for administrative reforms in his Armenian provinces. The 'Armenian Question' had troubled Anglo-Turkish-Russian relations since the close of the Russo-Turkish War in 1878. Australian opinion was easily aroused, having been prepared by Gladstone's outcry against the 'Bulgarian Massacres' (twenty years before) and by the tacit understanding that Britain had undertaken to protect the Christian Armenians as part of its bargain in the Convention of Cyprus. For comment on Turkey during this period see: Sydney Morning Herald, 5 Nov. 1895, 5 Feb. 1896; North Queensland Herald, 11 Dec. 1895, 1, 22 Jan. 1896; Evening News (Melbourne), 10 Dec. 1895; Newcastle Morning Herald, 12, 15 Nov., 2, 25 Dec. 1895, 7 Feb. 1896; Ballarat Courier, 11 Dec. 1895, 8 Feb. 1896; Geelong Advertiser, 28 Dec. 1895; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 28 Dec. 1895; Coolgardie Pioneer, 1 Jan. 1896; Southern Cross, 3 Jan. 1896; Launceston Examiner, 11 Jan. 1896; Argus, 31 Jan. 1896; Barrier Miner, 4 Feb. 1896, quotes Dr. Albert Shaw in the Review of Reviews and Richard Davey in the Portnightly; Maitland Mercury, 8 Feb. 1896; Bega Gazette, 12 Feb. 1896; Wangaratta Chronicle, 11 Mar. 1896; Methodist (Melbourne), 7 Feb. 1896; Churchman (Sydney), 7 Feb. 1896; Freeman's Journal, 28 Dec. 1895; Advocate, 28 Dec. 1895; Singleton Argus, 15 Jan. 1896.
Thomson's Murchison Times in remote Cue, Western Australia, was one believing that

the early spring will witness a big war and Great Britain is certain to be in it...there is a feeling of insecurity everywhere [but]...the tocsin of war will not be sounded before March next.¹

But before March (and Spring) two unexpected world crises - over Venezuela and the Transvaal - were to intervene. As the Levis held in their intelligent, short-lived Melbourne Evening News, 'wars and rumours of wars are all over the world just now' and it was expected that '...the impending Armageddon [was] to come before the end of the century'.² However, Australia's anxious editorial attention in this regard had, until 19 December, been focused elsewhere.³

Only after receipt of the cables on Cleveland's second Message to Congress did the Australian press become alive to what the first of those commentators, Sydney's Daily Telegraph dubbed the 'New Western Question', balancing the omnipresent 'Eastern Question'.⁴ Victoria's Governor, Lord Brassey, departed from the festive atmosphere surrounding the opening of Ballarat's Industrial Exhibition to observe, with the Clarks in their Ballarat Courier, the 'angry look' of the rift, with its 'grave possibilities...of great

¹Murchison Times, 7 Dec. 1895.
²Evening News (Melbourne), 19 Dec. 1895.
³In Victoria's parliament in December, 1895, Madden, representing Melbourne's Eastern suburbs agreed with the Queensland Governor and some of the South Australian parliament's members that Russia was the Menace in the East. His colleagues Rogers and McLellan believed the threat was from Germany and France in Europe: V.P.D.L.A., 1895-1896, Vol.LXXIX, pp.2866, 2876; Vol.LXXX, p.4789; S.A.P.D.L.A., 1895-1896, p.2767.
⁴Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 19 Dec. 1895.
results. Now the situation had taken a 'serious turn' thought the Barrier Miner and war was 'more than a remote possibility'. The Douglasses lamented in the Geelong Advertiser that:

...suddenly...in the course of hours it brings England and the United States to the verge of war....If Lord Salisbury insists on the terms he has laid down for settlement there will be war...the situation is critical indeed.

Heated excitement from America on the one hand and a cool steadiness on Britain's side at first, on the other, led to some interesting cross-currents in Australian opinion. What could avert an open clash? Editors from all sections of the press attempted answers. Those with faith in the caution and good sense of the American people relied on them to force their country's jingo elite into an accommodating position. But others hoped for the same to happen to Britain's arrogant establishment. Salisbury and Cleveland were both expected to defer to the national principles of the other and avert a terrible civil war between kindred peoples, unprepared either militarily or emotionally for such a struggle.

---

1 Ballarat Courier, 20 Dec. 1895; agreed with London Times' attitude: 'no nation with any sense of self respect can concede such a demand as that made by President Cleveland'.

2 Barrier Miner, 20 Dec. 1895.


Most feared with the Bulletin that Russia and France would seize on Britain's American distraction 'to leap at the lion's throat and the European scrimmage on the carpet for the last twenty years will be fairly afoot'. Later, Germany appeared as the startling new leader of this anticipated hostile European coalition. Worse, religious papers of different denominations feared that Britain was taking on the wrong enemy. Britain's aggressive energies should be reserved for 'tyrannous, retrogressive power[s]' like the Turks, not 'one which is in every respect travelling along the same road' toward freedom and equality for its people.\footnote{Bulletin, 28 Dec. 1895; Singleton Argus, 1 Jan. 1896. These reactions were similar to those of the British press. See R.C.K. Ensor, England 1870-1914 (Oxford, 1936), p.230.}

Hatred of the contrasting Turk was so all-pervasive that any Australian passion toward America was small by comparison. Much resentment was abruptly channeled toward the Germans - a long established alternative menace. These reactions indicated in editors an amazement amounting to disbelief in the sudden nature of the Anglo-American hostility. This sudden turning away from a growing confrontation mentality reveals the absence of any deep-seated enmity in Australia toward America.\footnote{Many British observers thought there would be war. Winston Churchill, returning from Cuba, expected to be instantly shipped to Canada to aid in its defence. See A History of The English Speaking Peoples (London, 1958), Vol.IV, p.259, footnote.}

Though a general war was predicted in the New Year by the Telegraph, it was noted how other powers were 'standing easy' until the United States had 'played its final card'.\footnote{Daily Telegraph (Melbourne), 2 Jan. 1896.}

In this period of suspense a series of red-inked hand-bill posters in the newspapers or rural areas of Victoria announced war between England and America in order to sell, among other things, 'scarce' American goods.\footnote{e.g. Numurkah Leader, Nathalia Herald, Maryborough Advertiser, 1-15 Jan. 1896.}
WAR! WAR!
SERIOUS OUTLOOK!
IMPORTANT PROCLAMATION
ENGLAND & AMERICA

WAR between these Two Great Kindred Nations would be an everlasting disgrace, but

EAKIN & CO'S
NINTH ANNUAL SUMMER SALE

Will be hailed with delight by the Nathalia people and district generally who have always appreciated these events.
The Sale of Sales. COMPULSORY Sale in consequence of having Overbought. 20 cases just arrived and will be opened Saturday. Merciless Reductions. We want the GOLD and must Sacrifice the Goods.

Saturday First, Great Opening Day
This Sale will last only about 13 days.
About £2500 worth of Superior and High-class Goods, including Dresses and Hosiery, Millinery, Mantles and Borses, Ribbons, Laces and Gloves, Men's Mercerery, Clothing, Etc. Calicoes, Flannels, etc., etc. Also in conjunction, BOOTS! BOOTS! BOOTS!!

Stylish, Strong and Reliable at a little more than half-prices. Inspect goods and note prices. For Prompt Cash only. We would like to point out that our sales are always what they are represented to be, and thousands of our Customers will bear out these remarks.

EAKIN & CO, the Ready-money Drapers. New

Nathalia Herald, 7 January 1896.
Free Press typified New South Wales country opinion: 'War is about the last thing which the world would tolerate at the present juncture and...the worst thing that could happen...its consequences would be tremendous' and unequalled. To prevent the calamity, it was argued that Americans should impeach Cleveland, for neither side could win without immense losses. These would be worse for Britain who would 'have to lessen her sway over most of her outer territory and...forego her dominant position in the council of nations'. No one doubted that an American or European war would threaten Australian security.¹

Confirmation of the failure of the Jameson raid cabled on the 4 January 1896 was the turning point regarding anxiety over the American situation as most papers, like Thomas Hunt's Victorian Kilmore Free Press, were talking as if the worst had passed.² William Fisher's North West Post in Devonport, Tasmania, explained how 'the war scare...flared up and flickered out like an old-fashioned sulphur match, leaving behind it only a little smoke and disagreeable odour'. But, he asked, 'how long is this periodic stench-creating business...to be allowed to proceed?' Only the preceding 'period of profound peace and general amity' existing between the two peoples had prevented a difficult situation from getting out of control, he believed.³

Lord Brassey in an interview at Launceston, now found it 'impossible to conceive such a frightful catastrophe as war between England and America, originating in so infinitesimal a matter as the imaginary boundary line through an untrodden jungle' (11 January). On 23 January the Hobart Mercury, among the earlier alarmists, thought 'War is now as far off as ever'. On the 27th: 'There is no danger of war with the United States'. The Melbourne Methodist considered it had the last word at the beginning of February:

¹Bowral Free Press, 4 Jan. 1896. See also, Morning Bulletin, 1 Jan. 1896.
³North West Post, 4 Jan. 1896.
The Venezuelan difficulty is healed over for the moment, but it has served to show how easily a rupture might be made between the two great nations which are bound together by ties of language and natural kinship.1

Following a month of strain, many expressed a visible relief. Christopher Crisp had attempted to ease the tension on 4 January by publishing two funny stories from the New York Herald and the Philadelphia Call on the front page of his Bacchus Marsh Express. The Melbourne Punch blamed those 'energetic fictionists who run the cables...' for the greater share of the excitement that Australians had felt, compared with Englishmen. The 'Special Correspondent' came in for his share of the chiding, for by creating rumour and later denying it, he turned his reader into 'an imbecile... or a bitter cynic'.2 'Outis' joked that the war scares were altogether too short. On 2 March, he noted that the 'real' war scare was yet to come with a Russo-French combination against England in the Levant. This appeared to return attitudes toward foreign developments back to their pre-crisis situation.3

For twelve days (19 December-4 January 1896) papers had coped with the almost unthinkable. Once aroused however, Australian press opinion flowed naturally into alternate hostility toward the German and Turk against whom it had long been more deeply prejudiced. But faced with the prospect of war with America, what stance would Australia have taken? Many editors had addressed themselves to this question.

The mid-1890s was a time when some Australians appeared to be contemplating the nature of their relationship to the Empire with a certain degree of satisfaction, especially in

3Brisbane Worker, 21 Dec. 1895, identified 'Outis' as John Farrell, 'the most prolific writer of the Australian press' (for the) Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 13 Feb., 2 Mar. 1896.
view of the prospect of their own coming Federation. Those still inclined toward Imperial Federation were deriving inspiration from either Kipling's latest offering in the London Times, in which he spoke of -

Men of the four New Peoples
And the Islands of the Sea

in which one paper saw 'the strong pulse of Empire and faith in the ultimate world dominion of the British race', 1 or from the speed of modern communications making the Empire one; or from Christopher Crisp's new pamphlet on the creation of an Imperial Consultative Council, which might 'embody for all time, in the face of all nations, the concrete fact that the Empire is one in all its aims....' 2

Others derived loyal and Imperial inspiration from the current judgements of prestigious foreigners like Justice Stephen Johnson Field of the United States' Supreme Court whose views on the Empire were quoted from the Canadian press:

You are bound to prosper. Wherever England plants her foot she at once establishes order; she makes laws; she protects life and property. And those who place themselves under that flag stay under it, assured they can sit under their own vine and fig tree. That is the secret of the British Empire. When I think of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India and Canada, I am filled with wonder. England's rule in the main is for justice and righteousness and therefore, I would safely predict permanence for her great Empire.

Statements of this kind were to prove for much of the press-opinion, a basis of confidence against the erosion of challenge to Britain's imperium. Though few were open Empire federationists, most were undoubtedly loyal to the

---

1 George Maxwell and John Bowser's Wangaratta Chronicle, 4 Dec. 1896, among others reviewed the poem. Published in The Seven Seas, Nov. 1896, it was one of Britain's most successful volumes of poems. Kipling was so sickened by the crisis it decided him on leaving his American home in Vermont forever. He believed war with America inevitable. See C.E. Norton correspondence in Charles Carrington, Rudyard Kipling (Penguin ed., 1970), pp.280-3.

2 Crisp in Bacchus Marsh Express, Dec. 1895.
British connection for a variety of reasons.  

When the American challenge came in December, the predominant response was clear and unmistakable: sympathy for America; support for Britain. Perhaps the *Argus* expressed it best: Australia had to accept insults and threats being itself 'part and parcel of a European power'. Further, 'the lowest of all instincts, that of self-preservation, as well as the highest, that of fidelity to our race, makes us cling to our flag'. That loyalty had been questioned in the British weekly *Saturday Review*. The Melbourne Stock Exchange telegram was used by a British commentator to conclude that 'Englishmen and things English [were] barely tolerated in the colonies and the people of Upper Canada and Australia...would almost as soon live under the stars and stripes as under the Union Jack'. The specific example as well as the general sentiment were put down as heavily as possible by the *Australasian* which regarded it as nonsense.

A random survey of Australian newspapers reveals the tone of the reactions: Whilst conceding that 'the last desire of any right-minded Briton would be war with America', nonetheless, 'America will need to reckon on an aroused and enthusiastic Britain, utterly different from the ashamed and fool-led country which resented their reasonable and honourable desires a hundred odd years ago'. Though it comes as a shock to...once again be paying the usual penalty of Empire, the Imperial Government will certainly receive the sympathy of its colonial empire in thus taking up the gauntlet in the interests of one of its smallest colonies.

---

1 Field from Montreal *Daily Witness* in *Donald Times*, 17 Dec. 1895, and others.

2 *Argus*, 23 Jan. 1896; *Australasian*, 8 Feb. 1896. These two newspapers were notably pro-Empire.

3 *Australian Star*, 19 Dec. 1895.
Beside, it would need to guarantee the 'independence and protection' from all aggression of its enormous American holdings.¹

In the event of the worst, we have only the grim satisfaction of knowing that the Empire was never in any period of her history so thoroughly equipped for a desperate struggle. A war now would probably alter the whole face of Europe if not the world, but Great Britain would emerge from the struggle not unscathed, but certainly not deeply injured in power and prestige.²

Though the Government of the United States had in late years 'made considerable strides to the position of a first class power', her navy 'compared only with that of Russia or Germany', was outnumbered in ironclads five to one and in cruisers six to one by the navy of Great Britain.³ Worse for them, the United States navy had admitted it was 'totally unprepared for war'.⁴ Thus,

one British Squadron is more than a match for the whole United States navy....Many of the United States vessels in commission are mere flag rafts of the 'Mohican' type, which less than two years ago were summarily disposed of by one ball from the brass popgun of a poaching sealer....⁵

'The sympathies of every true lover of liberty would be with the Union Jack, the freest flag on the face of the universe.'⁶

¹ Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 21 Dec. 1895. This paper quoted the extent of Britain's American interests: Canada, 3,456,383 sq. miles; Jamaica, Falkland, Bahamas, Barbados, Leeward, Trinidad, Windward Islands, 50,000 sq. miles; British Guiana, 110,000 sq. miles; British Honduras, 7,500 sq. miles.

² Ballarat Star, 23 Dec. 1895.

³ Bendigo Evening Mail, 23 Dec. 1895.

⁴ Observer, 28 Dec. 1895.

⁵ North West Post, 4 Jan. 1896.

⁶ Launceston Examiner, 6 Jan. 1896.
Some newspaper critics began cautiously: 'There can be no doubt as to what the United States would be able to do if the nation were bent on a fight with Britain.' She had shown she could hold her own 'with any race either in peace or war'.\(^1\) On the other hand, England had slipped in power. She had sold her soul to the Manchester hucksters; her best blood had emigrated; her army was miserably small; Free Trade had cut the throats of her yeomanry and her navy was capable of defending only her home waters. 'The result of the next big war to Britain [would] be a loss of power and prestige which no man could calculate.' Against the United States alone, such a war would be 'probably short, not particularly decisive and would produce only a limited amount of damage to either combatant'. As a duel, it would be 'desultory and unsatisfying...ending nowhere in particular'. Beside, Britain was an unknown quantity militarily,

the time being so long since it fought a great enemy by itself, or even with a single ally, that no one knows how far the process of deterioration has really gone.

[It had been 80 years since Waterloo; 40 years since Crimea.\(^2\) 'The nemesis which must sooner or later overtake England in her career of ruthless land-grabbing gains fast upon her...']\(^3\)

Following the new dimension which the crisis assumed after the Jameson raid, the optimists of Empire, no matter how badly their bland hopes were to later prove misplaced, dominated the opinions expressed. Presented with a double

\(^1\) *Newcastle Morning Herald*, 25 Dec. 1895.

\(^2\) *Bulletin*, 28 Dec. 1895, 4 Jan. 1896. Events in the next four years were to prove this assessment all too sadly true.

\(^3\) *Record*, 4 Jan. 1896. Despite this criticism, C.S. Blackton's articles on Australian nationalism have perhaps underemphasized the degree of Australian feeling for Britain in the 1890s. Especially, C.S. Blackton, 'Australian Nationality and Nationalism: The Imperial Federationist Interlude, 1885-1901', *Historical Studies*, Nov. 1955, pp.12-16.
crisis in early January, critics' voices grew smaller with the awareness of a cordon strangulaire of enemies emerging: America to the West, Europe to the East, led by Germany.

Some now believed that all attempts to isolate Britain in the past having failed, they would do so again. In her role as the world's banker, Britain was in a fine position to discourage her enemies by inflicting financial embarrassment on them. Others gathered that Britain would always be threatened, but her troubles would vary in intensity and importance and not all be critical at once. If the century was to close as the one preceding, in a war of nations with America as before taking a peripheral role, what were Britain's resources to meet the new situation: A doubling of population, commerce and wealth; a substantial increase in political freedom through liberal legislation, hence loyal classes; the asset of a set of colonies fairly equivalent to a continental alliance made loyal by their trust in British justice, restraint and fairness and relying on her protection in times of adversity.¹

A week after the news of the Jameson raid, the Wangaratta Chronicle, at the height of the outburst of patriotism for Empire, demonstrated how lyrical this could be:

¹For comment see editorials in the Evening News (Melbourne), 8 Jan. 1896; Melbourne Punch, 9 Jan. 1896; Ballarat Courier, 11 Jan., 5 Mar. 1896; Wangaratta Chronicle, 11 Jan. 1896; Goulburn Herald, 19 Feb. 1896; Australasian, 29 Feb. 1896; Bendigo Evening Mail, 3 Mar. 1896, quoted the words of Professor Vanberg, oriental traveller and historiographer: 'However strong the elephant may be, it can never conquer the whale.' Some Australians took refuge in the whale's dimensions: British naval expenditure was to be increased by £55 million in the next decade: 77 new vessels in the next 12 months. Beside, Britain could already claim 50 battleships, 25 armoured cruisers, 52 protected cruisers and 34 torpedo boats against 3 battleships, one armoured cruiser, 13 protected cruisers and one torpedo boat for America (Nov. 1895). Leopold, op.cit., p.165. Albert M. Imlah, Economic Elements in the Pax Britannica (Massachusetts, 1958), quantifies the nature of Britain's strength.
We are Australians [it wrote], because England is England. We owe everything – our lives, liberty, laws, religion, social and family gifts – all to the vitality, the prowess, the civilization and the wealth of the Anglo-Saxon and Cymric people grouped indissolubly under the name of England [sic]. We cannot imagine therefore, any other feeling in the moment of her danger than hatred of her enemies and a strong will to give a helping hand against them. If we have any hope of the world dominion of the white races; if we have any faith in the laws, the religion, the civilization of the Anglo-Saxon people and their beneficent influence for the future peace and safety of the world – and that is the morning hope of all our missionary effort – we shall feel the spur of patriotism when England [sic] is assailed, because there is the corner-store of the British Empire, the repository of all we hold dearest, the only efficient safeguard of our liberty. 1

As Melbourne's Weekly Times put it:

...away in Canada and here in Australia, the cry of Britain's children will be – 'Well done Old England! The lion's whelps are with you. And come the whole world of foes in arms, unitedly we'll face them. 2

Other patriotic outbursts were more extreme. 3

1 Wangaratta Chronicle, 11 Jan. 1896.
3 See, Melbourne Punch, 16 Jan. 1896; Maffra Spectator, 23 Jan. 1896; Methodist (Melbourne), 24 Jan. 1896; Ballarat Courier, 5 Mar. 1896, speculated that the new naval expenditures could only mean 'that the Imperial Government regard war as inevitably at an early date'. More than one paper hoped that the enemy was not to be America, for Mulhall, 'perhaps the greatest living expert in statistics' according to the Australasian, 14 Mar. 1896, had revealed that by 1910 with 90 million energetic people, the United States would be the 'most powerful state in the world'. Further, as the Adelaide Advertiser, 11, 13 Feb. 1896, agreeing with the Contemporary article 'World Powers of the Future' saw by 1920, the coming confrontation of the English-speaking peoples would be with Russia and the Slavs. Other such predictions were made early in 1896 in the Nineteenth Century and the North American Review. The Bacchus Marsh Express, 25 Jan. 1896, quoted the Scottish historian Prothero to the same effect from the Edinburgh Scotsman.
During the crises, how did editors view Australia's power position? At the time of Cleveland's first Message, Lord Brassey at the Melbourne Town Hall, was once again warning an audience of the defectiveness of Victoria's defences (in fact, one of the better defended of all the colonies) due largely, he believed, to retrenchment economies. The message that a federated Australia could deal much more effectively with the defence problem was once again delivered. After the second Message became public, the Sydney Mail felt obliged to rebuff 'Liberal and Radical' accusations that British Tories were using the foreign troubles to divert attention away from pressing domestic problems and insisted that they were real and uninvited. On Christmas Eve, the pro-Empire Argus felt it useful to review the Australian position. These war alarms are the occasion on which we can consider with advantage whether the insurance we pay in defence votes is sufficient and effects its purpose.

This consideration was forthcoming in the defence debates of the Victorian Legislative Assembly at the end of January, held in the context of the double-crisis. Concern that the Americans were not signatories to the Declaration of Paris of 1856 (providing for the abolition of privateering and respect for neutral flags in war time) was taken up when the press reassured its readers that Americans were unlikely to interfere with Australian cargoes.

---

1 Brassey's speech, 3 Dec. 1895, was widely reported e.g. Maryborough Advertiser, 4 Dec. 1895.
2 Sydney Mail, 21 Dec. 1895.
3 Argus, 24 Dec. 1895; see also, the Goulburn Herald, 15 Jan. 1896.
4 Victorian M.L.A. Kirton also called for Federation in the interests of improved defence at this time, V.P.D.L.A., LXXIX, p.2870.
carried in neutral vessels as 'she would seek not to strain her relations with foreign powers, but rather induce them to maintain a benevolent neutrality'. Regarding the possibility of American privateering, many were satisfied with the presence of the Auxiliary Squadron, whose vessels the Boomerang, Karrakatta, Katoomba and Mildura were considered among the fastest in the Royal Navy. With neither arsenals nor coaling stations in the Southern and Indian Oceans, American cruisers could little hope to affect the Suez route for Australians. Nor did the American fleet have the resources to control the Mediterranean or the immediate area around England. 'Thus', claimed the Argus,

there would seem to be a clear and safe run for our goods in and out from port to port, even without the assistance of a neutral flag....It looks as though...no big war in which Great Britain was involved would less directly affect the commerce of Australia.\(^1\)

The Bulletin was traditionally gloomy at first, regarding the disadvantageous position Australia was placed in due to the Imperial connection. During the American phase of the double crisis, it lambasted the 'dull, stupid, casual' Australian, who due to blind loyalty to an Empire with a huge number of enemies and quarrels, was bound to have his 'time for war, invasion and death'. With the German phase of the crisis however, the paper performed a volte-face. It now believed it was

high time that Britain seriously considered her position and began to set her house in order for war....For quite apart from Australia's direct interest in the encounter, we have some indirect anxiety for Britain's future....For, though we hate British cant and greed and hypocrisy, we admire British blood and grit and force....Beside, we have nothing to gain and a good deal to lose by the relegation of Britain to the ranks of second-rate powers - a contingency that looms nearer. With all Britain's faults, we cannot wish her failure in the struggle before her.

\(^1\) Argus, ibid.
Therefore, the Bulletin asked:

How would Australia stand if it came to a fight?
How many trained men, capable of bearing arms?
How many rifles and how much ammunition? What artillery, uniforms, accoutrements have we? 1

As Kipling had predicted three days before, the German situation coming as it did on top of the American, did indeed 'wake up the colonies', and provided one of the earliest evidences of the Bulletin's underlying chauvinistic tendencies. 2

Australia's initial sluggish reactions were nowhere better illustrated than in 'Woomera's' parody of William McCulloch, Victoria's Minister for Defence: 3

> How is it that amidst the row
> When din of battle peals,
> When Uruguay is on the ramp
> And Venezuela squeals,
> Victorians with unruffled nerve
> Go peacefully to bed?
> No wonder that they feel secure,
> McCulloch keeps his head....

and so on for four other verses, concluding:

> A fig for all the nasty things
> That Grover Cleveland said,
> There's peace on earth for Melbourne
> while
> McCulloch keeps his head. 4

This frivolous tone disappeared after the news of the Jameson raid and was followed by serious discussion on the colonies' war preparedness. A year before, readers were reminded, Admiral Colomb in a National Review article had

---


3 William McCulloch served from 27 Sept. 1894 to 5 Dec. 1899 in the Liberal Turner ministry. He was Minister of Defence from 13 Feb. 1895 and Vice President of the Board of Land and Works. He served again in the Turner Ministry from 19 Nov. 1900 until 12 Feb. 1901 and until 10 June 1902 in the Peacock Ministry. In all, he retained his Defence portfolio.

4 Australasian, 4 Jan. 1896.
argued that the £126,000 paid by Australia to maintain a fleet in her own waters and the 32,000 troops maintained would be of little use as such forces would be withdrawn to 'key' strategic areas if the Empire were at war. A light cruiser at each colonial port and a light sea-faced battery would suffice against any Alabama-style surprise attack. Other defence monies would be better handed to a central Imperial defence authority, Colomb argued. The Wagga Wagga Express was only one among the many now urging increased volunteering, more training, resuscitation of branch reserves and greater prominence and permanence for the military.¹

The new sense of alarm animating all sections of Australian press opinion combined with the new sense of solidarity among the colonies following the recent passage of the New South Wales' Enabling Bill. It produced the most remarkable telegram sent to the Home Government since that of the New South Wales' acting Premier William Bede Dalley on 11 February 1885, which followed news of the death of General Gordon in the Sudan. At 11 p.m. on Sunday night, 12 January, George Reid, Premier of New South Wales, sent the following official cable to Lord Salisbury:

The Governments of Australia and Tasmania [sic] view with satisfaction the prompt and fearless measures adopted by Her Majesty's Government in defence of the integrity of the Empire. We desire to convey our united assurances of loyal support. The people of Australia are in full sympathy with the determination of the Mother Country to resent foreign interference in matters of British and Colonial concern. Signed on behalf of and at the request of N.S.W., South Australia, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia - G.H. Reid.

A reply from Lord Salisbury was delayed by a breach in the line at Darwin. It arrived on Wednesday morning, 15 January and ran:

¹Colomb's ideas were widely re-discussed e.g. Geelong Advertiser, 5 Jan. 1896; Wagga Wagga Express, 9 Jan. 1896; Leon Desmond Atkinson, 'Australian Defence Policy: A Study of Empire and Nation, 1897-1910' (unpublished Ph.D., A.N.U., 1964), takes up these developments.
Hatfield, 4:30 p.m., Jan. 13th.

Her Majesty's Government heartily thanks you and through you, the governments of Australia and Tasmania for your patriotic assurances of sympathy and support. Nothing can give us greater confidence in maintaining the rights of our country than the knowledge that we have the approval and good-will of our fellow-subjects in the colonies.1

Australia's press and public were generally gratified with this official response. Not only did Australians in London note a generally approving British reception to the cable, but the Times on Monday, 13 January, had mentioned the gesture favourably as did the Canadian Parliament some time later. In Australia, Reid's message was described as 'wise, thoughtful and statesmanlike...representing ninetieths of the people of Australia'.2 That ten per cent disaffected - if the estimate was correct - were probably the 'disgruntled hobbledehoys' resenting British bullying, or cynics who believed that despite such assurances, Australia's capitalists would sever the British connection the moment property was endangered by 'Yankees...Germans or some other nation's warships bombard[ing] any or all of the principal cities of this continent'.3

Most however, were pleased with this possible strengthening of Britain's hand in diplomatic negotiation. Further, whatever friction or irritation which might arise from unpaid colonial debts during a time of war, might thus be compensated for by an early display of loyalty such as had been made.4 In any event it disproved the gloomy predictions of critics like war-correspondent Archibald Forbes and Manchester economist John Morley who had predicted

---

1The telegram's contents were widely publicized e.g. Tamworth News, 17 Jan. 1896.


3Brisbane Worker, New Year ed. 1896.

a decade before, the falling away of Australia during such a British crisis. 1

Could colonies remain neutral even if they wished to? The Launceston Examiner thought not. An Imperial Royal Commission, it reminded its readers, had been formed in 1870 to consider this question. Though that Commission had recommended that the requisite power be granted to the Australian colonies, nothing had come of it. Nonetheless, it was recognized that a declaration of neutrality would not help Canada's situation if the United States decided to take it. The question of neutrality was recognized as an academic one for 'having so long enjoyed the protection of the flag, it would be little short of cowardice to desert it when attacked, so the neutrality issue [had] been allowed to lapse'. 2

Most metropolitan newspapers agreed that the ties of Empire had been strengthened by the crises and it was generally recognized that the best way to make Australia secure was to give strong support to the Mother Country. Though Chamberlain's suggestions at the Lamington Farewell Dinner for a form of Empire-federation were politely put aside, less formal links were encouragingly received. 3

The enthusiastic reception of the Imperial cable conference held in Australia at the end of January was thus recognized as due to some extent to the emphasis which recent events have laid upon the necessity for a united Empire and the need for maintaining a rapid and permanent communication with every part of it. 4

---

1 It also disproved the prediction of Sir Charles Dilke who, while visiting the colony, believed that N.S.W. would not take the lead again in expressions of such loyalty. Problems of Greater Britain (London, 1890), p.177.

2 Launceston Examiner, 1 Feb. 1896.


4 Tamworth Observer, 29 Feb. 1896. The issue of a Pacific cable linking Australia and Canada had been discussed at length at the Ottawa Conference of 1894.
Most colonial parliaments had broken up far too early (before 20 December) to incorporate any discussion on the crisis, except for Victoria's Parliament which closed its session on 23 January with a debate on the Defence Budget in the Legislative Assembly. Should spending be increased above its figure of £165,000? No, argued Hancock, the Socialist member for Footscray who claimed that the war scares were artificially created 'in the newspaper offices of Collins Street and by Selbourne Chambers swashbucklers... inflaming uneducated, ignorant and brutal crowds'. He believed that 'any man who knew anything at all must have seen that war between England and America...bound by blood and commerce...was absolutely impossible' and was relieved that 'Parliament had not been sitting during the latest war scare'.

The conservative, R. McLellan, replied intemperately (and inaccurately) that America had been preparing for war since the time of independence and now possessed a threatening 'army and navy second to none in the world' - exaggerating the nature of the American menace. P. Bromley agreed with the Age that logistic problems and preoccupation in Europe rendered Australia relatively safe from the Empire's invaders and enemies. Another Socialist, J. Prendergast, whose ideas found a regular outlet in the Labour weekly, Tocsin, claimed 'the people of Victoria had no trouble with the Americans or the Boers'; that a citizen army such as the Americans used to defeat the British was best and that cut-backs should continue. With a sure eye for economy which was to earn him a place in the Australian Commonwealth's first Cabinet as Treasurer, Victoria's Liberal Premier George Turner, closed the debate on this note and the retrenchments amounting to £44,127 remained.

But the decision was widely criticized. The Wangaratta Chronicle agreed with the keen militarist Chirnside that this left Victoria's defences in a sad 'state of chaos'.

---

2 Ibid., p.4789 (McLellan); p.4798 (Bromley); p.4803 (Prendergast); p.4807, p.4840 (Turner).
The Melbourne Punch in a stinging cartoon claimed that Turner's amputations had rendered Victoria's defence decorative but useless. In this way the press reminded parliament that it considered the German and American menaces placed Australian colonies in real military danger.¹

On a more selfish economic level, some organs of the press suggested that Australian fishing in Britain's troubled commercial waters could be good. Having now suffered successive set-backs in Russia, South America and the United States, it was hoped that Australia might be kindly reassessed as an investment outlet for British capital. It was recognized that despite Britain's carriage of 57½ per cent of the world's ocean trade, the country could be starved into submission within ninety days of being cut off from a supply of American goods. This possibility should convince Britain to look more kindly upon Australia as a food source, some editors held. Especially would Chamberlain's recent trade circular reveal Australian potential in this regard.²

David Syme's Age as ever, led practical suggestions on how Australia's share of 4.07 per cent of Britain's trade in meat could be increased at the expense of the United States' and Argentina's combined 20.5 per cent share. Advances in refrigeration, greater concern for consumer tastes, better preparation, faster transportation, more effective quality controls and an immediate loan of £12,000 to an E. Hotson to expand Melbourne's existing frozen meat trade were all


suggested to Victoria's government, though with little success.\textsuperscript{1} With similar ends in view, Newcastle's protectionist daily suggested a further break into the British wheat market with the product of New South Wales' Hunter Valley.\textsuperscript{2} In a similar vein, the papers of the Wimmera suggested that Californian canned and fresh fruits consumed on Western Australian goldfields be replaced by the local product.\textsuperscript{3}

One extreme view came from the most intensely protectionist paper of those mentioned; the short-lived erratic Sydney weekly, the \textit{Australian News}. A British military involvement should be welcomed by Australians it believed. Why? It would prove that contrary to popular overseas legend Australia could feed both itself and Britain as well as provide the necessary gold to provide the sinews of war. Full employment, federation, manufacturing industries and national unity would be the Australian harvest, '...so just trot that war out...for we're all right and would be all right', it assured its readers, calling on the dubious authority of a P. Belfield, local stove factory manager, to back up its opinions.\textsuperscript{4} At a more sober level, most agreed with the normally sanguine \textit{Melbourne Punch} that even though Australia might escape direct conflict with an American or German enemy, Britain's losses in terms of total international trading wealth would beset Australia's economy with 'tremendous ills... protract[ing] for many a day the already long drawn out contest we are fighting with depression'.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Age}, 19 Mar. 1896. As C.E. Sayers points out in David Syme (Melbourne, 1965), Ch.8, this sort of initiative on his part was common. See also, J.A. La Nauze on 'David Syme', Political Economy in Australia (Melbourne, 1949), pp.118-22. The \textit{Beacon}, 1 Dec. 1896, was quick to point out that British naval authorities still purchased the bulk of their canned beef from Chicago.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Newcastle Morning Herald}, 30 Dec. 1895.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Horsham Times}, 31 Dec. 1895.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Australian News}, 20, 27 Jan. 1896.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Melbourne Punch}, 23 Jan. 1896.
While it considered itself reasonably secure, for a variety of economic, military and emotional reasons, Australia did not welcome war between Britain and America or any other foe. Furthermore, the Australian colonies were determined to demonstrate to the world that come what may they believed their own interests to be indissolubly associated for some time to come with those of their Mother Country - that as has often been stated, their loyalties were ’dual, but not divided’. ¹

More particular Australian reactions concerned several matters: those of her religious leaders; the response to Redmond’s appeal to the Irish; the question of the loyalty of her sister country Canada; an assessment of the chief protagonists of each country and an early forecast of new American foreign policy directions.

Even editors of small and remote papers such as Queensland’s Western Champion at Barcaldine were aware of the painful irony that the belligerence of the Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute was occurring at Christmas during the festival of peace. ² Overseas religious reactions to this irony were taken up by the cables. Australians learnt by cable of the influential Reverend Lyman Abbott’s large congregation loudly cheering his anti-war sermon at Brooklyn; of the famous episcopal Bishop, Henry Codman Potter raising his voice against Cleveland in a sermon in New York; of the prayers for peace in thousands of chapels in America and Britain, and of the English Nonconformists.

¹W.K. Hancock has most forcefully articulated this kind of loyalty, speaking of ’Independent Australian Britons’, Australia (Sydney, 1945), Ch.3. Recently, Russel Ward has posited this type of conceptual framework as a new way of writing Australian history, apart from the ’Whig’ approach pursued by R.M. Crawford, F.L.W. Wood, G.V. Portus, Geoffrey Serle, J.M. Ward and others, or the C.M.H. Clark framework of Catholic-Protestant-Enlightenment tensions. See ’Two Kinds of Australian Patriotism’, Augustus Wolkesel Memorial Lecture (Sept., 1969), University of New England Circular No. 15.

²Western Champion, 24 Dec. 1895.
sending messages of conciliation directly to fellow American churches. Joseph Pulitzer had cabled English bishops and statesmen for publishable messages of peace and goodwill and had received replies from the Bishops of Chester and Liverpool among others. On Christmas Day, the Bishops of Canterbury, Winchester, Bangor and London delivered 'peace' sermons.¹

Sermons were similarly preached on the Australian scene. Many papers reported the most impressive - that of Sydney's Catholic Cardinal Moran, given at the end of his High Mass on Christmas morning at St Mary's Cathedral. He condemned the warlike spirit of 'two great Christian nations' as pagan and barbaric. He thought it proper that the world should denounce 'those who set people against people and inundate the Christian world with blood'. He urged all

to pray to God on that day of peace that the politicians should not be allowed to spill the blood of Christians, but that the divine light of grace and peace should show them the error of their course.²

The Jewish Rabbi in Sydney, J.H. Landau, also preached a sermon on the text: 'And thou shalt speak peace unto the nations' (Zach. IX, 10). He saw the present situation as a mockery...when [at a time] the Christian nations [were] preaching 'peace on earth, goodwill to all men', the two great Anglo-Saxon brother nations - brothers in common sentiment and a common past, [were] on the brink of a cataclysm of war. Which may God avert!³

This moral timeliness was not confined to the cities. For example, the Reverend A. Ross at St John's Church of England Tamworth, engaged 'the close attention of a large

¹Argus cables 20-31 Dec. 1895.
²Moran quoted Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 26 December 1895; Freeman's Journal, 4 January 1896; small differences in textual details exist.
³Australasian Hebrew, 3 January 1896.
congregation' with a sermon based on a text from an Argus editorial: 'After the passage of two thousand Christmases, the two greatest powers in Christendom were trembling on the verge of war about a strip of South American forest.' Ross believed that nothing less than a revolution in human nature, taking 'twice twenty' centuries to accomplish was needed to effect a change. But to the Brisbane *Courier* such expressions illustrated the great 'progress of Christian sentiment...over the last hundred years'.

Not all would agree. Whereas Melbourne's *Methodist* had enthused over the style with which the official chaplain, Dr. P. Milburn, opened the current session of United States' Congress believing 'he became to the Senate, the interpreter of the Churches and of religious people generally', Adelaide's *Observer* attacked his informal prayer as hypocrisy: ('Heavenly Father, let peace reign throughout our borders. Yet may we be quick to resent anything like an insult to this our nation.') saying, 'it is nothing short of irrational for them to adopt, without valid excuse, measures directly inciting to war and at the same time to supplicate Heaven that the calimity may be averted'. Sydney's *Methodist* hoped that Dr Talmage, the new Presbyterian minister at Washington, would be a benign influence on the 'belligerent President of the United States'. Australian religious reactions were even more placatory than many overseas varieties.

On 27 December, the *Age* among other leading papers, carried the news that the Irish Parnellite leader in the House of Commons, John Redmond, had cabled Pulitzer's New York *World* to the effect that in the event of war, the Irish would back America. The action provoked a great outpouring of comment on the perennial Irish problem. To the *Age* it was traitorous:

We shall not be surprised to find that it has angered the British temper more than all the bounce from over the water....It has certainly put Home Rule out of the region of practical politics.¹

To the Courier it was a 'feeble malice' designed to appeal to 'that small section of the Irish in America which finds a savage delight in talking war'. Such were to be found at the recent Chicago convention (chaired by Finerty) who had declared as policy: 'We are here to tell beloved Uncle Sam that if he draws the sword in defence of the Monroe Doctrine, the Irish in America will be behind the Stars and Stripes.' However, for the rest of America's Irish, who were loyal and working constitutionally for a measure of legislative independence for their own country such 'as Queensland enjoys' it was 'a monstrous libel'.²

Of the papers denouncing the action the Sydney Orange Lodge's Protestant Banner was the most shrill. It was part of an ongoing international Catholic plot, it believed, for 'Rome never rests. She is ever on the wing....Like the hawk, only waiting an opportunity to drive down and seize her prey.' It assured Britain that her 'Yellow Boys of the Old Sod' would happily drive every Fenian into the sea.³ Others were of the opinion that Redmond should resign his seat and dissociate himself from those loyal Irish now 'more English than the English'. But for some, it was a perfect example of British tolerance that a member of the House of

²Courier, 27 Dec. 1895.
³Protestant Banner, 28 Dec. 1895.
Commons could thus speak with impunity. Protestants generally condemned the cable as a wild declaration and a blunder amounting to crime, sent only to refurbish a waning personal influence.¹ Adelaide's Observer labeled it 'the most discreditable incident in connection with the imbroglio'.²

Those more sympathetic to Irish-Catholic aspirations saw it as an error of judgement typical of the many committed in the name of Home Rule. As a 'mere burlesque of a crime' it aroused only contempt for the man and pity for the injured cause. Beside, it was repeatedly recognized that Redmond spoke for only a small fraction of the Irish.³ Catholic organs like Bishop M. Gibney's Perth weekly Record were more definite. It thought an Irish revulsion against recently entrenched Primrose Leaguers and Tory prejudice inevitable. It was legitimate tactics, given Britain's historic intransigence concerning Ireland, to call on the aid of the powerful Irish-American vote to pressure Britain into granting long-sought concessions. For Ireland stood 'before the world, baffled, beaten, driven into sore desperation'.⁴ The Freeman's Journal also hoped that the threat of an Irish rebellion and another American war (employing as many as 300,000 revengeful Irishmen on the side of America) might do 'more to further the future of Home Rule than all the strategy of Parnell and all the eloquence of Gladstone'.⁵

If such a war occurred, Melbourne's Catholic Advocate for one, openly forgave those Irish who did not pray for peace on the grounds of 'human nature...deep wounds, bitter memories and unsatisfied claims to justice'. At the same time, the Catholic press reminded Britain that a contented

---

¹ Tamworth Observer, 1 Jan. 1896; Launceston Examiner, 3 Jan. 1896.
² Observer, 4 Jan. 1896.
³ Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 27 Dec. 1895.
⁴ Record, 28 Dec. 1895.
⁵ Freeman's Journal, 28 December 1895.
Ireland would release at least 20,000 British troops for service abroad. Nonetheless, the same press continued to deplore the rifts in the unity of the Irish cause effected by the quarrels of factions led by Healy, Dillon, O'Brien and Redmond. At one point the Freeman's Journal considered the latter's telegram such a tactical political error it called its authenticity into open question. Most Australian Irish Catholics obviously preferred the peaceful, gradualist tactics of Irish Nationalist M.P. Michael Davitt (father of the Irish Land League), whose visit to Australia had helped him to achieve status among Catholic opinion leaders in the colonies.

The formation of the 'Irish Rifle Corps for the Defence of Australia' by a widely representative gathering in January 1896, presided over by Cardinal Moran, was denounced by the Protestant Banner and the Bulletin as the 'Cardinal's Corps', 'Rome's Army' and 'Sectarian Soldiering'. In fact, it did much to reaffirm the general Irish loyalty to Britain existing in Australia and cast into such doubt by the Redmond telegram.

At the height of the crisis, long-established literary connections on both sides of the Atlantic forcefully asserted themselves in the interests of peace. Australians learnt by cable of the friendly address sent by eminent 'men of letters' of England (Meredith, Lecky, Ruskin, Hardy, Blackmore, Arnold and others) to their American counterparts on Christmas Day. On the American side, Henry George, the pioneer socialist, well known for his Progress and Poverty

---

1 Advocate, 28 Dec. 1895, 4, 18 Jan., 1 Feb., 8 March 1896.

2 Freeman's Journal, 4 Jan. 1896; Davitt's book, Life and Progress in Australasia (London, 1897), which described his several months in Australia, was favourably reviewed. See South Australian Register, 30 Apr. 1896.

(1879) and his visit to Australia in 1890, expressed a reciprocal feeling which probably influenced some worker and radical opinion in Australia. 1

Some Australian literati and others took their conciliatory lead from the well known Mark Twain - whose droll humour made him in 1895, probably America's most widely-read author of fiction and travel-writing in Australia. During his successful lecture tour (mid-September 1895 to early January 1896) he spoke on the crisis. One occasion for this was his reception during the New Year's Eve luncheon at Glenelg celebrating the 59th anniversary of South Australia's foundation. Warmly received, Twain spoke following the Commissioner of Public Works who had blamed the war fever on the few 'demagogic scum' rather than the American people as a whole. Twain replied briefly but pointedly that

such a war would certainly stop the wheels of progress and intelligence of the whole world for generations. Therefore, he would listen to no talk of war between the two countries. Blood was thicker than water and there must be no blood shed between English and Americans. 2

Twain's own observations and experiences describe the tone in which the crisis was received. '...Speaking of the war flurry', he wrote in Following The Equator (1897),

it seemed to me to bring to light the unexpected...the attitude of the newspapers was new...they treated the subject argumentatively and with dignity, not with spite and anger.... I heard many public speeches and they reflected the moderation of the journals....The war cloud hanging black over England and America made no trouble for me. I was a prospective prisoner of war, but at dinners, suppers, on the platform and elsewhere, there was never anything to remind me of it. This was hospitality of the right metal and would have been prominently lacking in some countries, in the circumstances.

1 Argus cable, 29 Dec. 1895; Australian Workman, 2 Nov. 1895; Maryborough Chronicle, 30 Dec. 1895.

Twain's Glenelg speech both fitted and helped sustain the prevailing Australian mood.¹

No doubt achieving as wide an effect as Twain's placatory words were the witty cartoons of another American - Livingstone Hopkins, 'Hop' of the Bulletin - an institution on the magazine's front page since 1882. His accent on the lighter side of the crisis, satirizing Cleveland, Edison, the Monroe Doctrine and other 'sacred cows' of his own country, undoubtedly did much to relieve tension in many sections of Australian society.²

No portion of overseas Empire aroused more consistent interest in Australia, due perhaps to improving communications and trade and the country's federal experience than did Canada at this time. Many well-read Australians were made painfully aware by newspaper reviews of the article and book literature - especially Goldwin Smith's - of the arguments for Canadian annexation by America.³ The most recent rebuff of this sentiment had been J.G. Bourinot's 'Why Canadians Do Not Favour Annexation' in the Forum for March 1895. He expressed the view that Canadian annexation had been manufactured as an issue by newspapermen, that Canadians were content with their status and growth and looked forward eagerly to the fulfilment of their own destiny within the Empire. With modifications like the Australian ballot, Canadian politicians considered themselves more advanced and less corrupt than those of the United States. These opinions,

¹Mark Twain, op.cit., pp.167-8.
³Goldwin Smith's Canada and the Canadian Question (1891) argued for union on sectional geographic lines. This British historian and publicist who had resided in Canada since 1871 also presented his ideas in the Canadian Monthly which he edited. See, Reminiscences of Goldwin Smith, New York, 1910, pp.439-446.
taken with those of the United States' Chief Justice that force would never be used by America on Canada did much to calm apprehensions of editors concerned with Canada's future within the Empire. 1

As the crisis heightened, editors' thoughts returned to Canada's situation. Many newspapers reported with evident relief that the Canadian press supported Salisbury and were pressing Sir McKenzie Bowell to prepare for an invasion. With this development, many Australian papers were openly jubilant at the rebuffs to Cleveland in particular and the failing prospect of Canadian-American union in general. Others recognized that it was just such a tense confrontation which made war the disastrous possibility it had been 35 years earlier during the Trent affair. 2

The Age proposed that Britain think seriously of severing the Canadian connection in the interest of removing a hostage, the defence of which endangered the security of the rest of the Empire. 3 The Age had long held an ambivalent attitude toward Canada. It usually tended to discount Bourinot and promote Goldwin Smith's publicity for a 'Continental union' in the belief that in any future overall union of English-speaking peoples, Canada's identity would


2 Maryborough Chronicle, 20 Dec. 1895; Australian Star, 24 Dec. 1895; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 24 Dec. 1895. The 'Trent' Affair (8 Nov.-25 Dec. 1861), was an Anglo-American crisis which arose during the Civil War when the U.S.S. San Jacinto stopped the British steamer Trent and removed two Confederate commissioners en route to England. British war fever over the incident abated only after Secretary Seward released the two men.

3 Age, 2 Jan. 1896.
not be a pressing issue. 1

When news arrived of the loyalty to Britain and intrinsigence toward America of the newly re-opened Canadian Federal Parliament in the face of the threat, many papers hithero sympathetic to the Age turned on the influential Victorian opinion leader for its defeatism and lack of faith in the Empire. When letters from special correspondents, and Toronto and Montreal newspapers themselves arrived in Australia to confirm the impression of Canadian steadiness, the Age not only withdrew its earlier comments, but argued lamely in its own defence that the greater threat to the security of the Transvaal had made it react in this manner - an argument which fooled no-one, as the Age editorial comments had been made preceding the unexpected Jameson raid. In short, every section of the Australian press, including finally the recalcitrant Age, was pleased to see how well Canada had emerged from this supreme test of Empire-allegiance. 2

The double crisis in British international diplomacy brought about in the New Year by the Jameson raid (1 January) and the Kaiser's telegram (3 January) did much to distract attention in Australia away from Cleveland, America and Venezuela and toward the Kaiser, Germany and the Transvaal. Fifteen years of press comment since the British disaster at Majuba Hill (27 February 1881) together with the communications to their countrymen at home of the many thousands of Australian miners who had joined the Uitlanders, created a 'living and concentrated' association with the Transvaal in the opinion of John Farrell. It was one that

1Age, 11 Feb., 5, 27 July 1893.

gave a South African difficulty more impact in Australia than similar dangers affecting the scant number of dispersed Australians living in America.¹

By 10 January the Geraldton-Murchison Telegraph represented the last of those editors in Australia who had forgotten the Monroe Doctrine in the new discussion of the prospect of Germany leading the long-anticipated European coalition against Britain. Prejudice against Germans in Melbourne expressed itself in the action of a crowd in Flinders Lane which refused to listen to the German band there play 'Die Wacht am Rhein', forcing them instead to play 'Rule Britannia' repeatedly, instead of their normal selections. Rhodes' telegram to Pulitzer's paper reminding Americans of the numbers of their countrymen in the Rand in need of protection by Britain was expected to have a salutary effect on American attitudes toward the Empire. The long-standing basis for anti-German sentiment had been laid by the New Guinea annexation, the widely recognized belligerence of an unstable Kaiser who tolerated Turkish atrocities, and the 'Made in Germany' resentment against that country's commerce by those advocating increased Empire trade and domestic protectionism.²

For these reasons, general Australian editorial feeling in this second crisis was more fervent, and critical analysis


²Geraldton-Murchison Telegraph, 10 Jan. 1896. Other comment in, Maffra Spectator, 23 Jan. 1896; Mercury, 13 Jan. 1896; Maitland Mercury, 13 Jan. 1896; Age, 14 Jan., 3 Feb. 1896; Courier, 15 Jan. 1896; Argus, 15 Jan. 1896; Maryborough Advertiser, 15 Jan. 1896; Ballarat Courier, 30 Jan. 1896; Bacchus Marsh Express, 18 Jan. 1896, was one of the few papers very hostile to Jameson and understanding of the Kaiser.
more muted than during the first. Though Australian (and Empire) friendliness toward both Americans and Germans appeared to be quickly restored, in fact more permanent damage had been wrought to the image of the Kaiser's Germany. It was believed by many editors in Australia as in Britain, that Americans had been shocked by German interference and that they secretly admired Jameson's bold action on behalf of democratic rights while they openly condemned its illegality. Germans, predicted the North Queensland Herald 'on top of other discourtesies [had] permanently estranged British sympathies and decided that when the big war comes, England will be the ally of France'.

In broad terms, it can be said that Salisbury's and Chamberlain's reputations rose considerably in the eyes of Australian editors for what was believed had been a steady and dignified handling of the crisis on their part. Only a small section of the catholic and labor press held aloof from the general congratulatory feeling at having been saved both a war with America and the confusing dilatoriness in foreign affairs which had bedevilled the recently concluded Gladstone era. As the Goulburn Herald believed, with increasing concern at the consolidation of the Empire, an interest of the colonies in the character and policy of the British government was equally intensified.


2 Goulburn Herald, 27 Nov. 1895.
The radical Australian News was one of the few newspapers which directly blamed the crisis on Salisbury's 'ferociously barbaric nature'. By some means of its own, the paper claimed to have 'tested public opinion' on whether Salisbury should have agreed to arbitrate and had found the opinion 'locally endorsed by men of repute in the country'.\(^1\) Nonetheless, Salisbury was able to back down by slower degrees than did Cleveland, and the latter, by not following up his threat with immediate forceful action, was thought in the perception of a biased Australian press, to have lost face in a way which the British leader had not.\(^2\)

By contrast, Cleveland had been under attack since 1884 at the beginning of his first term of office by labor and protectionist elements of the Australian press. All sections of the Australian press had disapproved of aspects of his strike and depression-ridden second term (1892-96). Though elements of the press which were pro-Conservative, or Free Trade; anti-imperialist or pro-gold-standard in orientation, regularly defended him during this time as a man of strong principle, his incredibly belligerent, anti-British stand shocked them and provided the ideal excuse to flail him on personal grounds. Even the normally staid West Australian attacked him in the course of one editorial as 'arrogant...meddlesome...gratuitous...domineering...pretentious...high-handed and brazenly impudent'.\(^3\) He was regularly called 'mad' and 'criminal'.

---


\(^3\)West Australian, 21 Dec. 1895.
Some papers used the crisis as another occasion on which to remind the forthcoming Federal Convention of the deficiencies and rigidities of the American system of government and the arrogance of Presidential power in that system. Only after the cooling action of Cleveland's proposed Commission took effect and he was favourably compared with Bryan and McKinley in the approaching election, did his reputation begin to recover.¹

By early February 1896, some mature consideration had been given to America's new foreign policy aspirations by perceptive organs of the Australian press. The Launceston Examiner was the first with this reassessment. It realised that what was termed the 'dead hand' of the past was swiftly losing its restraining grip on the people of the United States and that the century-old traditional policy of non-interference with the effete monarchies of Europe was being abandoned. American actions in Samoa and Hawaii as well as interest expressed in events in China, Transvaal, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Cuba, the West Indies, Canada and Turkey revealed an American orientation toward increased involvement in European complications. This was not without considerable contradiction, as the intimation of courting Russia as ally against Britain and Britain as ally against the Turk illustrated. Thus,

so far as having no foreign policy, the United States is developing one as fast as it conveniently can and in a few years there will be hardly a dispute anywhere but the Americans will want to have a finger in.

The irony was recognized by the paper that distance, far from granting America immunity from interference in her hemisphere as she claimed, was being increasingly ignored by that country herself, in order to assert her own interests in far-away places. The present wide deployment of America's growing navy was actively forwarding the desire of Senator Lodge not to 'fall out of the line of march' of the great nations of the world. With the development of America's western territories, a swelling population of 70 million energetic people, animated by jingoism and the jettisoning of the old Monroe Doctrine,

the United States can no more follow a policy of isolation and confine itself to the New World than Great Britain can to the United Kingdom. The world is gradually growing smaller with steam and electricity and whether desirable or not, her natural expansion as a nation will bring her into contrast with others.1

The Sydney Morning Herald's concern was that this new expansionist foreign policy would quickly bring America into conflict with surrounding British territories in the West Indies and Canada. To prevent this, Britain had first, to arbitrate the present outstanding dispute and later, to enter 'a close and cordial alliance with the United States', in order to preserve and promote Anglo-Saxon interests.2

1Launceston Examiner, 6 Feb. 1896.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ARBITRATION IMPULSE OF 1896:

THE AUSTRALIAN RESPONSE
The prospect of a closer military and naval alliance of English-speaking peoples had occupied a part of Australian editorial thinking before the Guiana-Venezuela dispute. Following the crisis of late 1895, these ideas were re-examined to see what, if anything, of the desire for Anglo-American understanding remained.

Reviewed following the shock of collision of national interests, the older sentiments came into sharp focus for Australian press commentators. The first step in coming to terms seemed an appreciation of the existence of mutual differences. Time and thoughtful attitudes combined to assist in an actual waning of antipathy.

Arbitration of the boundary at first forced upon the British, was resented. Later, Cleveland's Commission was welcomed as a means of easing the immediate tension and as suggesting the broader solution of any such future disputes by means of general arbitration.

The chief attitude underlying the impulse to arbitration between England and America was ethnocentrism - the common sharing of racial ideas for purposes of surviving or prevailing in a hostile world. Elitist attitudes concerning the nature and mission of the Anglo-Saxon peoples were widely subscribed to by Australians who viewed this sympathetic racial self-centredness as a bond shared by Americans as well as by all branches of Empire. It was with dismay that Australians perceived that the prospect of superiority for Anglo-Saxon peoples in the councils of the world was in jeopardy at the end of 1895. Australian editors - whether liberal, conservative or radical - had the ideals of race loyalty and race solidarity at the front
of their thinking and they let it be known that as an increasingly important part of the Anglo-Saxon community of interests in the coming twentieth century, they desired a rapprochement between the two largest branches of that family to prepare the whole for the ultimate challenge from the Slav and Oriental.¹

There were several reasons explaining the interest in Anglo-American arbitration in this period.² Australia had a highly homogeneous English-speaking population of its own, in which ethnocentric ideas could take root. Over 95 per cent of the Australian population (excluding aboriginals) was of British origin. In 1901 in New South Wales, for example, of a population of 1,354,846, 1,316,097 were either born in Australia or somewhere in the British Empire. Of the latter number, 220,401 were from the United Kingdom and 1,079,154 were native born. The proportions were roughly similar in Victoria, which together with New South Wales contained three quarters of the population of Australia. Queensland was the colony with the highest proportion of foreigners - a mere 8.71 per cent. As B.R. Wise put it in


²Forming a domestic background to international arbitration was debate on Australian industrial arbitration. This bore fruit in the Commonwealth legislation of 1904. See H.B. Higgins, A New Province For Law and Order (Melbourne, 1922). The effect was to air principles common to all forms of arbitration.
1909: 'Australia is the most British country out of Great Britain.'

Australia was only another portion of Anglo-Saxon dom sharing in a general ethnocentric enthusiasm which began around 1885; reaching its height around 1899 before carrying through to the end of World War One and beyond. A Canadian scholar, D. Coles, recently observed that, 'Australian ethnocentric expressions were closely, often directly related to ethnic ideas held elsewhere in the English-speaking world'. He considered Henry Parkes' statement concerning 'the crimson thread of kinship which runs through us all' as 'perhaps the most famous in Australian history'. One of Australia's most eminent historians, Sir Keith Hancock, expressed roughly similar views when, as a young man, he wrote of the generation at the turn of the century, 'among the Australians, pride of race counted for more than love of country'.

The corollary of race pride, racism, has been considered by Humphrey McQueen (writing at the same age as Hancock, but forty years later) '...the most important single component of Australian nationalism'. Frank S. Stevens' recently edited work builds on the belief that the Australian racial experience contains virulent and sustained elements of prejudice and xenophobia - the basis of ethnocentrism - stretching back in particular to the 1890s when as a number of writers have shown, the 'White Australia' policy worked

---


3 Sir Keith Hancock, Australia, 2nd ed. (Brisbane, 1961), p.49.

4 Humphrey McQueen, A New Britannia (Melbourne, 1970), p.42.
out its final form. ¹ Historians such as Richard Hofstadter in America and A.E. Campbell in Britain agreed that British and American imperialisms from 1885 had 'Anglo-Saxonism, belligerent and pacific' as their 'dominant abstract rationale', while ethnocentrism, with its Darwinist element, 'more than anything else...set the tone of the argument' by providing an interpretation '...simple, comprehensive and impossible to prove'. ² Australian racial sentiment was part of a general phenomenon. Its particular tradition was expressed in its strong anti-Chinese and anti-Japanese bias.

Australian ethnocentric thinking was influenced by books on the topic from overseas, as well as by local productions. John Fiske's The Destiny Of Man and Excursions of an Evolutionist (both 1884), his articles, lectures and American Political Ideas (1885) were among the earliest to have a broad impact on these lines though inspired by earlier British historians, Carlyle (1842) and Seeley (1883). They affected E.M. Curr's The Australian Race (1886); W.E. Hearn's The Aryan Household (1891) and the American Charles Francis Adams' well known works in 1886 and 1892. Especially important was Charles Pearson's National Life and Character: A Forecast (1893), written while Pearson, the colony's former Minister for Public Instruction, was still in Victoria. ³ R. Thomson's Australian Nationalism (1888) and A. Patchett Martin's Australia and the Empire (1889) as well as more formally Imperial Federationist works were affected by Fiske and the British historians.

Among other important American influences on Australian ethnocentric thinking, beside William Graham Sumner who


³For Pearson, see J. Tregenza, Professor of Democracy (Melbourne, 1968).
coined the word\textsuperscript{1} were the writings of Josiah Strong (1885, 1893) and the works of Burgess, Hosmer and Carnegie (1890) and Mahan (1890, 1897) mentioned elsewhere. Though Brooks Adams' \textit{The Law of Civilization and Decay} (1896) and later works (1900, 1902) was defensive, like Pearson's, various others were more promotive of Anglo-Saxonism: Charles A. Gardiner's \textit{The Proposed Anglo-Saxon Alliance} (1898); Edmond Demoulins' \textit{Anglo-Saxon Superiority, To What It Is Due} (1898) and Charles Waldstein's \textit{The Expansion of Western Ideals and the World's Peace} (1899) to name but a few. Later works carried on the theme, for example: W.T. Stead's \textit{The Americanization of the World, or the Trend of the Twentieth Century} (1901); John Dos Passos's \textit{The Anglo-Saxon Century and the Unification of the English Speaking People} (1903) and A. Woodhouse \textit{The Foundations of National Greatness} (1905). Most of these books appear to have had an intellectual influence on Australian editorialists and other opinion leaders.

A number of influential, articulate overseas visitors stressed Australia's Anglo-Saxon links, thereby supplementing existing formal connections through British governors and officials. Among them were authors such as the Scot, James Inglis, who wrote \textit{Our Australian Cousins} (1880) for the Anglo-Indian market,\textsuperscript{2} and his fellow countryman William Westgarth, who wrote \textit{Half A Century Of Australian Progress} (1889).\textsuperscript{3} The English historian, James Anthony Froude published \textit{Oceana; or England and Her Colonies} (1886), the year following his trip to Australia.\textsuperscript{4} Charles Wentworth

---

\textsuperscript{1}Folkways, 1907, pp.12-15; though F.H. Gidding's 'consciousness of kind' concept broached the issue in 1896 in \textit{The Principles of Sociology}.

\textsuperscript{2}For Inglis, see \textit{Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol.4} (Melbourne, 1972), pp.457-8.

\textsuperscript{3}For Westgarth, see P. Serle, \textit{Dictionary of Australian Biography, Vol.II} (Sydney, 1949), pp.482-3.

\textsuperscript{4}For Froude, see A.D.B., op.cit., pp.221-2.
Dilke continued his earlier interest in Australia with Problems of Greater Britain (1890) and Imperial Defence (1892). James Bevan Edwards, an Imperial Federationist, was inspecting Australian defences in mid-1889. Contemporaneously, the Canadian Imperial Federationist, George Parkin was visiting Australia. He published Round the Empire in 1892. John Joseph Caldwell Abbott, Prime Minister of Canada 1891-92, visited the country in connection with the establishment of closer commercial contacts just before his death in 1893. Other visitors included the author Rudyard Kipling and the Salvation Army's founder, General Booth, who visited the colonies briefly toward the end of 1891. They increased Australia's awareness of belonging to a wider racial family. So too did general travel between England and Australia, often via America.

1 For Dilke, see A.D.B., op.cit., pp.74-5.
2 For Edwards, see A.D.B., op.cit., p.130.
3 For Parkin, see Encyclopedia Canadiaca, Vol.8 (Toronto, 1968), p.108.
5 For Kipling and Booth, see Carrington, Rudyard Kipling, op.cit., pp.260-1.
6 Regarding travel, for Victoria, 1890-9 inclusive, 70,386 departed for the United Kingdom, though from 1890 to March 1897, only six went directly to the United States. From 1890-9 inclusive, 67,281 arrived from the United Kingdom, while 171 arrived from the United States; see Passenger Ship Registers (Melbourne, Jan. 1888-Mar. 1901), Vols. "Englishmen travelling for pleasure or for business find it advantageous to traverse the U.S. and then to complete their circuit of the globe by travelling southwards to Australia before returning to Great Britain. Similarly, the opening up of communications between California and Australia leads numbers of Australians to visit the wondrous territories of North America." Standard, 3 Sept. 1890.
Andrew Inglis Clark, 1848-1907 is one example in this period of an Australian who represented the ethnocentric type. Born in Hobart; a lawyer in 1877 and elected to the Tasmanian House of Assembly the next year, he was a prominent member of the American Club and spoke of the 'Anglo-American Republic' with admiration. He first visited the United States on his return from a trip to England in 1890. During that stay, he renewed friendship with Moncure Conway, whom he had entertained in Australia in 1883, and was introduced by him to Oliver Wendell Holmes and other famous Americans with whom he corresponded for the rest of his life. The democratic and republican virtues of the American Constitution continued to appeal to him. In 1891 he circulated an important draft constitution bill at the Australasian Federal Convention in Sydney. B.R. Wise believed its American bias strongly influenced the Australian Constitution. Clark was a delegate to and served on important committees of the Federal Councils and Conventions during the 1890s. In 1897, he resigned from the Braddon Government and went to the United States to place his sons in schools there as well as make contact with American feminists. In 1900 he published a paper on 'Natural Rights' in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, of which he had been a member since 1891. His life and work was made up of a significant combination of English, American and Australian thought and activity.¹

Australian politicians of various hues widely disseminated ethnocentric attitudes in this period. Included in their large numbers were H. Parkes, A. Peacock, J. Quick, I. Isaacs, G. Reid, W. Hughes, E. Barton, A. Deakin, J. Watson, E. O'Sullivan, W. Spence and B. Wise. Most newspaper editors similarly broadcasted ethnocentric attitudes.²


All shades of opinion were influenced. Organizations such as the Australian branches of the Imperial Federation League promoted racial ideals up to 1890. The Australian Natives' Association (1898) did much of a similar nature. Labor organizations often easily accepted ethnocentrism as the corollary of the racism which they more openly endorsed, and Catholic as well as Protestant organizations freely subscribed to the ethnocentric concept—especially when Celts were given due regard as superior civilizations.


A constant stimulation was thereby given to editorial attitudes on race-kinship by this material.

From 1895 to 1899 Australian newspaper interest in this forging of closer links between Anglo-Saxon peoples focused at first on the fate of the specific arbitration agreement attempting to solve the Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute through the action of Cleveland's Commission. Later, it concentrated on the general arbitration agreement growing from the first development and embodied in the abortive Olney-Pauncefote

---

Melbourne Punch, 2 June 1898.
Treaty. By applauding, encouraging and occasionally agonizing over these arbitration developments, Australian editors revealed something of the nature of their own vague broader power aspirations beyond the framework of imminent federation as well as their underlying attitudes toward both England and America within the overall concept of Anglo-Saxonism.

Before reactions to these arbitration developments could be registered, underlying Australian press attitudes toward America had to reformulate following the disturbance caused by the crisis.

That there existed real differences between England and America was the first problem to be faced realistically by many organs of the Australian press. Some editors did this far sooner than their British counterparts who clung to an old-fashioned indulgent sentimentalism toward America. That a nation might not love Britain or the British, was not as inconceivable to Australians (especially Irish-Australians) as it appeared to some commentators in the mother country. There had long existed among Australian editors a sympathy for American independence and republicanism and an aversion to British class snobbery and patronage. It was quickly recognized that even family squabbles could be bitter and long-lasting and that the Alabama and Trent episodes had shown how readily bad feeling could develop.¹

Following Cleveland's second message - a convincing blow to existing notions of Anglo-American solidarity - several more radical organs of the press insisted that they had never believed in the notion of a 'pan-Brittanic idyll', despite the constant stream of overseas magazine and newspaper materials attempting to promote it, written by leading men in other countries. As independent of prevailing

¹Mercury, 6 Dec. 1895; Herald, 7 Dec. 1895.
opinion as ever, the Douglass's Geelong Advertiser insisted that 'unlimited and indiscriminate immigration has given the United States of today a more mixed racial population than exists elsewhere in the world' and worse, that this consisted of the dross of many countries, easily alienated from Britain. To prove this point, the paper claimed that the 26 (out of a total of 37) states which had backed Cleveland's belligerence were dominated by foreign elements - the Chambers of Commerce backing Cleveland for example, being mostly Dutch. The paper concluded that the blood-tie counted for nothing and that Britain would have to respond to an American challenge in as sanguinary a manner as if that challenge had been issued by the French or Russians.1

This situation, crowed the ever-sceptical Bulletin should be noted by all those eloquent drivellers who drivel so diffusely at maudlin banquets about the 'two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race' and the 'brotherhood' thereof and the 're-union of the English-speaking peoples' and similar absurdities.2

Conservative papers were near the edge of despair concerning what they believed was deep-seated, ineradicable jingoism and anglophobia existing in America toward Britain. The present outburst had severely crippled, if not destroyed the growing amity of the two nations it was felt, for even the Prince of Wales' telegram of goodwill and conciliation sent to Pulitzer's New York World had little tangible effect. The new attitude of Britons toward Americans must be one of 'cool watchful distrust' thought the Sydney Mail, for:

> It is useless going on talking the old language of friendship, kinship and brotherly good-will when one party to the relationship is animated by bitter and unrelenting animosity to the other. Since this is so it is better that it be recognized and frankly admitted...Any attempt to draw into closer and more friendly relations

1Geelong Advertiser, 23 Dec. 1895.

with a country which imparts the trickery and faction and unscrupulousness of its party politics into the more serious matters of diplomacy and international polity must be relinquished as hopeless.1

What had happened wrote the Advertiser, some time later, 'surprised and gave publicity to a kind of secret...that Americans love the Englishmen and hate England'.2

Misunderstanding was not all on one side. Christopher Crisp delighted in quoting the views of the American Franklin Eastman whose eloquent plea for understanding appeared in the Atlantic Review. To Eastman, Americans were neither philosophical radicals, English provincials, half-civilized pioneers, utopians, nor silly boys and girls as England constantly insisted they were. They were instead, a 'conservative and cautious people', easily misunderstood through distortion and exaggeration.

There is one liberty we claim as our English birthright - the liberty of being illogical when we please and succeeding or failing according to our own ideas of working out our own problems whether they are yours or not, he concluded.3

The Age joined in this defence. Critics like Lord John Russell, Sydney Smith and Charles Dickens had falsely labelled Americans as corrupt swindlers and hypocritical sycophants with absurd institutions containing ridiculous public men.

Yankee meat, Yankee cheese, Yankee oysters and all other Yankee notions with the exception of Yankee dollars and canvas - back ducks are names for inferior articles in the minds and mouths of most Englishmen, the paper chided.4 For their part, Americans were realizing,
claimed the *Argus*, that despite the irritations of 30 or 40 years, Britons were not 'foreigners'; nor were they insolent, bullying thieves as many Americans claimed. Given these mutual misconceptions, means had to be found, in the words of the *Advertiser* to 'extinguish distrust and promote genuine cordiality'. Mark Twain observed regarding Australian press opinion during the crisis: 'the outlook is that the English-speaking race will dominate the earth a hundred years from now, if its sections do not get to fighting each other'.

It was recognized that if restraint was exercised by both sides, a return might be made to something like the kind of amity that had existed between Britain and America at the end of November 1895. Certain things were possible 'only in America' some conservative papers agreed with England's Lord Bryce, and therefore had to be tolerated; the best means of handling America being '...kindness and firmness combined'. Other editors reminded readers that the German-American anti-imperialist Carl Schurz had urged his fellow countrymen not to 'swagger among the nations of the world with a chip on the shoulder, shaking a fist in everybody's face'. With the prospect of immediate hostilities past, the *Age* on 4 February 1896 was typical of those who in their desire to promote renewed solidarity, sought a scapegoat upon which to lay blame for the bad feeling engendered:

The mere suggestion that two great nations like Great Britain and the United States, allied by ties of blood, a common language and to a great extent, a common past, should embroil themselves in a fratricidal war because a little swindling,

---

2 *Advertiser*, ibid.
3 Mark Twain, *Following The Equator*, op. cit., p.168.
4 *Argus*, ibid.
half-savage state like Venezuela sets up a preposterous claim to a few miles of primeval forest is really too absurd. Far better would it be for the world at large if the miserable little despotism masquerading under the name of a republic were blotted out altogether from the map of nations than one drop of Anglo-Saxon blood should be spilt in its defence. 1

The *Argus* 2 summarized pre-crisis attitudes when on 9 November 1895, it confirmed Mahan's contention that the isolationist infancy of the States had passed. It also echoed the 'beautiful dream' of the former editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* and *North American Review* (1857-1872), James Russell Lowell - of an Anglo-American naval alliance to secure an absolute supremacy of the seas. Deploiring the publicist-industrialist Andrew Carnegie's 'shrieking... rhetoric' in demanding that the great crime of George III be undone, the paper nonetheless approved of his sentiment that 'the English-speaking race all round the world should be politically united'. 3

By mid-January some papers were returning to these attitudes expounded a year before by Colonel Bell in front of the New South Wales Premier during a lecture at the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce. 4 One New South Wales country newspaper hoped for a future 'trinity of English-speaking nations - the United Kingdom, the United States and a United Australia... leagued together to maintain the cause of

---

1 Age, ibid.; 4 Feb. 1896.


4 Bell reported in *Bendigo Independent*, 31 Jan. 1895.
freedom'. The *Age* believed that 'although exceedingly sensitive to any supposed injury to their dignity as a nation (the Americans) are always ready to forget and forgive when John Bull offers the hand of friendship'.

Patriotic public orators like the Reverend A.S.C. James at the Bendigo Town Hall ('The Queen of Empires' delivered in mid-March) repeated the older myths that 'America is as truly English as is Australia and Canada' and that she would join Britain in an alliance against any future hostile European coalition. This sentiment was enthusiastically affirmed in the widely acclaimed Canadian poem of that time, 'The Sea Queen Wakes'. Though much of this material lay in the realms of wishful thinking, it revealed the nature of the attitudes which formed the background against which the prospects of arbitration were considered.

With the arrival of the news on 28 December of the fortification of New York Harbour, John Edwards' *Bendigo Independent* was typical of those puzzled by the failure in diplomacy leading to such a drastic situation. 'Surely there must be some secret and confidential methods of

---


3James' s oration reported in *Bendigo Evening Mail*, 12 Mar. 1896.

communications between British and American statesmen, the latter assuring them prudently that there is nothing in it after all?" he asked. 1 The Age attempted the most thoroughgoing explanation of this sort of diplomatic failure. 2 Despite the fact that many of the authorities on international law were American, it held, Americans were almost entirely ignorant of the amenities of diplomatic life. 3 Deliberately eccentric by European standards, oversensitive to criticism and unrestrained by Congress, belligerent United States representatives abroad had developed insolent and arrogant habits — an over-confidence born of 50 years of wonderful prosperity. Though Guizot, 4 the French historian and statesman who had judged that America was the most disagreeable country in the world to negotiate with was considered overcritical, nonetheless, 'being the youngest of the great nations and only admitted to the charmed circle recently [they have] all the bumptiousness and self-assertiveness of the parvenu', commented the Age. 5 Such comment was ironic for a colony which could itself associate responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs with a Britain sober and seasoned in diplomatic niceties, while enjoying the luxury of criticizing that conduct when it suited.

More specifically, Syme's paper had long opposed the recently censured Thomas Bayard in his role as America's ambassador to England (since 1883) and used examples from

1 Bendigo Independent, 28 Dec. 1895.
2 Age, 28 Dec. 1895.
3 H. Wayne Morgan criticized those Americans who 'considered diplomacy the last refuge of timidity': in America's Road to Empire (New York, 1965), p.3.
4 Guizot died 1874 — it was recognized that his views were somewhat dated.
5 Age, ibid.
his period of office, as well as earlier episodes concerning Seward's opportunism while Secretary of State (1865-1869), to make its point regarding American indecencies in the conduct of international affairs. The paper considered that setbacks in diplomacy concerning Hawaii and Samoa had resulted in the present American bluster. That it was no more than this seemed testified by precedents such as the humiliating end for America of the German pork dispute.

Many were edified by the way that some lawyers and judges, together with authors, churchmen and workers, British professional people and prominent men from universities and the aristocracy, were using every means to bridge the gap in understanding which diplomatic failure had exposed.

The most impressive intercessor suggested to help close this gap had been Pope Leo XIII, whose good offices had secured the solution of some minor European disputes. Australia's Catholic spokesmen were enthusiastic about the suggestion. John Farrell considered the offer 'made in the true spirit of Christianity...an example for all its teachers to follow' and castigatd Churches for not taking a more active role from the pulpit in discouraging war than they had done hitherto. The Advocate assured its readers that the Pope was a 'peerless arbitrator', anxious to reconcile the leading English-speaking countries because of the liberties they both

---

1 Age, ibid: Thomas Francis Bayard (Sec. State 1885-1889; Ambassador to Britain to 1897) had been censured by the House of Representatives, 7 Nov. 1895, for excessive Anglophiliaon. The Age opposed use of his official position to propagate for free trade. A critique of Bayard appears in Allen Nevins, Henry White, Thirty Years of American Diplomacy (New York, 1930), pp.111-12.

2 As Secretary of State, William H. Seward was supposed to have commented to the Duke of Newcastle that he was obliged to insult England.

3 The German Pork Dispute occurred between 1879 and 1891 when heavy embargoes were placed on American pork and other product by Germany in retaliation for high American tariffs on German manufactured goods. American agreement to provide adequate inspection for disease of such exports removed the German ban after a decade of negotiation.
offered Catholics. However, to reject such an offer would 'not strengthen the British position in the eyes of unprejudiced observers' it believed with its London contemporary, the Tablet. Whether the Pope was to be employed in the present dispute or not, the Tasmanian Irish-Catholic Monitor considered the long-term goal of a means of international arbitration, the need for which had been currently highlighted, one to be applauded. ¹

Cleveland's proposed Commission, backed by Congress, was received in Australia with initial suspicion and hostility. The main objection was that the Commission was to be forced on Britain by America despite weak Venezuelan claims and that the decision was to be dictated by the United States. It became then, a matter of principle for the colonies of Britain to reject such meddlesomeness from an external power. As a body, the Commission was criticized for irrelevance, ineffectiveness and bias. Not only was its constitution 'impossible' in the eyes of the Brisbane Evening Observer, it was as well 'a folly and an insult' as a concept. ²

Defenders of the Commission there were. To accept the Commission would be a vote of confidence in the justice of Britain's claims, they held. A decision in Britain's favour would vindicate its honour and was to be expected given the strength of Britain's case and the desire of America to drop as quickly as possible the crushing new responsibilities

¹ Advocate, 1 Feb. 1896; Monitor, 3 Jan. 1896; Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) raised the prestige of the Church to a height 'unknown since the Middle Ages' in the opinion of one observer. He successfully arbitrated between Spain and Germany over the Carolines. Both Archbishop Tonti of Caracas and the Earl of Kimberley had been involved in abortive Papal negotiations over the Venezuelan boundary.

she had so rashly assumed. It was expected that the Commission would fill in its time with historical discussion. With America obviously not intending force, the Bendigo Independent predicted the Commissioners would 'bring nothing more formidable into play than a theodolite and a surveyor's chain or a pair of spectacles for use among dusty papers....' Most of the Australian press displayed an amused contempt toward America and an almost pathetic faith in the firmness of British claims. The London correspondent of the Argus conjured up the delectable prospect of a decision both against Venezuela and discrediting Cleveland - an ironic fate for his upstart Commission.

Readers no doubt followed in a desultory way the cable items to the end of April 1896. These concerned the publication of a British Blue Book on the disputed area and the modifications to the structure of the Commission suggested by a variety of people such as Carl Schurz and H.M. Stanley - especially those to include Englishmen. They also probably noted the failure of the British government to appear too enthusiastic about arbitration, despite energetic efforts by Smalley, the Times' American correspondent, to involve his government. However, editorial interest, instead of concentrating on matters as narrow as British ambassador Sir Julian Pauncefote's agreement with the Venezuelan minister in the United States to consider the Yuruan incident claims separate from the frontier question (news of which arrived 21 March), began to channel itself instead toward the infinitely more fascinating prospect of a general arbitration.

---

1 Bendigo Independent, 28 Dec. 1895.

2 Argus, 29 Jan. 1896. See also, Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 28 Dec. 1895; Newcastle Morning Herald, 15 Jan. 1896. Nonetheless the Bulletin endorsed the Commission because it believed Britain's claims were weak and wished it to give that arrogant country a lesson.
treaty.1

Such a prospect had not just suddenly appeared. Hopeful efforts beginning in 1873, renewed in 1887 by Randal Cremer, the British M.P. and taken up again by him in 1895 with Secretary of State Gresham, had been made. Only the death of Gresham and the December crisis itself had intervened to curtail their further development. With the negotiations in January regarding the acceptance of Cleveland's Commission, the issue revived.2

Some Australian newspapers were at first doubtful of the efficacy of such arbitration. In the case of the unpaid Bering Sea Fisheries awards3 and the excessive American claims concerning the Alabama,4 Britain had several times been the victim of Yankee duplicity, it was felt. Claiming that the latter award had been a 'notorious and confessed swindle' and the Webster-Ashburton Treaty5 'a palpable fraud' open to grave suspicion', the Mercury for one concluded that 'this way of settling international difficulties is

3The Bering Sea Dispute (29 Feb. 1892) referred the question of pelagic sealing off the Pribilof Islands near Alaska to an international tribunal. Its decision 15 Aug. 1893 awarded damages of $443,151 to Britain which remained unpaid until 16 June 1898.
4Alabama Claims (1869-72) were decided by an international tribunal, 25 Aug. 1872, against Britain for failing to exercise 'due diligence' in preventing the Confederate raider Alabama from preying upon Union shipping. The $15,500,000 award was paid by Britain, but the unclaimed excess was never returned - a point which long rankled.
5The Webster-Ashburton Treaty (9 Aug. 1842) settling the controversial portions of the U.S.-Canadian borders was felt to be unfair by the British due to the use of 'rigged maps' by the U.S.
not likely to grow in favour unless national honour increases considerably.\(^1\)

Despite a general recognition that such agreements were not panaceas and that they were only as good as the mutual confidence placed in them, many commentators, reacting against the high cost of war in blood and treasure (an estimated 4,913,000 men in the preceding century; £172 million in Europe on armaments per year), were prepared to endorse any system which offered a prospect of peaceful settlement of disputes 'in the interests of humanity, commerce and common sense' as one paper put it.\(^2\)

Some commentators grew eloquent on the issue. The words of Tennyson from the volume, *Locksley Hall* were quoted:

Till the war drum throbbed no longer and
battle flags were furled,
In the parliament of man - the federation of the world;
There the common sense of most shall hold a
fitful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in
universal law.\(^3\)

Sydney's rabbi J.H. Landau based his sermon following Kislev, on arbitration:

As Jews [he said], we protest against war.
Intelligence, justice, righteousness demand the settlement of all international disputes by arbitration, such as the prophets of our race sang in the days when brute force prevailed and none but inspired men dreamed of any other forms of settlement.

The concept of the brotherhood of man would relieve the crushing burdens of an armed peace and strengthen and purify the basis of all government. Every Jew should 'do

\(^1\) *Mercury*, 12 Dec. 1895.


\(^3\) *Ballarat Courier*, 25 Dec. 1895.
his little part in creating a strong sentiment on the subject', he urged.\(^{1}\)

Risking some unpopularity in the voicing of its views, the *Australian News* at an early stage urged Salisbury to back down and concede arbitration to Cleveland's appointed body, in response to 'universal endorsement from numbers [sic] of men representing all grades of society and all shades of public opinion'. Affirming the more pervading sentiment for arbitration, the paper claimed (20 January):

> The probability is that if the whole of the British race were to be polled tomorrow, it would be difficult to find a thoughtful man who would vote in opposition to the line of argument we have ventured upon.

Others agreed, but more cautiously. The *Leader* was eager to discover some way to preserve peace with honour in the present situation given the costliness of modern war,\(^{3}\) while its parent daily the *Age* agreed with Sir Richard Webster,\(^{4}\) that disputes like the present could be easily handled by a regular tribunal. The paper also expressed irritation at Salisbury's tardiness in arbitrating and outlined and approved of the existence of a more durable, impartial court. With others, it was impressed by America's long-established reputation for employing arbitral means to settle disputes.\(^{5}\)

---

4. Sir Richard Webster was Attorney-General of England and president of the Congress of the Association for Reform and Codification of Laws of Nations. The meeting of the latter had just been held in Brussels.
5. *Age*, 3, 16, 21 Jan. 1896; *Age* quoted *New York Tribune*, also referred to an article in the *New York University Law Review*, listing the 80 U.S. disputes settled since 1816 by arbitration making it 'literally the peace nation of the world'. By contrast, see *Brisbane Worker*, 11 Jan. 1896.
John Farrell was similarly delighted by the cabled suggestion of an established permanent court of appeal. He viewed it as

refreshing...cold reason...in the midst of all the blisterous war talk. It provided...the germ of a movement which promises more for mankind than anything that human reason has yet evolved.

In this, he countered the view of Brient, his editor, who the day before considered arbitration had little chance of success as 'the original instinct that might is right and trial of arms a natural court of appeal survives among European nations'. As ever, it appears to have taken considerable courage for opinion-leaders to condemn the international lawlessness of the day and the arms race, despite their palpable absurdities.¹

It was easier to be critical of the new arbitration phenomenon than of the existing anarchic system. Many wondered aloud how arbitration could have prevented any of the 'great' wars - the Russo-Turkish (1854), the Prussian-Austrian (1866) and the Franco-Prussian (1870). Sceptics pointed to the already-established Peace Society's failure to inaugurate an international court of settlement; to the possibility that Britain might be involved with the settlement of speculative claims all the year round - a prey to any small government seeking popularity, and to the impossibility of arbitrating affairs involving national honour and policing decisions thus made. Critics also questioned the feasibility of arbitrating Ireland's status and pointed out the unpromising belligerence of the American Republican party's projected foreign policy attitudes. Far from dampening conflicts as many Australian editors suggested had occurred in the present situation, commerce would ultimately:

¹Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 14, 15 Jan. 1896.
provoke struggles as bitter and prolonged as any more readily arbitrable territorial dispute. Finally, with Salisbury himself, some editors agreed that the time was premature for such a broader form of tribunal.¹

Yet editorial support for the idea grew. This was assisted by the backing away of the Times from its formerly intransigent position and on recognition of Britain's vulnerability in Turkey, Egypt and South Africa and the need for the country to settle quickly some of its outstanding problems. A large number of editors agreed that conditions generally favoured addressing the American case first and that Salisbury's decision to arbitrate the Guiana-Venezuela issue after all, opened fruitful prospects for further cooperation. The growing Australian sentiment for arbitration was assisted by what was believed to be the favourable reactions toward arbitration animating France and Belgium.²

There was further thrust provided by W.T. Stead's call 'To All English Speaking Folk' in the Review of Reviews. This remarkable item of peace propaganda urged the full arbitration of all future disputes, was signed by prominent clergymen and also included Darby, Secretary of the Peace Society; W. Cremer, Secretary of the Arbitration Alliance and J.F. Green, Secretary of the International Arbitration and Peace Association.³

¹ For this debate, see, Age, 16 Jan. 1896; Newcastle Morning Herald, 15 Jan. 1896; Mercury, 16 Jan. 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 15 Feb. 1896. The opinions of H.M. Stanley and Amos Shields were widely quoted.


³ Review of Reviews, 20 Mar. 1896, p.230. Stead's enthusiasm for the project is described in Frederick Whyte, The Life of W.T. Stead (London, 1925), II, p.87, passim. In her competent summation of Stead, Barbara Tuchman notes: 'The connecting principle running through his causes was belief in man's duty to amend society and extend the British sway.' These progressive and ethnocentric principles help explain his Australian appeal. See The Proud Tower, pp.245-8, esp. p.246.
Despite the impressiveness of this direct appeal and those supportive materials appearing in the article literature, the tone of the Australian reaction was still much more cautious than its overseas counterparts. It most closely matched that of John Morley in the Nineteenth Century, who both praised the general arbitration impulse and urged proper circumspection concerning it. Conciliation which did not enfeeble diplomacy but left open the right of protest was preferable, it was maintained. Attitudes expressed during the 1890 Pan-American Conference and the 1893 Chicago Peace Conference were cited as examples of this approach.¹ In mid-March the Argus typified prevailing views when it concluded that only a 'limited arrangement may be feasible [or] worth striving for'.²

April was a particularly active month on the American scene for the cause of arbitration. By cable, Australians learnt of the successful meetings of the American Peace Society of Boston and the Universal Peace Association of Philadelphia and the special efforts of Church groups - particularly the Quakers - in promoting the project. On America's west coast, college peace resolutions and on America's east coast, mass peace demonstrations, were also reported in Australia's metropolitan press. By 25 April the great Arbitration Conference held in Washington four days earlier which had boasted 400 distinguished


²Argus, 16 Mar. 1896.
representatives of most American States was reported. By
the end of the month news arrived of the proposal for
general arbitration drawn up by a special committee of the
New York Bar association, who had presented it to Cleveland.
These American developments and the known enthusiasm for
arbitration of British conservatives and liberals (such as
John Morley, James Bryce, Lord Rosebery, Herbert Asquith,
William Watson, Herbert Spencer, Sir Richard Webster and
Arthur James Balfour) together with the various religious
and worker petitions (the latter containing names of 5,000
labour leaders) and the work of the Conference of the
International Arbitration League and London Peace Society,
made their impression on Australian editorial opinion.

From the moment when Salisbury entered the official
negotiations on the prospect of general arbitration,
involving an exchange of secret correspondence between
Olney and Pauncfote (March–July 1896), Australian opinion
had to fall back upon article literature, its own ruminations
and cable news to assess what, if anything, was happening.
For all the uncertainty of the progress of negotiations,
comment moved slowly toward a hopeful position, much of the
tenuous optimism of this intermediate period being
vindicated by the publication of the diplomatic correspon-
dence reaching Australia in September.¹

Debate concerning the possible relations of the two
peoples continued into mid 1896. This was stimulated
by the article literature whose points were taken up by
various newspapers. Broken Hill's Barrier Miner for example,
granted that British diplomacy regarding America had been

¹Foreign Relations of the United States, 1896 (Washington,
1897), pp.222–4; Olney to Pauncfote, 11 Apr. 1896, pp.224–8;
Salisbury to Pauncfote, 18 May, 1896, pp.228–31; Olney to
Pauncfote, 22 June 1896, p.234. Published in the Times.
maladroit at an earlier time but believed it unfair for Americans to now judge Britons by the standards of George III's day, especially when evidence suggested that Britons erred on the side of generosity toward Americans in particular, in awards for all branches of endeavour. ¹ Economist, and arbitrator of railroad disputes, David A. Wells, had opened a branch of debate in the North American Review in defence of Britain and this had been challenged in the April copy of the same magazine by W. Hazeltine. The latter's reply suggested that Canada should be surrendered to America in line with the Shelbourne programme of 1783, a proposition denounced as unfair and unnecessary by the Miner's editor and W.H. Fitchett. In the Australasian edition of the Review of Reviews, the latter juxtaposed the tolerance of Professor John Bassett Moore of Columbia University in the May National Review with the intolerance toward Britain of Evelen Laura Mason in the May Arena, though 'she represents a trend in American opinion with which we have, as men bound to face the facts, in all seriousness to reckon'. ² Others gathered more from events such as the friendly reception of the Honourable Company of the Artillery of Boston marching through the streets of London, than from wordy arguments. ³

Some papers remained unimpressed by the cable rumours that agreement on more limited arbitration was imminent. One pointed to Venezuela's palpable unhappiness with such an agreement while another regretted that referring Venezuela's whole claim to a board of arbitration would 'forfeit sovereign rights, barter away prestige for a shadow and invite future aggression from every pettifogging

¹ Barrier Miner, 4 July 1896, ref. to Stanhope Sprigg's article in May's Ludgate on 'British Schools of Music'.

² Review of Reviews, 20 July 1896.

³ e.g. Methodist (Melbourne), 26 June 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 8 July 1896; Sydney Mail, 3 Oct. 1896; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 20 July 1896; Ballarat Star, 23 July 1896.
State whose impudence is greater than its love of honour'. J.B. Moore (himself later an active member of peace and arbitration tribunals) had alerted Britons to the potential danger of collision with America on the issue of American trade carried in British bottoms. Steeling its readers against a possible renewal of Anglophobia, the gossipy social weekly Table Talk urged Melbourne theatregoers to extract an open apology from the well-known American actor and anglophobe, Nat Goodwin, before permitting him to appear on 25 July 1896 at the Princess Theatre.2

Few however expressed this open hostility, preferring to wait upon events. Editors kept the debate on the efficacy of arbitration alive in an intellectual way. The Maitland Mercury agreed with W.N. King in the Century that Venezuelans had little to fear from British commercial control of the Orinoco,3 while the Hobart Mercury agreed with the recently arrived former Governor and present Agent-General of Queensland, Henry Norman, who was playing a large informal role in arbitration negotiations. In his article in the Cosmopolis Norman believed the dispute over Venezuela was still full of danger.4 The conservative South Australian Register agreed with Lord Bryce's vague belief that 90 per cent of peoples were in favour of an International Court for the settlement of disputes, despite Salisbury's caution.5

Others were encouraged with opinions expressed by anti-expansionists Edward J. Phelps, Frederick Greenwood and

1 J.B. Moore had been Professor of International Law and Diplomacy at Columbia University since 1891.
2 Table Talk, 24 July 1896.
4 Mercury, 17 Aug., 9 Sept. 1896.
5 South Australian Register, 31 Aug. 1896.
William Graham Sumner. Some hoped that prospects for mediation would be speeded along by the encouraging precedent of Queen Victoria's Argentinian-Chilean adjudication, or by an unforeseen calamitous event in Turkey. Many more were inspired by the poem of American anglophile and former editor of the Atlantic Monthly, Thomas Bailey Aldrich in the July Century. Its last lines, referring to England's influence on America, ended hopefully:

Thy blood makes quick her pulses, and some day, Not now, yet some day at thy soft behest, She at thy side shall hold the world at bay.

In the opinion of Stead, 'a pleasant message to reach the old country on the 120th anniversary of the Declaration of American Independence'.

Though a decision had been made in July 1896 by both governments in Britain and America to publish their correspondence on the progress of arbitration in the hope of soliciting public opinion on the issues, real comment on various proposals by the Australian press did not begin until W.T. Stead launched it in the Review of Reviews (20 September).


2 Geelong Advertiser, 4 Sept. 1896; Leader, 12 Sept. 1896.

3 Aldrich's poem 'On Reading William Watson's Sonnets: The Purple East'.

Stead summarised the Salisbury propositions to Olney regarding specific arbitration as being first, the appointment of a joint commission composed of two Americans and two Englishmen, to report on the facts of the disputed territory. Second, when their report was obtained, the nomination of a tribunal of three arbitrators — one British, one Venezuelan and a third to be decided by the first two. At that point, Salisbury had agreed only to accept recommendations and not awards concerning the settled districts. The Advertiser for one, commended this caution.\(^1\)

Sir Edward Clarke, a prominent British conservative and a former colonial Solicitor General, deeply disturbed Australian editorial opinion in October with his suggestion that not only might the British claim be weak, but that the Commissioners' report could be adverse to Britain. The light that this threw on Britain's reluctance to arbitrate was now a sinister one some thought, and would not only confirm American anglophobes in their worst opinions, but might even lead to a war in which Britain would appear in the wrong.\(^2\)

Anxieties of this nature were assuaged to a degree by British ambassador Lord Pauncefote's return to Washington (22 October) after a three month absence in England.\(^3\) It was now felt that a solution was imminent. Times cables, acting on the intelligence supplied by George W. Smalley to G.E. Buckle, the Times' editor, who passed it on to Salisbury, anticipated that the stumbling block to agreement was the length of time determining recognition of prescriptive title by British residents in Guiana. Not until Olney suggested

\(^1\) Advertiser, 26 Sept. 1896.


\(^3\) Foreign Relations, op.cit., pp.254-5.
50 years of occupancy as a negotiating formula was the deadlock resolved. During this latter phase of the proceedings and just prior to the signing of a draft Anglo-Venezuelan treaty (12 November 1896), the Australian press weighed in with its judgements.

Smalley had clearly indicated that an agreement was at hand and this provoked a relieved response, in the weeks following the suspense caused by Clark's remarks. Those who believed Britain had done well, based their claims on the evident retention of British honour and the preservation of American goodwill. Those who held that America had triumphed, based their views on the assumption that America had 'forced' Britain to negotiate and had thereby enormously extended the powers of the Monroe Doctrine. What then appeared as a temporary solution was storing up potential future trouble claimed the pessimists, as Britain was bound to clash with these new pretensions. Salisbury's annual London Guildhall speech (9 November) differed dramatically in tone from the one the year preceding. Its placatory nature set the seal on what had been anticipated for days.

---


2 George W. Smalley was an American who had returned to his native country (aged 62) to report on events. Many Americans such as Roosevelt came to dislike his pro-British snobbery.

3 For editorial comment, see Maitland Mercury, 2, 9 Jan. 1897; 9 Nov. 1896; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 11 Nov. 1896; Courier 11 Nov. 1896; West Australian, 11 Nov. 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 11 Nov. 1896; South Australian Register, 11 Nov. 1896; Australian Star, 12 Nov. 1896; Launceston Examiner, 25 Nov. 1896; Advertiser, 26 Nov. 1896; Capricornian, 28 Nov. 1896; Mercury, 1 Jan. 1897; Age, 1 Jan. 1897.
Details of the Draft Treaty arrived 12 November. The court of arbitration was to have two members from both America and England with a fifth to be decided by both sides. Venezuela was not to be represented. With this news was cabled the judgement of the Times, which because of its Washington link had far outstripped all rivals as an opinion leader in Australia on this issue. It claimed the Treaty a 'signal diplomatic victory for President Cleveland' and felt that 'Great Britain had virtually conceded to the United States a general protectorate over the South American Republics'. Most conservative editorial opinion in Australia now followed this pessimistic line. It was described by some as a backdown by Salisbury in the face of American recklessness and by others as a menace to the rights of new settlers in Guiana's gold areas; a serious derogation of the rights of Europe and a blow to British hopes of joining a friendly European Concert.\(^1\)

Optimism however, had been reserved for the cabled news also arriving 12 November that a decision had been made simultaneous with that on the Venezuelan arbitration, to proceed with the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration. Ironically therefore, the very machinery which had seemingly produced so unsatisfactory an arrangement in the case of Venezuela, was being applauded for the potential manufacture of unknown future decisions.

Common sense and humanity now appeared in the ascendant, it was held by many: the practical difficulties of the Venezuelan arbitration should not be allowed to

\(^1\)For editorial comment, see, Argus, 12, 14 Nov. 1896, quoting Le Temps' reaction; Bendigo Evening Mail, 18 Nov. 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 17 Nov. 1896, quoting Bryce's American Commonwealth to the effect that Mexico would be swallowed up like Texas; Maitland Mercury, 31 Dec. 1896; Advocate, 21 Nov. 1896, 9 Jan. 1897, criticizing the Argus; South Australian Register, 20 Nov. 1896.
obscure the idealism and vision of the broader scheme.
Russell of Killowen, Lord Chief Justice of England, who had delivered a speech before 4,500 members of the American Bar Association at Saratoga in August and had been enthusiastically received, now dominated Australian press opinion on these new developments. Highlights of the text of the speech were presented by Stead in the September Review of Reviews, based on the London Times' coverage. 2
Russell's general belief was that arbitration could work when the true facts of the case were ascertained; the right principles of international law were applied to them and a proper adjustment on a 'give and take' basis with equitable compensation provided for. This sober assessment was even further muted by the warning that a possible permanent tribunal might assume 'intolerable pretensions'. 3
Such sensible caution still fitted much of the Australian mood. 4

A few Australian observers were prepared to indulge in more open endorsement of the idea. One of the most notable of these was Dr. E. Bevan, who moved a resolution which was carried by a unanimous vote of the Congregational Union and Mission of Victoria. It desired to place on record its deep thankfulness that the danger of war between Britain and the United States had passed away and to prevent further such

1 Charles Russell (1832-1900) was recognized by Australian editors for his widely admired personality; his liberal advocacy of Irish Home Rule; his outstanding defence of Parnell (1889); his counsel as arbitrator in the favourable Bering Sea Award (1893) and his masterful conduct of the trial of the Jameson raiders (1896). After the death of Lord Herschell, Russell acted as British representative in the Venezuelan arbitration of 1899.


THE ANGLO SAXON TRIPLE ALLIANCE.

Melbourne Punch, 22 June 1899.
danger to civilization and Christianity, it recommended the foundation of a permanent tribunal to arbitrate any future disputes, taking the decision for war out of the hands of either an excited populace or the party designs of politicians. In conclusion, it applauded the present progress of the movement and trusted that 'the public opinion of Australasia may be led to express itself in sympathy with this endeavour to promote the peace and brotherhood of the nations of the world'.  

The growing popularity of the idea expressed itself in considerable approval of Sir George Grey's suggestion for joint flags above clasped hands and the motto: 'Hands Across The Sea' - one to be adopted in many subsequent concerts, tableaux and pageants in Australia. Professor George Huntington of Carlton College, Northfield, in the United States, had suggested words for a combined anthem (sung to 'God Save The Queen' and/or 'My Country 'Tis of Thee') and they were also widely quoted in an approving way:

Two Empires by the sea,
Two nations great and free
One anthem raise,
One race of ancient fame,
One tongue, one faith we claim,
One God, whose glorious name
We love and praise....
What deeds our fathers wrought,
What battles we have fought
Let fame record.
Now vengeful passion cease,
Come victories of peace,
Nor hate, nor pride's caprice
Unsheath the sword.

---

1 The resolution appeared in Review of Reviews, 20 Oct. 1896.

2 Sir George Grey (1812-98) was well known in Australia for his explorations in N.W. Western Australia; his governorships of South Australia and New Zealand, (1877-9). He had left New Zealand for London in 1894.

3 e.g. Bendigo Evening Mail, 8 Oct. 1896.
In these ways, Australian public opinion as revealed by the press responded to the suggestions for limited arbitration on the one hand and general arbitration on the other. General proposals seemed almost invariably to evoke a positive response, while that for specific proposals was more negative. In either event, interest was widely aroused and emotions deeply stirred by the arbitration impulse. Developments during the next three years were to build on the foundations laid in 1896.¹
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The fortunes of these two sets of arbitration proposals progressed through several further stages. Both forms however accomplished something. The first, more limited variety did so in a way that similar future forms of arbitration would not. For Britain it was more a short-term material victory while for America it resulted in a longer-term moral victory, marking as much as anything America's emergence as a world power. The second, general form did not appear to yield much official fruit. But in a long-term informal way, by promoting a body of opinion in favour of Anglo-American agreement, it did have its effect - as the period of crisis in 1896, which gave underlying race patriotism its chance to emerge, was to illustrate. For reasons of its own, Australian editorial opinion encouraged both these varieties of arbitral developments between mid-1896 and the end of 1899.

Undoubtedly the single most powerful restraint on Australian editorial and other enthusiasm for arbitration treaties, whether specific or general, was the intensified American anglophobia released by the turbulent presidential election of 1896. It had been feared during the first half of the year that the aggressive foreign policy plank of the Republican party might renew discord with the British Empire. Following the nomination of William Jennings Bryan at the Democratic Convention in Chicago (8 July 1896) it became obvious that a far greater menace to Anglo-American harmony had emerged. For the latter half of 1896 the overriding suspense in Australia concerning the outcome of the election centred first, on fears of whether the arbitration impulse
would lose its momentum and second, on whether the whole Anglo-Saxon ethnocentric ideal would suffer permanent damage by a Bryan victory.\(^1\)

McKinley's nomination (17 June 1896) at the Republican Convention at St. Louis had not been welcomed by many conservative Australian papers, traditionally oriented as they were toward the low-tariff, anti-imperialist, gold-standard Democrats. Though he was often viewed as an extremist in policy and a mediocrity in ability, when it became evident that McKinley stood for the maintenance of the gold-standard as the basis for international finance, the Australian free trade press quickly joined its protectionist brethren in its support of the candidate of commercial prosperity and stability. It was generally conceded that a high tariff and 'Large Policy' in foreign affairs were more acceptable alternative prospects to English colonists sharing in the repercussions, than were either devaluation or chaos in international trade and finance.\(^2\)

Bryan's nomination three weeks later was received in Australia with howls of dismay from most sections of the press. The Sydney Morning Herald's disgust was typical. The 'Boy Orator of Nebraska' was a 'buffoon...tossed to the top by popular caprice'. His nomination was a 'burlesque...a preposterous piece of spread-eaglism...a warning against

---

1 \(\text{Age, 6 Feb., 23, 27 May 1896; Argus, 1, 3 June 1896, focused attention on the contemporaneous Canadian elections vindicating Free Tradism, it thought; Age countered this by insisting Cleveland's Free Tradism had ruined America and given McKinley his chance, 17 Oct., 2 Nov.1896. See also Advertiser, 2 Nov. 1896; Maitland Mercury, 11 June 1896; West Australian, 17 June 1896.}\)

a possible danger of democratic institutions. Most editorialists agreed that Bryan's cardinal crime was that he had decided to cater to the rabble in their demand for a devalued currency based on silver and that the mob who sought this revaluation were the tools of the silver monopolists and currency faddists. Worse, it was feared that Bryan as demagogue was marshalling all the greed and spite in America under the banners of socialism, communism and anarchy. Bryan's strong sectional appeal to the discontented agriculturalists and miners in the West and South of the United States was quickly detected. Most papers managed to curb their natural sympathies for the Populists who, four years after their first bid for the Presidency had, as the left wing of the Democratic Party, now captured it in their desire to redress pressing economic and social grievances. The rampant anglophobia of this western sectional group against the 'money power' of the North-Eastern financial establishment sinewed in Britain, was exaggerated in the Australian press through the cable reports, correspondents' letters and campaign literature emanating from Republican-dominated New York.

When large amounts of gold specie were shipped to America from New South Wales banks and the value of Colonial Stocks rose with British investment monies deflected from the United States, the financial apocalypse many Australians had feared seemed at hand. As the election neared, a Bryan victory appeared an increasingly more plausible result. In that event, the worst predictions were for a short-lived period of artificial prosperity derived from the release of hoarded gold, to be followed by a stupendous crash. This would affect British finance in particular and through it Australia and the world in general, causing a realignment of currencies with the promised American silver ratio of 16 to 1—or half the agreed international rate. More sanguine predictions were for the confinement of the ill-effects to the United States alone or for the operation of Gresham's Law to produce such a gold scarcity there, that it would be America herself who would be forced to retreat from the new ratio before other countries advanced toward it.

Many commentators revealed their conservative side in expressing regret at what they considered to be the cupidity of tens of thousands of 'little people' in America who wished to see their debts halved and seemingly have more money to spend. But Bi-Metallist Leagues in every Australian Colony expressed a guarded support for silver. The Barrier Miner, in Australia's largest silver centre, repeatedly explained the real advantages to Australian mining, trading and investment of a new internationally sanctioned bi-metallist agreement. Those like Bonython who agreed with this view, were at pain to distance themselves from Bryan's 'go it alone' attitude on the matter. The Meat Traders Journal was the first to reprint a letter from Canada sent by a strong pro-Bryan Silverite, Moreton Frewen—to the owner of 'Canonbar' station in New South Wales. That 'sublime failure' as he has been called by his biographer, assured Australian business journals that a Bryan victory, far from damaging Australia's commercial prosperity, would assist it by introducing lower American tariffs and bringing
more money into circulation. ¹

But other sections of Australian editorial opinion beside the commercial, remained sceptical of such beneficent results. Labor journals believed both major Presidential contenders to be equally the servants of large money interests and endorsed only the little known Socialist candidate. Religious papers reacted as violently as any at the challenge to the status quo and appeared particularly offended by Bryan's religious references (the 'Cross of Gold' speech) and what they considered to be open attempts at exploiting man's weak nature. ²

Large penny dailies in the capital cities squeezed most newsworthiness from the election excitement. Heavily influenced by the outrage demonstrated by G.W. Smalley, the Times claimed Bryan's election represented 'a greater peril than either war or domestic disloyalty'. Newspapers in Australia, wary of Smalley's bumptiousness, quoted the view without ever entirely endorsing it and few descended to the partisan depths of labelling Bryanism 'Lungs, Lunacy and Larceny' though such vituperation was well known.

Overseas materials, most of them damping Bryan as well, provided much room for comment. Nonetheless, there was an impulse in Australia as elsewhere to reduce the complex issues to bare simplicities. New South Wales' Premier George H. Reid spoke for many when he likened the election during a speech in the Legislative Assembly to a referendum


between gold and silver. The most reliable American commentator was the Sydney Morning Herald's perceptive correspondent. He was widely quoted as predicting a close election and, if Bryan's influence persisted, a growing rift by the end of the century between Anglo-Saxon peoples. Goldwin Smith was quoted along similar lines, but granted less credibility. Talk of mass hysteria and renewed civil war was confined to lighter journals such as Table Talk. Americans like Colonel Bell, recently returned from the United States, and visiting businessmen and sea captains, calmed such fears when interviewed, by assuring Australians of a speedy return to prosperity following the election, regardless of the victor.¹

Confusing the issue for all commentators was the break-up of old party loyalties with their resulting political realignments. This sort of disruptiveness, thought to be caused by the attraction or repulsion of Bryan's appeal, was felt to endanger the very principle of democracy in its emphasis on baser popular emotions. There was renewed debate on the efficacy of the American system of choosing political leaders, with special reference to developing Australian federal theory. Phrases concerning 'law and order', 'haves and have-nots' and the 'silent majority' entered the discussion.²

¹ Stead, Shaw and Fitchett in the Review of Reviews, June-Nov. 1896, were not unsympathetic to Bryan. They reviewed articles by E.L. Godkin, F. E. Haynes, J. A. Collins, R.B. Mahany, Dr. Arendt, Senators Miller and Chandler, J.R. Bishop, C.S. Gleed, W. C. Alden, A. J. Wilson, T. G. Shearman, Goldwin Smith and J. L. Rice among others. The views of Chauncey Depew, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Henty, John Russell Young, Henri Conuschi, Ernest Seyd, Alexander Del Mar, Dr Ireland, E. Atlgeld, E. V. Debs, Henry George and E. Bellamy were referred to. Among other Australian commentators, the most conspicuous were Lyne, O'Sullivan, Dr Jeffers and Grainger.

² Contained in the following editorials: Mercury, 2 Nov. 1896; Maitland Mercury, 2 Nov. 1896; South Australian Register, 3 Nov. 1896; Ballarat Courier, 3 Nov. 1896; Ballarat Star, 3 Nov. 1896; Australian Star, 3 Nov. 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 3 Nov. 1896.
Most newspapers agreed that it was the first time since Lincoln's election 36 years before that Australians had been so excited by the results of a Presidential contest. Run on the same day as 80,000 spectators viewed the favourite Newhaven win the Melbourne Cup, it was deemed as being of proportionate interest - an observation that would have pleased Mark Twain.¹ At the heart of the Australian anxiety was something deeper than the issues of silver, the tariff, or imperialism. What was feared most was the scuttling forever of those dreams of a peace-keeping Anglo-Saxon world federation due to the constant and massive strains that would be imposed on the relationship by belligerent Bryanite economic attitudes.²

News in Australia of Bryan's defeat (5 November 1896) produced much editorial comment. 'Demagoguery', 'Extreme Radicalism', 'Fiscal Faddism', 'Dishonour', 'Disorder' and most of all, 'Anglophobia' had been hearteningly deflated by the patriotism, honesty and sound commercial sense of all sections of the American people - so it seemed. Davies, Tasmania's arch-conservative who had predicted in the Mercury a return to a new Dark Age, reached the apogee of delighted over-reaction. He believed that 'in the world's record of telegraphy, a more important message than this, telling of the result of the United States Presidential election has never been flashed across the waters...³ For all their excess, such reactions indicate the degree of nervous relief with which even remote corners of Australia greeted the news. For a week, papers of all shades of opinion and backgrounds sank their differences in editorial

¹Twain, Following The Equator, op. cit., pp.162-4. He identified Cup Day and Election Day as Australia's and America's respective national festivals.

²Comment in the following editorials; Singleton Argus, 4 Nov. 1896; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 4 Nov. 1896; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 4 Nov. 1896; Launceston Examiner, 4 Nov. 1896; Argus, 4 Nov. 1896; West Australian, 4 Nov. 1896. A good index of the topic's seriousness was that cartoonists left it completely alone.

³Mercury, 5, 6 Nov. 1896.
rejoicing at the expected return of stability, prosperity and prospects for arbitration.\footnote{See the following editorials: \textit{Age}, 5 Nov. 1896; \textit{Advertiser}, 5, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 5, 7, 9 Nov. 1896; \textit{Daily Telegraph} (Sydney), 5, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{South Australian Register}, 5, 10 Nov. 1896; \textit{Courier}, 5 Nov. 1896; \textit{Daily Telegraph} (Launceston), 5 Nov. 1896; \textit{Mercury}, 5, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Herald}, 5 Nov. 1896; \textit{Ballarat Courier}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Ballarat Star}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Geelong Advertiser}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Geelong Times}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Bendigo Advertiser}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{The Northern Star}, 6, 11 Nov. 1896; \textit{The Week}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{West Australian}, 6, 9 Nov. 1896; \textit{Perth Morning Herald}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Australian Star}, 6, 10 Nov. 1896; \textit{Weekly Times}, 6 Nov. 1896; \textit{Launceston Examiner}, 11 Nov. 1896; \textit{Australasian}, 7 Nov. 1896; \textit{Arrow}, 7 Nov. 1896.}

This surge of optimism continued until the inauguration in March 1897, though it was tempered by those who maintained that the disruptive forces of Bryanism and discontent had only been rendered latent. Some also bewailed the potentialities for harm to the Australian economy in McKinley's flirtation with an international silver agreement and with a new high tariff against wool. The Dingley Tariff\footnote{Nelson Dingley (1832-99) was an editor, publisher and politician. As a Republican congressman from Maine, 1881-99, he prepared the tariff that bore his name.} of July 1897 made palpable those fears when it raised tariffs to an average of 57 per cent, the highest in America's history, which effected Australian wool and hides as expected. Though panic buying of wool had made the American market briefly lucrative, the renewal of restrictions from mid-1897 onward, helped cool feeling in Australia toward America. In this fashion, the election of 1896 paved the way for both the euphoria of early 1897 and the equally brief bitterness toward America during the
latter part of that year.¹

There followed upon the developments of November, a brief euphoric period in Australian editorial reactions, during which the general arbitration gains were hailed in Cleveland's terms as opening a new epoch in civilization. Whilst the specific arbitration treaty on Guiana-Venezuela awaited Venezuelan approval (2 February 1897) and Congressional ratification (30 March 1897) as well as further ratification between Britain and Venezuela (14 June 1897) before sinking out of sight until its conclusion (3 October 1899), the spotlight fell dramatically on the general arbitration, or Olney-Paunceforte Treaty signed 11 January 1897. Responding to Salisbury's remarkable and unprecedented invitation to comment on these foreign policy developments, influential sections of the press in all of the Australian colonies expressed

---

encouragement for this supremely ethnocentric turn of events. A great event in the history of the world... perhaps the first step toward a mighty English-speaking confederation, which if achieved, would dominate the world... one of the most important events of the nineteenth century... one of the most hopeful signs that the human race has yet seen,

were some of the words used by Sydney's Daily Telegraph. Others used similar superlatives to describe the treaty. 'The history of the world supplies no exact parallel to this momentous event', claimed the South Australian Register. It thought the 'impossible' had been attempted as an experiment

not by decaying states which have fallen under the sway of either timidity or sentiment, but by nations in the full heyday of their prosperity and vigour... To Britons wherever they may be, it cannot be other than a most gratifying reflection that it is Great Britain and America which are leading the way in the greatest and most beneficent movement of this or any other age. In this respect, the English-speaking race is acting in accordance with its noblest traditions and fulfilling the highest mission that it is possible for it to undertake.

---

1 See, Age, 5 Jan. 1897; Leader, 9 Jan. 1897. The later history of the specific arbitration is covered in Proceedings of the Tribunal of Arbitration between Great Britain and the United States of Venezuela (Paris, 1899). The Olney-Farnecote Treaty was designed to cover all types of controversies and to provide a final decision in most cases. Pecuniary claims not exceeding £100,000 were to be subjected to the final decision of a tribunal composed of one arbitrator from each country and an umpire chosen by the two; all larger pecuniary claims and other controverted matters except territorial claims were to be submitted to such a tribunal of three, but unless their decision was unanimous, an appeal might be made to a second tribunal of five: two from each country, plus an umpire chosen by the four. Territorial claims were reserved for a tribunal of six members: three from each party, with no umpire and were not to be final unless agreed to by at least five of the arbiters. Disagreements over the choice of umpires were to be resolved by the King of Sweden. See Arbitration with Great Britain, 58 Congress, 3rd session Senate Document No. 161, pp. 2-7.

2 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 13, 16 Jan. 1897.

3 South Australian Register, 14 Jan. 1897.
BETTER UNITE THAN FIGHT.

"If you and I agree to settle our little differences amicably now, we may presently employ the strength of the Lion and the cunning of the Eagle in settling our little differences with other people."

Melbourne Punch, 20 January 1897.
Even the highly conservative *West Australian* thought the treaty "invested with a dignity, a significance and a potentiality far exceeding anything that has preceded it by reason of what is termed its permanent character."\(^1\)

This euphoria did not last long. Earliest opposition in Australia to the concept of general arbitration centred on what Sidney Low had called in an article in the December Nineteenth Century, the 'Olney Doctrine'. This new version of the older Monroe Doctrine obviously implied that a conflict sometime in the future concerning tracts of land in the Caribbean, Central and South America or Canada was inevitable and this probability dampened the congratulatory impulse animating other organs of the press. Another line of argument had it that to appear too enthusiastic about the treaty was to ensure its defeat by arousing the suspicions of the American anglophobes. Vague notions of the damage to a potential Australian Monroe Doctrine claiming the hegemony of the South Pacific following Federation, through a permanent Anglo-American agreement embodying even bolder concepts of Monroeism than the Olney variety, similarly worked against universal acceptance of the treaty among some Australian editors. But even more telling than the arguments of those worried about the frustration of Australia's future power aspirations were the arguments against human nature allowing the completion of such a scheme. The *Perth Morning Herald* was the most discouraging:

---

\(^1\) *West Australian*, 14 Jan., 1897. See also, *Argus*, 12, 13 Jan., 1897; *Maryborough Standard*, 14 Jan. 1897; *Mt. Alexander Mail*, 25 Jan., 1897, referred to the union of the "two great, pure, white world forces, birds of the same stock..."; *Advance Australia*, official organ of the Australian Natives' Association in its inaugural edition, *Australia Day*, 26 Jan., 1897, denied that Britain had committed herself to backing the Monroe Doctrine.
New epochs in civilization are not brought about by paper treaties; international difficulties are not settled by an application of the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount (which) in the mouth of a statesman or politician is cant...of a very nauseous kind. ¹

Senate opposition to the treaty which had manifested itself immediately following the treaty's announcement was the factor which did most to sour the early enthusiasm. A treaty promising universal peace and goodwill was too good a thing to be killed by 'baleful influences' and 'malevolent attacks' insisted the Mercury. For, in a blatant land where craving for excitement and sensation marks every phase of public life, where hallucinations or inventions defy all the resources of fact...honest, practical politics in America receive many rude shocks. ²

Jingo senators like Morgan from Alabama, the new Secretary of State, John Sherman, and the United States Board of Trade were all felt to be gathering their strength to defeat the treaty in the face of popular press, religious and business agitation in America supporting it. Amendments by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee were viewed as being similarly hampering. Some suspected lobbies from American armaments manufacturers and German, French and Irish minorities as working against it. The most obvious explanation to others was that America wished to retain a predominance over the Nicaraguan Canal and was not prepared to negotiate concerning it. Personal spite and factional malice aimed against the outgoing party of Cleveland and Olney were also keeping opposition to the treaty alive, as were the frustrated Western populists and silverites; it was held. All, aspects of American life had been affected by the overwhelming spirit of unrest caused by unsatisfactory

¹Perth Morning Herald, 14, 18 Jan. 1897. See also, Sydney Morning Herald, 15 Jan. 1897; Courier, 16 Jan. 1897; Ballarat Courier, 16 Jan. 1897; Bendigo Advertiser, 15 Jan. 1897; Capricornian, 16 Jan. 1897; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 16 Jan. 1897; Bendigo Evening Mail, 14 Jan. 1897; Barrier Miner, 14 Jan. 1897; Review of Reviews, 20 Jan. 1897; Young, op.cit., p. 279.

²Mercury, 16 Jan. 1897.
domestic economic conditions asserted the Launceston Examiner, the arbitration treaty suffering among other things. 1

Opposition of this kind helped drain away the hostilities initially expressed by certain Australian commentators and aroused sympathy for the scheme in others. Even the Melbourne Punch joined the Age in criticizing the half-hearted endorsement of arbitration shown by Salisbury in his Address in Reply to the Queen's Speech opening the Imperial Parliament. For, 'we do not expect war to be abolished within the next ten years as a result of this treaty...but we expect much more than the English Premier is prepared to admit'. 2 Other former opponents, like the Sydney Morning Herald, were impressed by the body of opinion in America growing in its favour and 'though the treaty may not lead to a perennial peace...the opposition to it seems wholly out of place and against the popular weal'. 3

Though not an epoch-making event, claimed the Advertiser, the treaty was valuable as a precedent, 'the embodiment of sentiments that cannot be compressed into legal and diplomatic phraseology...more effective and enduring than a formal alliance'. Opposition to such a scheme, it held, could only be a short-term hindrance, compared with the slower 'ocean current' of 'irresistible' popular feeling for arbitration that had been awakened. 4 The Daily Telegraph was more trenchant. It attacked the many journals and influential men in America against the Treaty as 'a conspiracy against civilization and the worst of national crimes...a declaration in favour of the old method of

---

1Launceston Examiner, 2; 26 Feb. 1897. See also, Sydney Morning Herald, 3 Feb. 1896; Sydney Mail, 23 Jan. 1897; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 13 Feb. 1897; Advertiser, 4 Feb. 1897. Pulitzer's N.Y. World received 2,000 replies from church, labour, educational and commercial leaders—mostly favourable to the treaty; of 400 U.S. newspapers polled, only ten percent were critical or hostile. Literary Digest, XXV (23-30 Jan. 1897), pp.357-8, Public Opinion, XXII, (21 Jan., 11 Feb. 1897), pp.66-70, 166-7, Senate Documents No. 63, 55 Congress, 1 Session, p.2. The Examiner was aware of this material.

2Melbourne Punch, 28 Jan. 1896; Age, 22 Jan. 1897.

3Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Jan. 1897.

4Advertiser, 2 Feb. 1897.
settling international disputes by means of gunshot wounds and bayonet thrusts'.

Others accepted the treaty's inevitable defeat with better grace. Human nature could bring any treaty, 'though drawn up by a committee of angels, to hopeless breakdown', held the Australasian. Further,

if the United Senate can throw out a treaty of arbitration for the sake of affronting Mr. Cleveland, it might reject the award of the arbitration of that treaty for the sake of a party triumph, or to gratify any transitory craze of popular passion.

With its parent daily, the Argus, it viewed the imminent defeat of what the Daily Chronicle had called 'the event of the century' and 'one of the most celebrated events in diplomatic history' - as part of the 'inevitable satire of history'. For, 'the privilege of twisting the lion's tail when occasion suits, is too dear to be surrendered'. Behind the brave words and 'sour-grapes' attitude there was nonetheless among those who had dared hope for much, 'justification for real regret'.

Hope for the treaty's survival in however truncated a form, had been kept alive by the document's 'wise prudence and business-like' nature; the belief that Continental European opposition to the treaty would be combated by patriotic American feeling, and the hope that the Senators could not really be as cynical as they appeared at a distance. New hope however, sprang from the impetus of approval given the treaty during the inauguration of McKinley (4 March 1897). Beside promising a 'firm and dignified' foreign

---

1 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 3 Feb. 1897.

2 Australasian, 27 Feb. 1897. The paper however was not so inclined to completely agree with E.L. Godkin's assault on war in the Century as an 'animal' method of settling differences (13 Feb. 1897); Argus, 5 Mar. 1897. Both papers welcomed the announcement (22 Feb. 1897) of Colonel John Hay's appointment as ambassador to London replacing Thomas Bayard. Hay was expected to revitalise Anglo-American diplomatic activity. See also, Nairnland Mercury, 27 Feb. 1897.
policy, he had recommended the Senate 'as a duty to mankind' to ratify the Olney-Paunceforte general arbitration treaty as a 'glorious example of reason and peace'. Boosting these new hopes was the influential opinion of
the Sydney Morning Herald's New York correspondent who held that despite all objections, especially the well-known reluctance of the Senate to embark on novel departures in policy, 'nine Americans out of ten believe that the treaty will somehow make its way safely into port'.

The American Senate now became the focus of hopes and fears concerning the fate of the treaty. With journals in America and Britain, Australian papers vigorously attacked senatorial pretensions, which appeared to desire an even great influence in foreign affairs than the President.

Stead, particularly, was furious at the mutilations wrought on the treaty by the Senate. He impugned American sincerity, pointing out the irony that America's desire to go to war in late 1895 over the principle of arbitration was being contradicted by their present intransigence regarding the passage of an arbitration proposal initiated by them and forced on Britain.

Smalley's view that the arbitration treaty was 'dead' was first taken up by the Melbourne Herald (27 March 1897) lamenting, 'so perish therefore, all the great hopes formed on both sides of the Atlantic'. What had killed it?
A failure of racial sympathy thought the Geelong Advertiser:

---

1 Sydney Morning Herald, 9 Mar. 1897. Letter sent 9 Mar. 1897. See also, Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 8 Mar. 1897; Mt. Alexander Mail, 9 Mar. 1897; Mercury, 10 Mar. 1897; Leader, 13 Mar. 1897.


3 Herald, 27 Mar. 1897.

4 Geelong Advertiser, 29 Mar. 1897.
a lack of ready cash to pay the outstanding Bering Sea award believed the Mercury. For, 'the enemies of Great Britain in America are many and must influence legislators in a country where political action is as corrupt as in any part of the world, excepting Turkey'. Others suggested that Senators were withholding their support in the hope of extorting benefits for the pecuniary interests they represented; out of pure cussedness, or from revulsion against a detested administration. Whatever the reason, the result was undesirable and potentially disastrous for Britain, 'due to threatened crises in the Mediterranean, the Nile, India, China and Siam'. Not only was the Senate running counter to public opinion on the issue, but it was steadily losing the confidence and respect of the people and stood to 'damn itself to everlasting fame'.

Australian constitution-makers stood to learn from the American Senate's terrible example, others warned. An Upper House placed by constitutional enactment above the voice of the public and hence irresponsible as was the American Senate, became an obvious hindrance to a democracy as the present situation showed, for such a body could not even be controlled by the threat of the creation of new peers. Power should be written into the Australian Constitution to prevent such deadlocks some added. The present circumstance sadly illustrated how regardless of the praise of John Bright and Sir Charles Dilke, the American Senate had degenerated and was far from the ideal of consisting of the best men.

The Sydney Morning Herald believed that the narrow attitude of the American Senate was symptomatic of the

---

1Mercury, 29 Mar. 1897.

2See, Sydney Morning Herald, 30 Mar. 1897, correspondent's letter sent 27 Feb. 1897. Smalley had again performed sterling service as an 'early warning system', though he was mocked by the Sydney Telegraph as 'a big journalist who knows all things', 13 Feb. 1897. See also, Chronicle, 3 Apr. 1897; Mercury, 3 Apr. 1897. But jingo papers like the N.Y. Sun and Journal, the Chicago Tribune and Irish World and parts of the more Western U.S. presses were opposed to the treaty.

3Ballarat Courier, 7 Apr. 1897; Mercury, 8 Apr. 1897.
'degrading, demoralising' nature of American life. This was in line with the Times' indictment. The Senate had struck a blow at the principle of arbitration itself and at the confidence of the world in the American people....There is in its action a note of levity, of wantonness and of irresponsible caprice, such as happily, is very rarely struck by any legislative assembly.

New South Wales' senior metropolitan newspaper hastened to assure its readers that such behaviour would not have occurred in Australia to mar such 'a unique and great occasion' as the achievement of Anglo-Saxon solidarity. The Federal Convention which had been sitting in Adelaide since 22 March 1897, was urged to consider these points in its protracted debate on the nature of the Senate in the coming Australian Federation. Whether strong as Conservatives wanted, or weak as Liberals and Labor members wished, the main concern was that the Australian Senate should be flexible, cooperative and responsive to the popular will.

This sort of criticism injected an increasing amount of realism into the commentary. H. Wilson, author of Ironclads In Action, was often quoted for his view that the arbitration process could be the occasion for more friction than amity due either to non-payment of awards or biased and fraudulent decisions. Others considered the old 'give and take' concessions of diplomacy a preferable system. Even the Argus was dubious as to whether the European wars of the nineteenth century could have been avoided. For arbitration would have had in those instances as much effect as 'pulling at a locomotive with a snaffle bridlet. The Sydney Morning Herald's American correspondent rationalized the failure by admitting the treaty was merely 'a general

1Sydney Morning Herald, 16 Apr. 1897; London Times, 10 Feb. 1897.
2See editorials in Age, 17 Apr. 1897; Advertiser, 6 May 1897; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 7 May 1897.
3Age, 22 Jan. 1897; Argus, 5 Mar. 1897.
expression of opinion that war should be reached by three stages instead of two. 1

Louis Tracy, that 'Anglicized American with some experience as a war correspondent' as one paper described him, was assessed by several editors in April and May 1897 for his book The Final War. It timed 'Armageddon' as 2 May 1898 and visualized the struggle as that of twelve million English-speaking troops against Germany, France and Russia — a struggle from which the former emerged victorious. His conclusion that the destiny of Britain and America is to rule the world, to give it peace and freedom, to bestow upon it prosperity and happiness, to fulfil the responsibilities of an all-devouring people; wisely to discern and generously to bestow; was now condemned as ridiculous, misleading and mischievous — an editorial reaction reflecting better than anything the new sobriety of opinion. 2

The outbreak of the Greco-Turkish War (17 April 1897) served to remind Australians that it was still a hazardous world and despite the imminence of the treaty's defeat, many continued to voice support for the ideal of the peaceful settlement of disputes. The International Union of Peace meeting at Berne in March was taken as a hopeful sign that the peoples of the world, if not their governments, wanted such a peace. The South Australian Register echoed the hopes of Professors Freeman and Dicey for a 'common citizenship of the English race', 3 while the details of the panegyrics delivered by the British economist Morley and American diplomat Bayard in praise of the Anglo-Saxon initiative were applauded in other editorials. W.T. Stead let it be known that he would accept any treaty, no matter how mutilated. 4 Sir Langdon Bonython's paper attempted a last word on the day of the Senate vote on the treaty: 'The

1 Sydney Morning Herald, 30 Mar. 1897; letter of 27 Feb. 1897.
2 See editorials in Advertiser, 9 Apr. 1897; Sydney Morning Herald, 16 Apr. 1897; Barrier Mail, 26 May 1897.
3 South Australian Register, 21 May 1897.
4 Review of Reviews, 20 May 1897.
ideal of humanity, so far as the Anglo-Saxon world is concerned is nearly if not quite attained', he believed. Even if not adopted by legislatures, the treaty had been adopted with enthusiasm by the peoples on both sides of the Atlantic, and like Penn's treaty with the Indians in Pennsylvania which was 'never signed and never broken' the arbitration treaty is operative from henceforth. 1

News of the defeat of the much-amended treaty came as no great surprise to Australians. On 5 May 1897, even a weak gesture of good-will toward Britain which was all the treaty by then represented just failed to gain a two-thirds vote and was lost by 43 votes to 26 in the American Senate. Silverites, determined amenders, Irish, Anglophobes of different hues, anti-arbitrationists and arrogant Senatorial power had combined to destroy it. But, as the Advertiser and others intimated, the idea had taken root in Australia as elsewhere and the hopes expressed for future rapprochement would not easily die away.

However, during the latter half of 1897, Australian editors indulged themselves in expressions of irritability toward America. The most immediate items to attract criticism were domestic developments - a traditional source of anti-American reactions. McKinley's newly-appointed Secretary of State, John Sherman, 2 the younger brother of the famous general, then 74 years old, was an early target. He had been regarded with mixed feelings in Australia due to his leading role in enacting two important items of legislation in 1890: the Anti-Trust Law, at first applauded until judged ineffectual, and the Silver Purchase Act, which came to be considered an unmitigated evil. His appointment was cynically regarded as an open political reward for past services rendered to the Republican party. As the former

1 Advertiser, 6 May 1897. See also Sydney Morning Herald, ibid.; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 8 May 1897; Age, 17 Apr. 1897; Courier, 20 Apr. 1897.

2 John Sherman subsequently resigned his office due to the strain of the Spanish-American war in April 1898 and died 22 Oct. 1900.
chairman of the Senate committee on foreign affairs which had done so little to help the treaty, these services were not considered highly in Australia. Now his tactless jingoism and anglophobia became once again evident when he attacked Britain for 'quarreling more often than she fought' and by sending despatches to Salisbury at least as provocative as some of Olney's had been. In particular, he attempted to reopen the Bering Sea controversy. This served only to remind Australians of America's bad faith in that affair and how palpable had been the failure of the arbitration system in that case. Harsh words concerning Yankee 'smartness' were applied. 'In the affairs of great nations they show a bewildering readiness to use the arts of a fifth-rate court practitioner', the Argus charged. Sherman was bracketed with the 'tiresome old ranters' of the Senate and not taken seriously. But the Mercury, which had lost patience, insisted that Americans needed to be taught a lesson and treated in the same rough fashion they treated Britons.

We submit that the constant references to [the Americans] as a great, noble, conscientious people are just the kind of stuff to make them despise the English and be a great deal more insolent and aggressive than they are...At all events it seems to be [Britain's] duty to preserve her own dignity and not be constantly fawning as if she was dreadfully afraid.2

Beside the enactment of the Dingley Tariff in July which because of its concentration on wool many in Australia took as a direct affront, there were other minor irritations. One concerned the much publicized murderer Butler, hung at

1 Argus, 20 July, 8 Sept., 20 Dec. 1897.
2 Mercury, 16, 17 Sept. 1897. See also Herald, 9 Aug., 30 Sept., 1897; Geelong Advertiser, 10 Aug. 1897; Bendigo Evening Mail, 10 Aug. 1897; Advertiser, 21 Aug. 1897; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 21 Sept. 1897; Brisbane Evening Observer, 28 Sept. 1897; Sydney Morning Herald, 12 Aug. 1897, 13, 21 Jan. 1898. Materials from the British Blue Book and from a November Macmillan's article were quoted on the Dispute and from the New York Herald on Sherman.
Darlinghurst jail (16 July 1897) after having been apprehended in San Francisco and extradited at New South Wales' insistence. Beside an exorbitant claim for £7,000 to cover the four long months of court proceedings, the United States' Government suggested that a piece of silver plate to the value of £100 be presented to their Attorney General. John Henry Want, Q.C., ¹ indigantly suggested that America keep any future such criminals and during a heated debate in the New South Wales Legislative Council (4 August) loud cries were heard for the revision of extradition treaties along reciprocal lines. ² The Ballarat Star suggested that the figure requested by America be withheld as part payment of Britain's outstanding Bering Fisheries award. ³

Australian sensibilities, most acute concerning sport, had also been offended by the shabby treatment of the Australian baseball team visiting America in the summer of 1897. 'Cheating and intimidation were felt to be frankly justified and constantly utilized in defeating the visitors,' complained the Bendigo Evening Mail. But the trouble was broader: 'The same sordid, degrading spirit seems to permeate the sporting, the judicial and the political life of this people, so great in numbers and in wealth. The almighty dollar is supreme, Mammon is their God and the fruits of worship are lying, thieving, bragging and bullying!' ⁴ The Melbourne Leader agreed:

> Not only in baseball do American methods strike outsiders as not altogether consistent with fair and honourable dealing. Our cousins across the Atlantic [sic] play to win the game and in their desire to attain this object they appear to cast away all scruples as useless and hampering lumber. In matters or sport this theory is accountable for much irritation and many misunderstandings, but introduced into the more

¹John Henry Want (1846-1905) was an advocate and politician who served as Attorney General in the Reid Ministry (1894-99). Always strong-minded, he was a determined anti-federationist.

²The issue was covered in most newspapers (July-Aug. 1897).

³Ballarat Star, 6 Aug. 1897.

⁴Bendigo Evening Mail, 10 Aug. 1897.
serious realm of politics, it is liable to evolve graver danger.

At this point, America's standing in some Australian eyes reached its nadir.¹

Overseas analyses of America were pursued for similar condemnatory appraisals. One brought to Australian readers' attention was America and the Americans, From the French Point of View. Traditionally friendly, the French too, were undergoing an anti-American phase. The book attacked America's government as a 'plutocratic ochlocracy' and its Senatorial power as undemocratic and unrepresentative given that 'almost one fourth of the voting power...is in the hands of men who represent a population smaller than New York city'. The book predicted 'a mad war of races, interests and classes' resulting from the strains in American society. Altogether, this outsiders' view verified all the worst estimates long entertained by Australian editors.²

There followed a period wherein older charges of Yankees as loud-mouthed braggarts was revived. Some arguments were specifically designed to combat the false judgement of W.D. Howells, who in the July Harper's Magazine had claimed Americans were 'modest...thoughtful...quiet and meekly attentive' and to defend Britons accused in the Forum of being 'unsympathetic, unsociable and overbearing'.³ To make their own predilections perfectly clear, some papers reacted violently to the supposed suggestion of the American journalist Whitelaw Reid, that Australia's Colonial Premiers who had so impressed at the Diamond Jubilee Celebration in London were 'Much more like Americans than

¹ Leader, 14 Aug. See cartoon 'Australian Baseball In America', Melbourne Punch, 27 May 1897, p.414.

² E.g. Argus, 21 Aug. 1897; Review of Reviews, 15 Aug. 1897, p.224, similarly regretted the Senate's unrepresentativeness in that a state like Nevada (population 60,000) could block so important an issue as Anglo-American arbitration. The editor of June's New England Magazine, was comforted that none of that area's 12 senators had 'blocked civilization and covered the Republic with shame before the world'.

³ Argus, 28 Aug. 1897; Newcastle Morning Herald, 2 Oct. 1897.
they [were] like citizens of the old country'. This was 'untrue and absurd' growled the _Herald_, one newspaper to take W.T. Stead's mischief-making in this respect, badly.¹

On the other hand there emerged a general recognition that talk of an alliance had been widely premature, the sort of practical problems involved in a broad Anglo-Saxon federation, becoming daily more evident with the numerous problems bedevilling Australia's own limited attempts at federation-making. Some were prepared to admit that the failure of the Senate to pass the treaty by a mere three votes was encouraging for future attempts. The great festival of solidarity marking sixty years of Victoria's reign (June 1897) during which many American journalists heaped praise on the monarch, the colonies and the Empire's defences, helped calm anxieties regarding the Anglo-Saxon future. Those who took stock at this time could see that only one nation rivalled and surpassed the Empire in every aspect of growth and general progress and was therefore best kept on side, and that nation was America.²

Among reasons advanced why Americans should continue to remain in Australia's good favour was the renewed virility of Sir Wilfred Laurier's leadership of Canada apparently now forever removed from the possibility of acceding to American annexation. Germany, France, Russia, China and Japan, in which the European power struggle was developing, were all considered to be more detestable as nations than was America. Some pointed out that Sir George Dibbs ³ and Justice John Want had often illustrated that Australia could lay claim to a number of jingoes of its own. It was argued that America ought to be courted for its future payment of the Bering Sea Award; the markets on the

¹_Herald_, 30 Sept. 1897. They were 'all Yankees' Stead reported Reid as saying, guessing Australians' reactions to this.

²See editorials in, _Mercury_, 6 Sept. 1897; _Geelong Times_, 6 Nov. 1897; _Daily Telegraph_ (Sydney), 8 Nov. 1897; _South Australian Register_, 13 Nov. 1897; _Advertiser_, 4 June 1897.

³Sir George Dibbs (1834-1904), Premier of N.S.W. 1891-94 was always considered an authoritarian man.
THE GRAND IMPERIAL TABLEAU.

"Well, I saw a great spectacle, Joe. I guess it was the princess, wasn't it?"

"I'm not sure if it was on my own..."

Melbourne Punch, 1 July 1897.
West Coast it was opening up for Newcastle coal and for access to the Yukon goldfield, whose rush beginning in the summer of 1897, attracted hundreds of Australian miners to American ports in Alaska.¹

As Charles Bright ² put it in an article in the Age ('Does America Love England?'), some Americans were Anglophobic because their newspapers (especially Charles A. Dana's New York Sun) artificially encouraged it as part of editorial policy. The author, one of several Australians who had worked briefly for the American press, travelled widely and talked to many in the United States in the late 1870s, thought the opposite feeling existed among the classes and professions of people in America he had met, most of whom treated visitors from Britain and her Empire with extreme courtesy. The trait Dickens had labelled 'Universal Distrust' kept anglophobia alive in the American character, he believed. Such an assessment did much to get the 'love-hate' relationship (viewed from America's side) into perspective.³

There were more open expressions of affection. Melbourne's Catholic Advocate held that despite the irritations caused by the re-opening of the Bering Sea controversy, 'we love our cousins too much to quarrel with them under any provocation'.⁴ The Leader frankly attacked Australians acting from spite when it wrote:

If I were not an Englishman I would be an American is the view held by most Britshers, who cherish the Stars and Stripes only next to the Union Jack... Though there are influences

¹See editorials in, Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 28 June, 2 Sept. 1897; Melbourne Punch, 1 July 1897; Barrier Miner, 7 July 1897; Herald, 9 Aug. 1897; Argus, 30 Sept. 1896; Newcastle Morning Herald, 14 Oct. 1897.

²Charles Bright (1832-1903) was a journalist, lecturer, spiritualist and insurance secretary. He wrote for the Argus in his earlier free trade years and edited the Melbourne Punch 1863-67. A gossipy, courteous man, he wrote later for the protectionist Age though his views were dated. Internal evidence suggests that Bright wrote the article, but there is some doubt.

³Age, 16 Apr. 1898.

⁴Advocate, 8 Jan. 1898.
which tend to hostility, there are others and we hope stronger ones, which encourage a comity of purpose. 1

It became obvious by the end of 1897 that most of the animosity expressed by Australian editors and others toward America, had been defensive. The moment American attitudes appeared to assume a positive friendliness toward Britain, Australian reactions were quick to reciprocate in kind.

For this feeling, 1898 was to be a crucial year. The condition of Cuba wrought by the three years of destructive war between the Spaniards and the insurgent Cubans was well publicized. In mid-1896 some papers had suggested that Britain should join the United States 'for the common benefit of civilization' in preventing further barbarities. But the issue of international co-operation did not take hold until the end of 1897 and the beginning of 1898 when the alarming situation in China made the need more urgent in British eyes. Russian and German seizures of territory there made war appear imminent. In the search for allies preceding such a conflict, Britons everywhere looked toward the United States where Secretary of State John Hay's concern for an 'Open Door' suggested a natural ally. The Newcastle Morning Herald spoke of the probability of America wishing to retain its position as 'the natural dominant power in the Pacific' and regretted that country's naval preoccupation in the West Indies which now appeared to prevent her from asserting that primacy. 2

1 Leader, 14 Aug. 1897.
2 Newcastle Morning Herald, 21 Dec. 1897, 5, 22 Jan., 14 Feb. 1898. See Also West Australian, 11 July, 1896; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 26 Jan. 1898. The China Difficulty referred to the anger aroused in England by Russia's illegal seizure of two ports from China - Port Arthur and Talieman, supposed to secure domination over Peking. This followed Germany's seizure in November 1897 of Tsingtao in the Shantung peninsula. From mid-December 1897, until February 1898, the situation was confused, but Salisbury was heavily censured for passing by the aggression with no more than a diplomatic protest, when many expected war. J.A.S. Grenville, Lord Salisbury and Foreign Policy (London, 1964), Ch.VI, pp.130-47.
A new friendliness toward Britain seemed to animate the American press. 'North America has virtually sent up a shout for Anglo-Saxondom', rejoiced the Brisbane Courier.¹ Most guessed that America's motive in this strong change of attitude was the hoped-for preservation of mutual trading interests in China. America's interest in China as a field for investment and economic exploitation was well recognized by Australia's press and heartily approved of for its unifying tendencies.²

War fever had once again gripped Australia since the beginning of the China troubles in November 1897 and by March 1898 was still very much in evidence. Australian newspapers relying on the friendly attitudes of papers like the New York Herald, the Baltimore Sun and the Boston Transcript hoped with the Geelong Advertiser that 'possibly if it became necessary, the Americans would be prepared to make a naval demonstration in Chinese waters¹, to help warn off any threatening European combination³. Many Australian newspapers were confident concerning American antipathy toward Germany and Russia because of those countries¹ well known anti-democratic and anti-Monroe attitudes. Archibald's reference in the Bulletin to a San Francisco paper debunking those 'treasury enthusiasts' for an Anglo-Saxon alliance was an editorial voice in the wilderness.⁴

Sydney's Daily Telegraph best exemplified the nexus of emerging diplomatic interests in its editorial 'The Far East and the Far West'.⁵ Increased diplomatic activity on the part of Sir Julian Pauncefote seemed to British and Australian observers as being on the point of producing a rapprochement, if not an Anglo-American alliance by the end of March. Signs of American approval for such a scheme now attracted eager attention in Australia's press: the enthusiastic reception given the British cruiser Cordelia

¹ Courier, 5 Feb. 1898: 'Anglo-Saxonism cannot live unless the world is opened up to its activity.
² Sydney Mail, 19 Mar. 1898.
³ Geelong Advertiser, 23 Feb. 1898.
⁴ Bulletin, 19 Feb. 1898. See also, Courier, 19 Feb., 7 Mar. 1898.
⁵ Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 10 Mar. 1898.
coaling off Key West; the pro-English speech of Richard Olney at Harvard; the friendly observations in Mark Twain's recently published book covering his antipodean travels; the Empire's message of sympathy to McKinley following the Maine disaster and the rousing singing of what was believed to be Britain's national anthem in American music halls (especially New York's Empire Theatre), were all taken as indicators of growing Anglo-American collusion, though somewhat erroneously.

As the Cuban situation warmed up and the Chinese situation cooled, the focus for such common interests shifted from the Eastern Chinese theatre to the Western, Cuban area. Again economic reasons were put forward as the ostensible reason for cooperation — the exchange of raw cotton and British manufacturers, mutual passenger services and use of British bottoms carrying grain, cattle and dairy products from America to England, had to be preserved in the face of possible Spanish piracy, it was held. The Daily Telegraph was one of the few disgusted by the fact that Britain seemed to be spending more energy reassuring America of its support and good-will than in attempting the more humane task of drawing the combatants apart.

Most newspapers were partisan concerning these developments. The Argus claimed "no doubt our policy with regard to America should be to persistently claim brotherhood with her and persistently refuse to treat her as a foreign power." Some comment was stimulated by cabled suggestions of the re-opening of general arbitration negotiations, while others were excited about the prospect

---

1 See comment in Age, 10 Mar. 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 3, 10, 12 Mar. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 9 Mar. 1898; Argus; 18 Mar. 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 15 Mar. 1898; the Melbourne Punch viewed a union of the English-Speaking Peoples as "no longer a wild dream"; the Anglo-American poem of workers-solidarity "The Brotherhood of Man" by Arthur Desmond can perhaps be viewed in the same context: Bulletin and Tosch, 3, 10 Mar. 1898.

2 It seems probable that observers were confusing the singing of "My Country 'Tis of Thee" with "God Save the Queen".

3 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 10, 14 Mar. 1898. For further comment see Newcastle Morning Herald, 22 Mar. 1898; Advocate, 20 Mar. 1898; Maitland Mercury, 16 Mar. 1898; Herald, 19 Mar. 1898.

4 Argus, 18 Mar., 16 Apr. 1898.
of a British-American-Japanese triple alliance regarding China, though others regretted that America's preparedness for such an alliance was hampered by a small navy. ¹ Best of all, the Brisbane Evening Observer believed, was that the element of kinship lies underneath everything...and Great Britain's needs are probably helping to the better understanding we all hope for.² With both Cuban and Chinese troubles threatening European war 'one conclusion is clear to us Australians³, held the Ballarat Courier:
'the wisdom of consummating our federal aspirations'.

That the budding Australian future would blossom in a secure Anglo-American environment seemed obvious to most. Several opinion leaders now voiced classic encouragements of the ethnocentric ideal. One which summarized others was from the Australian Star. Cuba the paper saw as:

the revolt of British-bred people against tyranny which insults humanity and flouts the age...And if, as may be, European Powers regard the maintenance of territorial rights and the upholding of imperial dynasties of higher importance than the most sacred rights of common humanity, they may make their own move and necessitate the American, which will then be but the wider, British appeal. And of its answer, no man who feels the tingle of British blood in his veins would have much doubt. Britain throughout the world indeed, is quickening for a reply to that appeal. It would come with one shout from the remotest Hebridean isles to the furthest Austral shores. It would provide instantly the flux to weld Saxon and Celt, with all their descendants and all the peoples they have absorbed and incorporated into one people, indivisible, indomitable and practically unassailable. We can hardly suppress a desire that the time of that appeal may be nigh. It would come to us, as most great

¹For the exact details of the complicated and confusing diplomacy which preceded the Spanish-American War, see R.G. Neale, 'Anglo-American Relations During the Spanish-American War: Some Problems', Historical Studies Australia and New Zealand, VI, No. 21, 1953, pp.72-89, and the same author's Britain and American Imperialism, 1898-1900 (Brisbane, 1965), Ch. 1.

²Brisbane Evening Observer, 14 Mar. 1898.

³Ballarat Courier, 25 Mar. 1898. See also, Sydney Morning Herald, 24 Mar., 6 Apr. 1898; South Australian Register, 29 Mar. 1898; Geelong Times, 18 Apr. 1898.
matters in the development of our race, through a rain of blood, but the strength and security and the abiding peace to be ultimately established will make full compensation.1

Cables reinforced the prevailing impression that Anglo-Saxon peoples throughout the world were 'solid for America' in the coming struggle. In the words of the Brisbane Evening Observer with war imminent, Anglo-Saxon dom is practically united...Later on there will be room for arbitration treaties and the hearty exchange of brotherly greetings. Today there is only room for active sympathy in a crisis and the readiness to join hands when the call comes...If nothing else comes of the war with Spain that would be a great gain.2

As Frederick Greenwood, who was pro-alliance, put it in the Argus: 'At all events, we live in notable times. We see the oldest Empire in the world, China, disappearing and the youngest republic of the globe - that of America - coming to the front'.3

Expressions of support were more common as war approached. The crises in China and Cuba had called forth all that underlying sense of Anglo-Saxon solidarity. Seen in perspective, anti-American expression of the Australian press in 1897, was an aberration caused in part by what was considered to have been a somewhat misguided view by America of her racial loyalty.

But the anticipated European involvements and consequent need for alliance did not materialise. During 1898 America fought a brisk, efficient war which Spain felt compelled to bring to a rapid conclusion. With Europeans, despite external appearances to the contrary, Australia believed that the future lay with America, not Spain. Therefore it endorsed America's war, rejoiced in its victories and approved of its expansion. The impulse for

1 Australian Star, 18 Apr. 1898.
2 Brisbane Evening Observer, 21 Apr. 1898.
3 Argus, 9 Apr. 1898. As an index of the speed opinions travelled, the Maitland Mercury, 12 Apr. 1898, 500 miles away from Melbourne, agreed with Greenwood three days later.
alliance was kept hopefully alive during this period and encouraged at every turn. That it did not eventuate was not reacted to in the same bitter way as earlier disappointments had been. Rather, Australian editorial opinion contented itself with recognition of the genuine harmony now existing between the leaders of their race.¹

Tangible expression of that good-will was provided in the following year by the agreement on the Guiana-Venezuela boundary, reached after the report and recommendation of the Commissioners of the Arbitration Court sitting in Paris had been given.

The first Hague Peace Conference convened by the Czar (18 May-29 July 1899) in which 26 nations including Britain and the United States participated, did establish the Permanent Court of International Arbitration. Through it, disputes could be settled by means similar to those being proposed throughout 1897 in the Olney-Pauncefote discussions. Though they considered them a definite step forward, the Australian press was never as enthused by these proposals as they had been by Anglo-American prospects. Given the failure of the latter, some considered the Hague Court as utopian and were openly cynical of it. But it was against this background of international agreement and on the eve of the Boer War (Kruger's ultimatum was sent 9 October 1899) that the Australian press greeted news of the success of the

long-awaited specific arbitration.  

The Venezuelan Arbitration Court had opened in Paris in June during the Hague Conference, under the Presidency of Professor Martens the eminent Russian jurist nominated by King Oscar of Sweden. Its sittings extended over 55 days and were closed on the 28 September. Sir Richard Webster, Attorney General, had argued the British case and Mallet Provost had performed a similar task on behalf of Venezuela. The British representatives were Justice Collins and, following the death of Lord Herschell, Lord Russell of Killowen. The Americans were represented by Chief Justice Fuller and Justice Brewer of the United States Supreme Court. In a fashion similar to Clark at an earlier date, Webster had alerted public opinion in Australia to the expectation of an adverse decision.  

Sydney's Evening News was the first to comment at length on the favourable decision (5 October). Britain retained possession of the goldfields and valuable forests while Venezuela gained possession of Point Barima and thus the mouth of the Orinoco. American and Venezuelan honour thus appeared satisfied, while Britain had avoided humiliation and upheld former claims.  

The result evoked a mixed reaction. Some papers felt it conceded even more to British rights than was originally claimed, while others considered that it was no more than what had been expected as probable. The Bulletin noted cynically how consistent was the coincidence of British national honour and the existence of disputed gold areas, while the Advertiser believed that the result had illustrated that neither aggrandisement nor greed lay at the basis of Britain's claim. The same paper contrasted  

---

1Australian cynicism toward the Hague Conferences of 1897 and 1907 is understandable given the open doubts entertained by the powers participating of the conferences' efficacy. See B. Tuchman, op.cit., pp.229-88.  

2Age, 29 Sept. 1899. Cable.  


America's present friendliness with her former hostility, while Archibald's weekly believed that 'the United States apparently abandoned Venezuela in payment for Britain's moral support against Spain'.\(^1\) The *Sydney Mail* was only one holding that the new American friendliness exemplified by the Treaty decision left Britain stronger than ever and with a free hand to deal with Kruger in the Transvaal.\(^2\)

Undoubtedly British confidence in the moral righteousness and justice of her claims in the disputed African gold area had been boosted by the decision concerning the South American gold area, though circumstances differed.

Venezuela had been justly rebuffed in the eyes of many by gaining only 30,000 square miles, or three-eighths of what she had claimed. The long-held unworthiness of that country seemed highlighted to some by the fact that while the arbitrators were sitting in Paris, the Republic was undergoing a revolution which replaced Ignacio Andrade with General Castro as president. Yet Venezuela's obvious unhappiness at this decision confirmed some in the belief that no arbitration treaty could please everyone.\(^3\)

W.T. Stead received the decision with predictable enthusiasm and thought it not only 'speedy, definite and satisfactory', but (agreeing with the *Edinburgh Review*), 'the first great arbitration... in which neither side has shown signs of resentment at the award and neither side impugned the reasons of the decision'.\(^4\) 'Tom Touchstone' of the *Ballarat Courier* was not the only one believing that a similar system of successfully settling disputes should be applied to the present unhappy Boer situation, which they took to be a crisis situation precipitated by the type of belligerence Chamberlain had displayed when he sent Maxim guns to Venezuela in his first week of office as Colonial

---

1 *Advertiser*, 16 Oct. 1899.


秘书。1 然而， Chamberlain 的演讲在莱斯特提出英美德三国条约的可能性，引发了较为审慎的反应。

Thus was closed 'a chapter of history of which the direct results have been out of all proportion to its intrinsic interests and merits'，claimed the Sydney Morning Herald:

The philosophic historian，accustomed to deal with the relations of the facts forming the bald record of history to their antecedent causes and ultimate effects，will find in this comparatively insignificant question about a disputed strip of gold-bearing Guiana territory the starting point of new international policies.

For 'whatever the future may hide，it is safe to say that it will be coloured and influenced by the events of the last three years'。The Cleveland-Olney diplomatic challenge had made Britain aware of her 'splendid isolation' and its dangers and had precipitated the further challenges to Britain's power by the Russians and Germans in China，the French at Fashoda and other irritations elsewhere the paper held。Britain's reaction to this，the re-establishing of friendly relations with America at the time of the Spanish-American War，had established 'a community of sentiment and feeling of racial kinship as well as a shrewd appreciation of the advantage of union'。Not only did it appear that Britain's isolation was at an end given the success of this policy，but the paper regarded 'race sentiment' ('part of Australia's tradition of growth from the first') as responsible for this；2 It was an optimistic assessment.


2Sydney Morning Herald，7 Oct.，18 Nov. 1899.
With both Empires too involved in the quelling of difficulties in the Transvaal and the Philippines to criticize each other, this solidarity continued beyond 1899. In the latter year the 'White Man's Burden' concept entered Anglo-American thinking to provide a further sense of common commitment concerning the responsibilities of empire. To all outward appearances, the years of arbitration excitement had resulted in an 'informal alliance' between America and the British Empire.

\[1\text{Compare this with the attitude a decade before: 'It is inconceivable that any nation will ever consent to modify the very smallest of its sovereign rights; and so well is the fact recognized that the humblest tyro in a debating society rarely ventures nowadays to prophesy the advent of international arbitration', Argus, 4 Feb. 1889.}\]
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THE CONDITION OF CUBA, 1895-1898:
AUSTRALIA'S CASE AGAINST SPAIN

American interest in the condition of Cuba had declined in the 20 years following an earlier attempt in 1875 to terminate the ten year insurrection of 1868-1878. When on the 24 February 1895 a new revolt against Spanish rule broke out, American sympathy was once again with the rebels. Despite the fact that it was widely recognized that high American tariffs, and the depression of 1893 had done much to add to Cuban distress, overt assistance by means of filibustering was officially discouraged. Contributions to finance the filibusters were freely and openly solicited by the Cuban juntas - committees of revolutionaries - in American cities. As well, insurgents deliberately destroyed American investment property on the island in an attempt to coerce active American intervention. Cuban insurgent strategy remained the older one of attrition - to break the will of the Spanish rulers.

Recognition of the belligerent rights of the Cuban revolutionaries (discussed by Congress, February-April 1896) and an offer by America to Spain to recognize Cuban independence (refused by Spain 22 May 1896) stimulated early Australian comment. When it was learnt of the concentration camps established by General Valeriano ('Butcher') Weyler on Cuba (from February 1896), the situation invited comparison with the harsh treatment the Turks had meted out to the Christian Armenians (1894-96).

Most blame for the destruction of crops was placed on Spain's shoulders. By the July of 1896 sugar production

---

had dropped to a fifth of its 1894 figure and tobacco to a tenth of its former production, while the total value of exports had fallen from £12 million to £3 million. So read the figures in the metropolitan Australian press taken from the London Times. One of the fairest spots on earth had received its death blow and lay in ruins. Queensland politicians and newspapers evinced special interest in the prospect of taking over Cuba's share of the world's sugar market. 1

Despite the bias of the London Times reports reaching Australia from correspondents in Havana, opinion leaders such as the Sydney Morning Herald had, by the end of 1896, through constant and uncritical repetition, granted them a degree of authenticity. 2 This was in strong contrast to the credibility of the severely censored Spanish news sources. Consequently, when the British correspondents wrote of the destruction of the 'best cigar industry in the world' and other depredations, they were generally taken as being authentic, a general shortage of Cuban and Manilan cigars in Australia proving their point.

Overseas comment was keenly sought. Articles by Clarence King in the Forum 3 and Mayo W. Hazeltine in the December (1896) North American Review 4 were given wide currency through editorials. King described the desolation being wrought by the insurgents on an island 'which they crush to liberate'. Hazeltine's observations evoked more sympathy for the Cubans. He maintained that only 53,000 were enfranchised in a population of 1,600,000 and that this had resulted in the crushing tax burden of $9.79 per inhabitant (the highest on earth) to remove a deficit in

---

1West Australian, 11 July 1896; Queensland Times, 24 Oct. 1896. One of the earliest reports on Cuba was veteran journalist Murat Halstead's Review of Reviews, 20 May 1896, p.501. The Age's New York correspondent had put the number of Cuban refugees in America at 10,000-12,000, 9 Apr. 1892.

2Sydney Morning Herald, 11 Dec. 1896. Though the paper believed they were 'well-informed', A.E. Campbell in Great Britain and the United States (London, 1960) questions their reliability, p.147.

3Clarence King, 'Shall Cuba Be Free?', Forum, XX (Sept.1895) pp.57-8.

excess of $295 million. Further, out of an annual budget of $26 million, only three-quarters of a million had ever been spent on actual improvements for Cuba, the bulk going on 'Spanish wars, Spanish efforts to suppress insurrection and Spanish extravagance'. As one paper put it - 'a heavy price to pay for mismanagement'.

In the middle of 1897 the *Age* weighed in with the observations of a captain of the Cuban insurgent engineers - Leon De Monte - who had written in April's *Pall Mall*. De Monte delivered a formidable indictment of Spain's rule. The hollowness of Spanish trade reciprocity arrangements, the rapacity of officials, the burden of maintaining a minimum of 20,000 Spanish troops even in peace-time were but some of the complaints. The poverty of education where 90 per cent of whites and all blacks (one-third of the population) were illiterate and the inadequacy of 1,000 miles of railway in an island of almost 50,000 square miles were others. Some organs of the Australian press added Cuba's poor roads, primitive sanitary arrangements, dishonest government lotteries and discriminatory tariff duties to this picture of Spanish-induced suffering. To the *Launceston Examiner*, as to others, De Monte's views revealed the story from the 'other side', by-passing the less credible official Spanish sources.

By August 1897 the large dailies were dubbing Cuba 'America's Armenia'. Progressive figures on the cost of the war were published. The 1895-96 campaign had cost Spain £31 million. Sixty thousand insurgents had died - 10,000 in battle, 20,000 from starvation and 30,000 from disease. The *Age* lamented the fact that Cuba's condition 'does not

---


2*Age*, 31 May 1897.

3*Launceston Examiner*, 8 June 1897.

4E.g. *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 18 Aug. 1897.
appear to rouse any responsive thrill in the minds of the
great European nations although they are always ready to go
into fruitless hysterics over some alleged Armenian
atrocities.  

The statistics of the American Red Cross published in
March 1898 were the most influential and widely publicized
facts available on the Australian scene. Though in fact
greatly exaggerated, they confirmed and emphasized the
profile of suffering built up by the earlier overseas
literature: Weyler's reconcentrado policies had resulted
in the death of 425,000 neutral Cuban country folk it was
claimed, while 200,000 more were said to be 'living
skeletons'. Dr. Lesser's grisly assessments heightened
Australian press indignation.

Many now agreed with the sober judgement of the British
Spectator (12 February 1898) that 'the wretched island is
tormented beyond belief'. Sympathy was expressed for the
miserable boy soldiers of Spain. In excess of 50,000 Spanish
troops were quoted as lying sick in Cuban hospitals. For a
Spain now obviously suffering as much as the Cubans
themselves, the 'game was not worth the candle' was the
opinion of more than one paper.  

From the middle of 1896, the Australian press took an
increasing interest in the parallel struggle in the
Philippines. The South Australian Register whose editorials
on foreign matters often took a large view, was one that
thought the news of an insurrection in favour of autonomy in
a group of important and fertile islands only 700 miles from
New Guinea 'of exceptional interest' to Australian people,
bringing 'active hostilities on a large scale closer to
Australia than they have ever in the past been brought'.

---

1 Age, 23 Aug. 1897. The Times did not bestir itself until
eight months after the Australian editorial. See The Times,
15 Apr. 1898 and the Economist, 16 Apr. 1898, for the
recognition of the parallel between Armenia and Cuba.

2 E.g. Editorials in Argus, 25 Mar. 1898; Leader, 26 Mar.
1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 16 Apr. 1898.

3 See editorials in Courier, 26 Mar. 1898; Leader, op.cit.;
Daily Telegraph (Sydney), op.cit.
It was concerned that the 'Monster Mother' Spain, who
devoured her colonial children instead of suckling them,
would send her warships through the Arafura Sea. It further
condemned that power for keeping a quarter of the population
of 4 1/2 to 7 million Filipinos as slaves.¹

An interest now began to be taken in the attractive
physical facts concerning the Philippines. James Bell
held that 'few countries in the world vie with the 1,200
islands in processing the essentials valuable to a
commercial nation'. Not only were there good harbours
and easy water transit, but alluvial gold and many other
minerals as well as precious woods, fruits and other
plantation crops, cereals and animal products made up the
picture of Filipino wealth.² To Queensland papers,
destruction of this potentially valuable economy with its
'mild-mannered and easily governed population' - despite
the opportunity presented for developing a Queensland
tobacco industry - was a tragedy. Worse, it awoke that
bogey of all Queenslanders - a Japanese takeover.³ In
time the sufferings and ordeals of Filipino civilians
and the estimated 50,000 rebels were to receive a
circulation and credibility almost equal to Cuba's more
widely publicized troubles. Only the faultiness of Hong-
Kong sources, due to cable difficulties and Spanish
censorship of news, rendered press reactions less consistent
and regular.⁴

The statistics of the true extent of Cuban and Filipino
suffering have for long remained vague. The Australian
press shared in the dissemination of myths and inaccuracies.
The important thing is that the figures were quickly
believed and rarely questioned. In themselves they provided
the most important indictment of Spanish colonial rule.
Such a conviction was only very indirectly the result of the

¹South Australian Register, 25 August 1896.
²Geelong Times, 28 Nov. 1896.
³E.g. Brisbane Evening Observer, 30 Nov. 1896.
⁴See for example, Mt. Alexander Mail, 1 Dec. 1896; Mercury,
  3 Dec. 1896.
MAP SHOWING THE POSITION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
efforts of Hearst, Pulitzer and the New York 'Yellow Press'. Conscious distortion of this kind was avoided by the Australian press. Supposedly conservative and reputable English sources were quoted almost exclusively on Cuba's condition (Puerto Rico and the other Spanish colonies were virtually ignored). But both the conscious and unintentional bias and exaggeration of these sources was enough to provide the basis of an anti-Spanish attitude.\(^1\)

Some pro-Spanish attitudes revealed themselves during the period 1895-98. Some were merely a reaction against American means - the internationally illegal use of filibusters, or American ends - the creation of another 'Black Republic'. But sympathy for Spain's massive military effort in the face of severe domestic problems was also an active factor. Others were appalled either at America's blatant rejection of the Spanish proposals for Cuban autonomy or the national guilt which many had quickly placed on Spain over the sinking of the Maine. Not only did Spain also appear to have the approval of Europe in general to support her colonial claims, but there were many even in Australia who were sorry to see Spanish pride, chivalry and tradition so humbled on the international scene.

Most of the early form of sympathy for Spain was due to the annoyance caused by illegal American-based filibustering activity. John Farrell\(^2\) and Alfred Douglass\(^3\) were but two who objected to the Argus description\(^4\) of the capture of the filibuster Commodore (January 1897) as 'treacherous' on the part of the Spaniards. They should be able to give as well as they receive was their opinion.

---


2Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 7 Jan. 1897.

3Geelong Advertiser, 7 Jan. 1897.

4Argus, 7 Jan. 1897.
The Catholic Melbourne Advocate's sympathies were racial and religious. 'We have no wish to see Spain deprived of Cuba', it wrote, and see no good reason why she should be. Her rule in Cuba may be, on some points, indefensible, but she is not unwilling to right any existing wrongs and the Cubans have no claims to independence that enlist our sympathy for the present struggle. From our point of view, it is preferable that Spain should not be weakened than that an inferior race of coloured people should be allowed to set up an independent kingdom.

This conservative-racist attitude was not confined to Catholics.

While some conservatives were concerned with maintaining a fragile status quo, others like John Farrell even condoned Spanish cruelty in the pursuit of that goal. To refuse medical attention to Cuban prisoners belonged to the 'true logic of war' by speeding results, Farrell considered. 'The ruthless Spaniard is therefore the true warrior who plays this grim game on the all-in principle.' Pro-Catholic sympathizers also believed that Protestant America was wrongfully prolonging Cuba's agony.

Sydney's Catholic Freeman's Journal vigorously rebutted the Sydney Morning Herald's accusation regarding the Spanish use of 'Inquisition' techniques. First, it attacked the credibility of the charges 'furnished forth months ago by the Star from a Hong-Kong source' tainted with German prejudice. Second, it suspected the Free Trade press of now using those charges to woo New South Wales' Catholics away from the Protectionist convictions of their influential Catholic press (which would now obviously share in Spanish discredit, given its previous championing of that country). Further, it mounted a counterattack. It regarded Protestants as guilty of the use of 'rack and thumbscrew'.

1 Advocate, 9 Jan. 1897.

2 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 30 Jan. 1897 - the most pro-Catholic of all Australia's major dailies, due perhaps to Farrell's influence.
as Catholics had ever been and blamed Kingsley and Froude for having popularized the ridiculous English anti-Spanish tradition. To associate dubious reports of present Spanish actions and Catholicism in general was slanderous. The Protestant position was hypocritical: the actions of the English in Ireland and India, the Germans in Zanzibar, the Dutch in the East Indies and the New Zealand treatment of the Maoris proved this. But Spain has only to protect her colonial possessions after the same fashion to furnish occasion for ignorant and silly aspersions on the Catholic Church. Though this may be considered another episode in the continuing sectarian debate, New South Wales' Catholic protectionists nonetheless derived evident satisfaction eighteen months later, following George Reid's free trade party defeat by Lyne's protectionists (July 1898).

Other non-Catholic conservatives attempted to balance their estimates of Spain. The Argus praised Spain's 'splendid sacrifices' and 'incredible exertions' overseas given her poverty and decadence at home. With common estimates of the Cubans themselves as most unflattering, a line was taken in mid-1897 that if the rebels could not be placated, then they should be swiftly crushed by Spain in the interests of international peace and commerce.

More immediate sympathy for Spain's plight came with the news on 10 August 1897 of the assassination by Golli, an Italian anarchist, of the ex-Spanish Conservative Premier, Senor Canovas del Castillo. He was praised as able, honest and resolute - insanely struck down by Spanish anarchists in the course of his duty. One paper feared his death would be 'prelude to a series of events disastrous to the peace of Spain'. Even at this comparatively late stage the authors of a repressive conservative regime were not without their Australian defenders. Fear of the possible

1 'Freeman's Journal, 6 Feb. 1897; ref. to Sydney Morning Herald, 28 Jan. 1897.
2 Argus, 25 May. 1897.
"I DO PERCEIVE HERE A DIVIDED DUTY.

Melbourne Punch, 5 May 1898.
disappearance of Spain through a combination of internal revolt and external attack, was a potent factor keeping sympathy for her alive. Some Victorian papers expressed a vague fear that they would lose Spanish investment capital in their colony.1

A number of events now resulted in Australian press testimonies to Spain's national integrity. The departure of correspondents from Cuba was taken as a sign by the Australian press that the Spanish autonomy proposals of the new Liberal Ministry led by the aging but trusted Praxedes Mateo Sagasta were expected to render revolt unnewsworthy. After the Maine disaster in February, a large element of the Australian press insisted that it was 'hardly likely' that Spain would 'have recourse to assassination in order to adjust their differences with other states' and preferred to place the blame on either fanatical Royalists in Cuba or some unknown accidental cause.2

By 18 April, few Australian could have been unaware of the sympathies of the Continental press toward Spain.3 Some continental Europeans living in Australia - especially newly-arrived Spaniards or monarchists, may have been swayed by the diplomatic and financial bias of German, Austrian and Jewish interests asserting themselves on Spain's behalf.4 But little evidence suggests this and beside, their influence on opinion in Australia would have been negligible. Continental Europeans formed only 2 per cent of the total population of Australia at the time of her nationhood in 1901.


2Editorials in, Argus, 4 Jan. 1898; Herald, 12 Feb. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 7 Mar. 1898; Freeman's Journal, 16 Apr.1898.

3Even remote papers like Budaposts1 Posten Lloyd were quoted by the Australian press for their attitudes.

4Despite attempts by European powers not to offend America, the impression in Australia was one of almost open European assistance to Spain. See, J.A.S. Grenville, Lord Salisbury and Foreign Policy (London, 1964), Ch.IX; C.S. Campbell, Anglo-American Understanding, 1898-1903 (Baltimore, 1957), pp.30-40. Cable perceptions of secret diplomacy were responsible for this misleading impression in the Australian press. Some historians, especially G.L. Beer, The English-Speaking Peoples, Their Future Relations and Joint International Obligations (New York, 1917), have perpetuated this.
Of these 74,253 Europeans, only 515 (or .4 per cent) were Spanish. As well, there were 1,902 Austro-Hungarians, 3,358 Russians, 3,592 French and 5,678 Italians. Germans formed the largest group - 38,352.\(^1\) One suspects however, that many of these people migrated as far as Australia through a basic lack of sympathy with the monarchism and militarism of their own countries. Undoubtedly among those who were determinedly anti-American, there must have been many who now found themselves pro-Spanish.

Some Australians could not have but been touched by the evident loyalty of individual Spaniards to their mother country. As clear underdog in the coming struggle, they undoubtedly struck a responsive chord. Spanish delusion was revealed in an Argus interview with J. Luffman, director of the Horticultural Gardens at Burnley, a former resident of Malaga who had traversed Spain by foot:

The Spaniard has a supreme confidence in himself and his country (he said), but it is founded on ignorance. Even well-educated Spaniards are deplorably ignorant of the outside world. They do not realise the strength of the great nations of the earth, nor their own comparative impotence. They are eager for war because they do not know its risks.\(^2\)

In the face of this, much could be understood, if not forgiven. The Brisbane Courier,\(^3\) whose Editorialist had for long agonized over the question of which side was 'right', could not in the end blame Spaniards for believing officials of their own country. If Spaniards were told that the facts on Cuba were distorted by enemies; that the Maine was a plot or an accident; that illegal American filibustering

---

1 Commonwealth Year Book (No. 1, 1908), p.168, gives figures for 1901. Numbers for 1898 would have been slightly smaller.

2 Argus, 18 Apr. 1898.

3 Courier, 18 Apr. 1898.
was a connivance with the insurgents and charges of incompetence against Spanish officers a scandal against the nation, how could they gainsay it? Even those who hated Spaniards could sympathize with this view. Others were more frankly disgusted with the nations of Europe - Britain in particular - for allowing America a free hand to batter Spain into submission. ¹

Despite this evidence of some pro-Spanish sentiment, Spain was nonetheless enormously unpopular in Australia. First among the reasons for this was the Spanish colonial practice of an administration based on exploitation rather than nurture. This was resented by Australian editors who were in the process of shedding evidence of their inferior colonial status and among whom, paternal-liberal concepts of governance were enjoying high esteem. Next, overseas press charges of martial incompetence convincingly substantiated the Australian press belief that suffering on both sides was being needlessly prolonged by a power of superior race, numbers and technology, employing ineffective means. Most damaging to the Spanish case were the continual reports of employment of cruelty by starvation and torture. These were readily believed (in the face of Spanish attempts to suppress the reports) by a predominantly Protestant-British population containing strong anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish elements already aroused to indignation at unreavenged Armenian atrocities. Finally, a social and political-Darwinist element depicted Spain as an old, decadent monarchist power forced to give way by the 'laws of nature' to the younger, more virile democratic power of America. Australian xenophobia was appealed to in assessments of a 'treacherous' Latin type. These factors, combined with the

¹E.g., South Australian Register, 18 Apr. 1898. A similar assessment was made on the British scene, a little too late to influence Australian opinions: e.g. Saturday Review, 9, 23 Apr. 1898, pp. 480 and 545 respectively.
weight of immediate events, conspired against any favourable view of Spain by the majority of Australian journals.

From the start it was recognized that the insurgents were fighting for an aim with which any Anglo-Saxon could identify: the right to self-government. J.L. Brient, editor of the Daily Telegraph, was quick to suggest that the United States and Britain 'should join hands for the common benefit of civilization' in helping to provide it. By August 1896, the Melbourne Age was among those who had recognized the important of the 'Ever-Faithful Isle' to Spain. 'In trade, revenue, banking, investment and military career opportunities it deserved the title "Pearl of the Antilles"', he thought.

When we add to all those material inducements to hold the island at any cost the haughty pride of the Spanish hidalgo, it is obvious that no effort will be spared to retain possession of this almost sole remnant of the once wealthy colonies of Spain...At the same time it is equally certain that among all classes [in Cuba] with the single exception of the government employees, there is a general widespread distrust too at the greed, arrogance and tyranny of the Spanish office holder.

Reports about Weyler's concentration camps highlighted the cruelty and short-sightedness of Spanish policy.

Spain's special failures had been of temperament - in want of adaptability and passionate resort to force, and of limited imagination in not understanding the process of colonial growth and change. Nonetheless some press recognition was granted Spain for her 'splendid' past colonial

1 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 17 July, 1896.


3 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 11 Sept. 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 12 Sept. 1896. Australia's 4th of July editorials constantly reminded Australians of how bad British colonial policy could itself be.
achievements, which in the opinion of one paper deserved to rank with the works of Clive and Hastings in India. ¹

The Queensland Times was one that presented the theory that unlike more idealistic Australian socialists, Cuban revolutionaries were really only after a better sharing of the 'stealings' of government. ²

By the end of 1896, Spain had forfeited the racial sympathy of the most senior Australian metropolitan press opinion leader, the Sydney Morning Herald. ³ The paper denied that Spain was fighting 'for the supremacy of the white race' as some of her overseas defenders were declaring. Her colonial malpractice - banning Cubans from high office-holding, placing discriminatory tariffs on Cuban goods, imposing harsh government and frustrating local autonomy, were reasons for denying Spain honour as a champion of western colonial liberalism. It asked, let alone the 400 years of Spanish practice. Expressed on the day that news of Cleveland's anti-imperialist message to Congress ⁴ and the death of the insurgent leader Maceo reached Australia (11 December 1896) - at a time when events favoured Spain - this editorial was an important indication of the determined anti-Spanish stance being increasingly adopted by the liberal-conservative press. ⁵

¹E.g. Queensland, 7 Nov. 1896.
⁴It is possible that the ambiguous bellicosity of Cleveland's Message may have encouraged Australian aggressiveness. While cables pictured the message as uninterfering, the complete text can be interpreted another way. See Foreign Relations of the United States (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1897), pp.XXIX-XXXVI, passim.
⁵British journals' reactions were obviously exerting an increasingly powerful influence on Australian attitudes, see Geoffrey Seed, op.cit., pp.258-9.
From the beginning of 1897, Australian editorial opposition stiffened. Spain's contempt toward the Cuban desire for local government was given fresh emphasis with the unyielding reply of the Duke De Tetuan, Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Richard Olney: 'Spain must be the sole judge of the reforms necessary to be carried out in her colonies.' Tasmanias Charles Davies, who was usually Tory-elitist in his attitudes, now believed that America, having compared the conduct of Spain's colonies with Britain's in that area, had found them damningly anti-progressive.

It was commonly believed that the whole reform programme of Canovas's Conservative Party was too little, too late. Nonetheless, even papers with liberal sympathies believed that if they could find the proposals at all acceptable they should do so. The reason was that the Cubans were considered in Australia as 'only half civilized' and like those in 'neighbouring islands under the Republican flag [were] not ripe for self-government'. Thus the depressing example of Haitian misgovernment acted to make Spain's own misrule appear as the lesser of two evils.

But such reforms were not formally offered until after the Sagasta Ministry took office in October 1897. It was the quick and decisive rejection of the autonomy offer by the insurgents that convinced the Sydney Morning Herald and others that the cause of the Cuban 'Republic' would now survive and prevail.

Following the assassination of Canovas, irritation at Spain's colonial intentions was caused in Australia by the Spanish suggestion to found an international colony for

---

1E.g. Brisbane Evening Observer, 18 Dec. 1896.

2Mercury, 15 Jan. 1897. See also, Methodist (Melbourne), 19 Feb. 1897.

3See, Sydney Morning Herald, 8 Feb. 1897; Launceston Examiner, 9 Feb. 1897.

4Sydney Morning Herald, 14 Oct. 1897.
anarchist convicts. The Sydney Morning Herald, anticipating a site in the South Seas, quickly reminded Spain that it would be considered 'an unfriendly and an unneighbourly act towards the colonies of Australasia' to implement such a proposal. As nothing came of it, the matter was soon dropped. ¹

Just before the onset of the Spanish–American War, most Australian papers viewed the colonial situation as hopeless. The unrestrained arbitrary powers of Governor-General Blanco would render autonomy 'a fictitious independence'. Cuba would get no relief 'except at the point of a bayonet'. The dilemma remained as to what to do with a Cuba once rid of Spain - an unenviable American problem due to its racial and political connotations. ²

Attempting to understand the reasons prompting ordinary Spaniards to fight, Brisbane's Courier concluded that it would only be because they were 'so accustomed to their bad politics that they cannot understand the American abhorrence of the mis-government in Cuba'. ³ Flushed with the hopeful liberalism of Jubilee Year, the Telegraph concluded that Cuba's being denied 'such freedom in managing their own affairs as we have in New South Wales', had been the cause of all the present troubles. ⁴

Beside the complaints regarding colonial exploitation, the most persistent charge made by Australians was that of military incompetence. Spain's inability to bring the struggle to a clear decision, as well as the military means

¹ Sydney Morning Herald, 18, 24 Aug. 1897. See also Review of Reviews, 15 Oct. 1897.
² Leader, 29 June 1897; Brisbane Evening Observer, 30 Mar. 1898.
³ Courier, 21 Apr. 1898.
⁴ Daily Telegraph, 29 June, 1897. Queen Victoria's great Diamond Jubilee Celebrations took place at the end of June 1897 in London and were attended by the Australian Colonial Premiers. In Australia they were followed with intense interest.
employed, gave rise to the continuing bad publicity which so damaged their image.

Only ineptitude and an excessively defensive posture could explain how (what was by 1898) 200,000 regular Spanish troops, could be held down by around 40,000 active irregular guerilla insurgents in an area the size of Ireland. As in the previous decade of rebellion, it was believed that the island's devastation would come more quickly than victory. Though Spain had shipped men and material most efficiently, the rot lay in the army, where initiative was lacking and entrenchments too thin.¹ Some Australian papers, reviving memories of their own dashing first foreign venture, pointed by way of contrast to the well-organized British forces moving into the Sudan at this time.²

Disgust took on a deeper dimension with a realization of the means of attrition being used by Weyler. The Telegraph castigated the struggle as 'about the savagest and most disgustingly brutal war waged during modern times between white men'.³ To this racial confusion - for by no means were all the combatants Caucasian - was added the irony of the Empire's own use of concentration camps within the next five years, against an even more homogeneously European population.

Some believed that Spain was headed for the same catastrophic defeat at the hands of natives using inferior weapons but superior tactics, as had befallen another Latin race, the Italians, at Adowa, Abyssinia (1 March 1896). Those who saw that neither Spain nor Cuba could gain the upper hand in the military struggle believed rather that,

¹E.g. Editorials in West Australian, 11 July 1896; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 17 July 1896; Argus, 22 Aug. 1896.
²Omdurman was to crown British Sudanese efforts on 2 Sept. 1898. For the story of the N.S.W. Contingent's farcical and portentous attempt to avenge Gordon's death see Barbara Penny, 'The Age of Empire: An Australian Episode', Historical Studies, Vol. II, 1963-65, pp.32-42.
³Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 31 Aug. 1896.
'the time has come when for decency's sake, some healthy power should step in and draw the helpless combatants off'.

How would Britain have handled the problem of Cuba? The *Geelong Times* thought it knew: 'She would have sent a detachment of a squadron to Cuba, would have landed about 5000 bluejackets and the insurrection would have collapsed a couple of days after the ships arrived'. Again ironically, the words illustrate the ignorant optimism gained by belief in British arms (which had just conquered the Ashanti) and the easy arrogance that could be assumed by one of Britain's colonies not yet confronted by a determined guerilla force in difficult terrain. For despite the death of the rebels 'Garibaldi' - Maceo, it was obvious that the forces would rally around their other leaders Gomez and Garcia to fight again now that the rainy season had ended and they were so close to Havana. More cynically, the revolutionaries were regarded as enjoying soldiering better than farming and the Spanish it was believed, would fight on as long as tax monies supported them, rather than return to unemployment at home.

Despite the Melbourne *Herald*’s chiding of those of its contemporaries who appeared more eager to settle the affairs of others abroad than pressing problems of their own at home, the Australian press nonetheless continued to offer judgements and advice on the military level. Adelaide's *Advertiser* agreed with the *London Times*. Both thought Spain's military salvation lay in more vigorous offensive generalship following up its victories; the defence of Cuba's coastline against filibustering and the implementation of the death penalty against Americans involved in it...

---

1 For example, editorials in *Geelong Times*, 28 Nov. 1896; *Daily Telegraph*, 3, 5 Dec. 1896; *Mercury*, 3 Dec. 1896. As Mahan put it in a later reflection: 'It had become apparent to military eyes that Spain could not subdue the island, nor restore orderly conditions. The suffering was terrible, and was unavailing, *Lessons of the War With Spain* (Boston, 1918), pp.225-7.


3 See comment in *Herald*, 21 Dec. 1896; *South Australian Register*, 14 Dec. 1896.


altogether a harsh editorial in the interests of peace, to be issued on Christmas Day.

Some preferred to see the Canovas reform-proposals of February 1897 as an admission by Spain of exhaustion, if not defeat. Their rejection, the intensive lobbying of the 'Cuban Party' in the American Congress, the renewed call for recognition of the rebels' belligerent rights by the Senate and the internal squabbling within the Spanish Conservative party, all told a different story. The press suspected (and T.G. Alvord's article in the Forum corroborated) that the Cubans were in a far stronger military position than Spanish reports indicated. Indeed, they were probably in control of the provinces of Oriente, Camaguey and Las Villas. Alvord also observed during his four months in Cuba that the Spanish military effort was not serious: 150,000 soldiers were on passive garrison duty, shooting was wild, marching aimless, café generals at saturation point and 30,000 officers idled their time in the towns. In electing a president to their internationally unrecognized Cuban republic the insurgents has issued 'the most direct challenge' yet to Madrid. With this development, the idea of General Weyler undertaking a successful campaign against an intervening United States was 'too grotesque for a circus'.

At first some hopes were entertained for General Blanco who replaced Weyler under the new Sagasta Ministry in October. It was believed he might act as an 'energetic and humane dictator', for 'what is wanted', asserted the Sydney Morning Herald, 'more at the present moment than even a constitution is the means of making a livelihood and

---

1Comment in Mount Alexander Mail, 5 February 1897; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 6 Feb. 1897; Argus, 25 May 1897; Australasian, 4 Sept. 1897; Age, 1 Sept. 1897; Advertiser, 16 Sept. 1897; Sydney Morning Herald, 15 Sept. 1897; Herald, 24 Sept. 1897.
reduction of sickness and mortality'. 1 Blanco appeared to fit the heroic mould when he was reported to have burnt Esperanza, the rebel seat of government. Almost alone among its conservative peers, the _Telegraph_ hoped that the American fleet's presence in West Indian waters would restrain Spain from going 'too far in its victorious anger' - the others desiring that fleet in Chinese waters to help Britain there. 2

Many papers believed that this resurgent Spanish militarism had been responsible for the loss of the _Maine_. The _Geelong Times_ was typical of those who dismissed the explanation of an accidental mine as 'absurd'. 3 At best an increasing number of papers were charging Spain with military negligence and irresponsibility following the report of the American naval commission examining the explosion's cause. Upon receiving news of Spain's naval rebuilding programme, papers questioned how funds could be so readily raised for this purpose in a country supposedly near bankruptcy. Most now believed that Spain would fight America over Cuba as much from a desire to forestall domestic rebellion - like the King of Greece the year before against Turkey - as from a sense of misguided honour, and to assuage 'the hot blood of old cavaliers which still ran in the veins of the present generation'. 4

At this point, Australian press opinion regarding Spanish militarism was in a cleft stick. All along accused of a failure of _clan_, the most vociferous criticism followed a restoration of military morale. With other factors, it revealed an underlying bias toward the Cuban cause.

1 _Sydney Morning Herald_, 27 Oct. 1897.

2 _Daily Telegraph_ (Sydney), 26 Jan. 1898; this was in step with the opinion of London's _Daily Chronicle_, (which it modelled itself on somewhat) but the opinion was expressed earlier than the British paper (7 Apr. 1898). See also _Herald_, 27 Oct. 1897.

3 _Geelong Times_, 1 Mar. 1898.

4 See comment in _South Australian Register_, 16, 29 Mar. 1898; _Mt. Alexander Mail_, 17 Mar. 1898; _Launceston Examiner_, 31 Mar. 1898; _Age_, 31 Mar. 1898; _Courier_, 4 Apr. 1898; _Ballarat Star_, 7 Apr. 1898.
Most damaging of all the charges brought against Spain was that of cruelty. Such accusations were quickly taken up by the leading opinion-makers in New South Wales and Victoria and provoked a debate involving anti-Catholicism and anti-Spanish feeling. Though vague and often exaggerated, the accusations were frequently believed because of the more credible corroborative press materials seemingly involving insensitivity and incompetence in colonial and military matters.

By forbidding the harvesting of sugar and coffee crops in an attempt to flush out the rebels through starvation, it was argued that Weyler was simultaneously condemning innocent civilian women and children to death by cutting them off from their means of livelihood. With awareness of this, sympathy for Spain dwindled further.¹

One of the fiercest indictments came at the end of 1896, from the Bendigo Evening Mail.² Spain had dropped her religious mask to reveal a ferocity as great as that of the heathen Turk. If reports of the use of the thumb-screw and rack, midnight assassinations and death by slow torture were correct then,

Spain had forfeited all right to exist as a Government or nation, certainly all claim to rule dependencies,...Any nation whose civilization is more than skin deep should support [America] in her threatened rescue and extend it to all populations subject to the same wrongs.

These makings of another press crusade, appealed as in the case of the Americans, to proper Victorian Protestant humanitarianism as it existed in the antipodes.³

Some conservative papers doubted the veracity of these reports. The Argus for example, admitted they were 'partisan', but noted that 'true or false, they are believed.

¹Daily Telegraph, 31 Aug. 1896.
²Bendigo Evening Mail, 22 Dec. 1896.
³E.g. Weekly Times, 26 Dec. 1896. Most religious papers played down this aspect, however.
Spanish rule, it is said, baffled and despairing, has ceased to be civilized and reverted to barbarism. As noted, the Sydney Morning Herald was prepared to believe these derogatory reports because they were 'generally credited in Europe'. It based its attack on the treachery of Filipino Dominican and Franciscan friars and believed 'the tools of the Inquisition have never been allowed to grow quite out of date in Spain'. These inflammatory remarks intensified sectarian controversy in Australia during the next two years.

The Melbourne Herald provides an interesting example of evidencing. For the existence of a 'Black Hole' of Manila in which 59 prisoners suffocated in a single night, evidence from Hong Kong and Singaporean papers and 'an English merchant' at Manila was used. For the judgement of Weyler as 'exterminator', and sham poseur as 'champion of Spanish trade', the long letter of an English observer to the London Times (1 October 1897) was cited.

Far from contradicting this evidence, most papers sought to explain it in terms of 'national temper' or history. Thus the Sydney Morning Herald:

At one end of the Mediterranean, Spain, at the other end, Turkey. Truly these two extremes do not seem to belong to the comity of European nations. Someone says that Africa begins at the Pyrenees and in the light, or rather darkness of these recent acts of official savagery, the saying seems to be fully justified.

Throughout 1897, many pro-Empire Australian papers called for British action, even intervention, especially in the Philippines where it was believed a potential Japanese takeover needed to be forestalled.

---

1 Argus, 27 Sept. 1897. Nonetheless the Age and the Adelaide Advertiser were also guilty in the eyes of Catholics of jumping to conclusions.

2 Sydney Morning Herald, 28 Jan. 1897.

3 E.g. Freeman’s Journal, 6 Feb. 1897.


A small section of the Australian press came as close as it ever would to an arrogant 'Yellow Press' of its own, in the editorial of the Ballarat Star — undoubtedly the most over-ripe expression of Australian indignation:

There is not a Christian community on the face of the earth that would not experience satisfaction at witnessing the great drama of the United States undertaking to wipe out once and forever the last vestige of Spanish rule from America. There cannot be a scintilla of sympathy with Spain in her misfortunes and if these should result in her total obliteration from the map of Europe as a nation, it could only be regarded as the just judgement of Heaven for centuries of the most hideous and abominable crimes that have ever darkened with blood the pages of history...

[Spain's] last foothold has been simply a catalogue of ruthless brutalities upon people driven to despair by misgovernment and indifference to human suffering...When was Spain ever known to keep faith or to be touched by a feeling of pity?...There is a limit to human endurance collectively no less than individually. Mankind is weary of beholding this blood-gorged nation still prowling in search of victims. If ever a sacred federation was conceived it would be a Brotherhood of Man formed for the extinction of Spain.

Her effacement at the hands of America should be "...complete...pitiless and inexorable" and this would evoke "...universal applause and gratification". With this, a certain element of the press joined what it believed was a developing Anglo-Saxon crusade.¹

In an age which endorsed Social Darwinism, considerable opinion was ranged against 'losers' in the scramble for Empire. As it became increasingly more evident that Spain would soon join those international losers a rationale centering on national degeneracy was built up concerning her.

¹Ballarat Star, 26 Mar. 1898; see Langley, op.cit., p.110 on Cuban intervention as a popular crusade. George W. Auxier in 'Middle Western Newspapers and the Spanish-American War, 1895-1898', Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XXVI (March 1940), illustrates how excited rural-populist newspapers (geographically distanced from America's east) could become, with examples paralleling this editorial.
At first Spain was condemned as 'untrustworthy'. Not only had she once chained Columbus and recently disgraced the chivalrous General Campos, but now the savage General Weyler had been installed in his place. Defects in national character were commonly cited as reasons for Spain's falling from first to last place in the realms of Empire in the course of 400 years, as well as explaining all her errors of judgement.¹

Many believed that the Latin character had been put in its place once again by the superiority of the English race. Thus the Mt. Alexander Mail:

...the whole nation flames and boils and surges with a mad passion of enthusiasm directed against the progeny of those English bulldogs...who had forced the nation [Spain] down, down upon its knees to poverty and wreck.²

Now the country would be no match for a more vigorous Anglo-Saxon rival (America) with her boundless energies and incomputable resources.³ By the time war broke out, many had joined critics like Bonsal and Shaw⁴ in condemning the 'vain and vulture-like Don'.

Perhaps Spain was unfortunate in being lumped so definitely with 'fin de siecle' aristocratic degeneracy contrasted with progressive American democracy. With the overwhelming pressure of adverse propaganda in the English-speaking press against Spain, it was almost inevitable in which direction Australian press sympathy would travel.⁵

¹See comment in Barrier Miner, 4 Mar. 1896; Sydney Morning Herald, 12 Sept. 1896; Queenslander, 7 Nov. 1896, 26 Dec. 1896.
²Mt. Alexander Mail, 8 Apr. 1898.
³For example see, Ballarat Star, 13 Apr. 1898; Australian Star, 18 Apr. 1898; Argus, 18 Apr. 1898; South Australian Register, 20 Apr. 1898.
⁵John Grenville assures us that national prejudice of this kind has not decreased since 1898: 'National Prejudice and International History', pam. (Leeds, 1968), p.21.
What debate remained among editorialists concerned the international legality of American filibustering expeditions; the nature of Spanish military strength; Spanish performance in the Philippines and the character of Spain's rulers.

Given the costly international legal precedent of the Alabama claims, it was natural that Australian opinion was long opposed to the sort of informal military assistance being rendered Cuban rebels by various filibustering expeditions. Especially was this so where Americans who were involved were mostly escaping the consequences of those activities which had cost the British people many millions of pounds sterling.¹

Each crisis in turn - The Competitor (May 1896); The Three Friends (December 1896); The Commodore (January 1897) and others following, awoke a chorus of support or detraction - mostly the latter - from the Australian press. Whether those Americans captured deserved the death penalty was the main point of contention. Australians sympathetic to the cause of the Cuban 'Republic' were opposed to it, while those who supported Spanish attempts to introduce reforms viewed the harsher alternative as the only effective deterrent. Use of the Monroe Doctrine as an American justification was again debated. Some claimed its misuse; others that the British had already endorsed its extension to include Cuba as an American sphere of influence. American magazine reports of filibustering were either applauded for their obvious panache, or condemned for their larrikin attitude toward existing notions of international law.

¹The debate can be traced in the following: Argus, 13 May 1896; 7 Jan. 1897; 19 Apr. 1898; Weekly Times, 16, 23 May 1896; Age, 14 Aug. 1896; 13 May 1897; 18 Apr. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 16 Sept., 21 Dec. 1896, 22 Nov. 1897; Review of Reviews, 20 Sept., 20 Oct. 1896; Mercury, 9, 19 October 1896; Ballarat Star, 22 Dec. 1896; Advertiser, 25 Dec. 1896; Brisbane Evening Observer, 4 Jan. 1897; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 6, 7 Jan. 1897; Geelong Advertiser, 7 Jan. 1897; Advocate, 9 Jan. 1897; Sydney Morning Herald, 11 Nov. 1897; Bendigo Advertiser, 16 Apr. 1898.
Further, American actions were condemned by some for causing internal difficulties for the Spanish government while those who defended them did so on the grounds of defence of American 'interests'. Australian press opinion mostly concurred with McKinley's articulation of these interests in his Congressional Message (11 April 1898) and his sudden decision for war based on those interests.\(^1\) As the Age rationalized it a week later: the older, stricter view of international law which held every State to be sovereign in itself was giving way to the newer rule that a nation should be sovereign 'so long as the operations of that state are confined in their effort to the limits of national territory'. America had the precedents of Greece, Turkey, Mexico and Egypt in its favour, and only the Virginius incident against it.\(^2\)

Now Australian liberal-conservative press opinion was prepared to endorse the new interpretation of international law. Nothing reflects better the direction of the flow of Australian sympathies than this sudden shift of legal viewpoint favouring America against Spain.\(^3\)

A prolonged debate centred on Spanish military prospects. Much of it was based on ignorance, prejudice and

\(^1\)For McKinley's Message see Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States (1898, Government Printing Office, 1901), pp.750-60.

\(^2\)The filibuster Virginius was captured 31 October 1873 and 53 of the crew, including Americans were shot. American Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish, attempted to use it as a pretext for American intervention in Cuba's 'Ten Years War', but was unsuccessful in arousing European backing: Allen Nevins, Hamilton Fish (Vol.II, 1936), p.671, passim. T.G. Shearman's 'International Law and the Cuban Question', The Outlook, LVIII (16 Apr. 1898), p.987, arrived too late to affect the Australian debate.

\(^3\)Progressive Imperialists had oft been careless of the niceties of international law if it meant achieving an end:\(^1\) Alec Campbell, 'The Spanish-American War', History Today, VIII (1958), p.239.
the operation of imponderables. ¹

At first, there was much opinion in Australia expressed in favour of Spain's military chances against America. Spain's past reputation as a fighting nation was not lightly put aside. Nor were her recent successes against the insurgents of Cuba and the Philippines in early 1898. As well as her greater experience in jungle fighting and as a naval power, it was expected that her present desperation and appeal to national honour would call forth greater effort. Rothschild's naval gift to Spain and the evident financial and diplomatic sympathy of France and Germany gave extra credibility to Spain's military chances. A short war might just see Spain triumph against an ill-trained and ill-prepared America.

But Spain's support dwindled as war approached. The Argus was typical of those who believed it was the most incredible folly for Spain to take on alone a power of 'seventy millions of perhaps the most intelligent and enterprising people on earth', whose new ships of the Oregon class were claimed to be the most powerful afloat. Beside, economic disparities and political dissension in Spain, made her no match for America's resources and renewed sense of national unity. Most Australians placed great store in Yankee ingenuity and energy in overcoming initial handicaps. Spain's detractors believed her Continental

backers would not rally to her and that if they did, Britain by immediately taking the side of America, was more than a match for such a combination. Further, they maintained that militarily Spain had proved herself to be lethargic, inept and unimaginative and many of her troops were sick. Strategically, in terms of supplies of material and maintenance of communications, she was disadvantaged by fighting so far from home and her ships had few coaling stations.

Nonetheless, Spain's internal difficulties and her uncertain political future, especially of the noble Queen Maria Christina, aroused some pangs of sympathy during 1897 - the year in which Britain's great monarch received affectionate regards from the colonies of Australia.¹ This feeling was counteracted by the debate on the future of the Philippines, from which Spain emerged as an insufferable future overlord. As with the legal issue, a sharp turning away from the contemplation of a Spanish victory coincided with a more partisan backing of America as war neared.

Turning now to consider Australia's attitudes and reactions toward America, we can see that sometimes the debate is complementary. However, America presented its own distinctive case and stimulated more comment in Australia than did Spain. Many old themes treated previously were again raised, but viewed in a new perspective. The change in attitude toward America derives much of its meaning from an understanding of the attitudes expressed toward Spain.

¹British sympathy was much greater at the official level for the Queen Regent, see C.S. Campbell, op.cit., pp. 25-6.
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Anti-American attitudes and reactions in Australia were quite widespread and continued throughout the three years under discussion. They focused on two phenomena whose growth and development were distasteful to Australians. These were the continuing American jingoism, now translated into a new American international style and its vehicle, the 'Yellow Press',\(^1\) representing a new American journalistic tone.

Though objections were raised regarding both means and ends in the new American diplomacy, adverse comment at first concentrated on means. American jingoism toward England had caused irritation in Australia. Since early 1896 Yankee phobes such as Davies trenchantly criticized American 'paper warriors', 'saloon orators' and 'firebrand Yanks' who traded in 'cheap heroics' against Englishmen, having been frustrated in their early designs on Cuba.\(^2\) The new and bellicose developments in American foreign policy received such a bad press in Australia because Englishmen first felt their bite.\(^3\)

At an early stage, critics like the Brisbane Worker\(^4\) and others noted that America's ship-building programme would result in America 'continually standing on the edge of international troubles which have cost ten times as much as an unnecessary fleet'. This was sad, John Farrell believed, because

\(^{1}\) 'Yellow Journalism' derived its name from the yellow ink first used in comic strips, especially the 'Yellow Kid' in Pulitzer's New York World. Hearst took it up and by 1898 the term was synonymous with sensational journalism in popular papers. Australian papers did not carry comic strips in their papers at this time.

\(^{2}\) Mercury, 4 Jan. 1896.

\(^{3}\) See for example, Launceston Examiner, 6 Mar. 1896. Britain ran similar comments e.g. Saturday Review, 'The Blatant American', LXXXV, p. 546.

\(^{4}\) Brisbane Worker, 22 Jan. 1898.
no country in the world, no aggregation of modern people has had such an opportunity of setting an example of peace as the United States was given before she took to building warships, cultivating a foreign policy and in pretended solicitude for the spirit of Monroecism, breaking the spirit of it into small bits.

He concluded prophetically:

It is not good business to have a number of foreign complications in hand [with] more to follow...a position into which the American navy will more firmly (and dangerously) wedge the Republic as time goes on.¹

The Navy League in London even suggested that Australian interests would ultimately collide with America's over that country's ambitions toward Hawaii.²

Stead, in the Australian Review of Reviews, treated American filibusterers harshly. To him they were 'professional ruffians and atrocity-mongers, uncivilized blackmailers' typical of 'Yankee barbarism'. By contrast in this respect, the Spanish became in his eyes a 'renowned, heroic and unvanquished people'.³ The Launceston Examiner blamed American brusqueness in this regard on her isolation from foreign politics, developing 'indifference, if not arrogance...calculated to wound the susceptibilities of a nation like Spain'.⁴

To Australian commentators, America was flirting with a policy dangerous to world peace. The prospect of a Continental combination backing Spain might precipitate war, if only to put America in its place. German Hohenzollern sympathy with Spain for traditional reasons was as well recognized as was that country's hostility toward Monroecism. To the Argus,

there is peril in the position of a democratic people unequipped for a great war, yet perpetually straining at the leash, held in the tiring hands of their Executive. Some day the leash may break or the grasp upon it suddenly relax.⁵

¹Daily Telegraph, 4 Mar. 1896.
²Argus, 26 January, 1898.
³Review of Reviews, 20 Sept. 1896, commenting on Bloomfield's 'Cuban Expedition'.
⁴Launceston Examiner, 21 Dec. 1896.
⁵Argus, 29 Dec. 1896.
The success of the Three Friends filibuster (December 1896) indicated to other conservative newspapers how much pressure the encouraged jingoism could assert on the American scene.\(^1\)

Some of these conservatives were prepared to applaud when this annoying jingoism was checked. The Duke of Tetuan's diplomatic rebuff was an occasion for this. America's 'undignified' actions were being answered with 'something of the old haughty and resolute Spanish temper'. But when the Duke's resignation was demanded in the Cortes (May 1897) some blamed General Lee, America's Consul General in Havana for having engineered it. Others were more critical of Republican policies being implemented by McKinley, when a retreat from Cleveland-style Monroeism had been predicted.\(^2\) The President's threat that unless Spain subdued her possessions by October, America would feel justified in intervening, aroused the Argus and others:

'No more "forward" policy than this can be imagined', it wrote. 'No slight could be offered which it is less possible for even a decadent power to brook without humiliation'. For some editors, America was going too far.\(^3\)

In an editorial entitled 'Those Irritating Americans', the South Australian Register mitigated its criticism of such forwardness by claiming that the way of wisdom regarding America was to gain 'increasing insight into the purely evanescent nature of American ebullitions of feeling and the make-believe of Washington politics'.\(^4\) Others were less tolerant. One paper believed that ironically, America was assisting in the Cuban's downfall by forcing Spain to redouble its military efforts against them.\(^5\) British sources were equally critical. Smalley agreed that America's final notice to Spain though long delayed, was cruelly short when

---

\(^1\) South Australian Register, 29 Dec. 1896.

\(^2\) E.g. Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 19, 21, 30 Jan. 1897; Sydney Morning Herald, 1 Apr. 1897; Age, 31 May 1897.

\(^3\) Argus, 27 Sept. 1897.

\(^4\) South Australian Register, 30 Sept. 1897.

\(^5\) Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 12 Oct. 1897.
it came, especially as Spain would be only too pleased to find a means of withdrawing its troops with honour. After the Stock Market dropped following the American announcement, some were displeased enough to suspect manipulation by speculators of the Sugar Trust.

When Senorita Evangeline Cisneros was rescued by Karl Decker and reporters of Hearst's *New York Journal*, many scoffed at the new international role created for journalists.

Upon the *Maine* being ordered to Havana on a 'friendly call' (26 January 1898) as the cables described it, many were openly sceptical. 'You know the sort of "friendly call"' scoffed 'Aliquis' in the *Telegraph*:

The sort of call that is also made when some infuriated citizen calls on his neighbour and exhibiting a loaded pistol at full cock, remarks that he has just dropped in to express a hope that the baby is well.

The transparent menace of the 'big sea-going pugilist' was not lost on astute observers.

Among the cables delayed from America by a week's failure of the overland line to Darwin, was news of Senor Dupuy De Lome's derogatory letter and the 'profound sensation' its publication had aroused in New York. The

---


2 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 11 Nov. 1897.

3 *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 30 Nov. 1897. See also *Review of Reviews*, 15 Dec. 1897. The Cisneros rescue, publicised by the *New York Journal*, 10 Oct. 1897, headlined: 'An American Newspaper Accomplishes at a Single Stroke What the Best Efforts of Diplomacy Failed Utterly to Bring About in Many Months'. The paper claimed that the rescue from Havana of a girl who had been imprisoned for defending her virtue against the advances of a Spanish Officer was 'The Greatest Journalistic Coup of this Age'. Miss Cisneros had accompanied her father into exile following his imprisonment for complicity with the insurgents. When she arrived in New York, there was a huge reception for her at Madison Square Garden and she was introduced to the President. For an account, see Walter Millis, *The Martial Spirit*, pp.82-4.

4 *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 28 Jan. 1898.
private communication of the Spanish Minister at Washington had contained criticism of McKinley as 'weak and catering to the rabble...a low politician who desires to leave a door open to me and to stand well with the jingoism of his party.'\footnote{1} As the letter had been stolen from the mails in Havana and released to Hearst's \textit{New York Journal} by the Cuban junta, the incident aroused only contemptuous criticism in Australia. Memories of similar indignities through partisan trickery attending the expulsion of the British ambassador Lord Sackville-West in 1888, were a continuing source of Yankeephobia after the passage of a decade. The \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} was shocked:

\textit{...except in America, there is hardly a case extant of an Ambassador being disgraced by means of a trick....With these developments of 'smartness' in diplomatic relations with the United States, the \textit{corps diplomatique} at Washington will soon need to be composed of Sherlock Holmeses, it wrote.}\footnote{2} In the eyes of Australians, in strong contrast to British reaction, the episode did not redound to American honour.\footnote{3}

Even the \textit{Maine} catastrophe a week later (15 February 1898) failed to arouse immediate sympathy among those still soured by the De Lome revelations. The \textit{Australian Star} blamed 'American bluster' for what had happened. The \textit{Maine's} presence had been a thinly-veiled threat. 'Zed' in 'Day by Day' in that paper remarked: 'If the tragedy assists to make the American eagle a trifle more modest, it will not have been altogether in vain'. Taking a vicious side-swipe at the loquacious American Consul in Sydney, he

\footnote{1}{Text of the letter published in \textit{Age's American correspondent's letter}, sent 18 February, arriving 26 March. Translation slightly different from later versions. See H. Wayne Morgan, \textit{William McKinley and His America} (Syracuse, New York, 1963), p.356 for a critique.}

\footnote{2}{\textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 17 Feb. 1898. See also \textit{Review of Review}, 15 Apr. 1898, pp.395-7.}

\footnote{3}{C.S. Campbell, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.27-8, makes a strong case for British press sympathy toward America over the De Lome affair. These differing reactions highlight the individuality of Australia's press. See also B.A. Reuter, \textit{Anglo-American Relations During the Spanish-American War} (New York, 1924), p.68.}
asked: 'Now will Colonel Bell kindly deliver one of his well known lectures on "Explosions"? '1 Though more kindly disposed toward the hapless Bell, 'Niemand' of the Telegraph echoed 'Zed's' sentiments precisely. If sobering, 'it may result in a thousand times as many lives being saved as have been lost' (260 officers and men had been lost in the mysterious explosion).2 The Australasian claimed 'it is scarcely a favourable moment for a powerful American cruiser of nearly 7,000 tons to steam into Havana as a friendly guest'.3 The Sydney Morning Herald harshly reminded the public that danger was the 'business' or 'duty' of sailors in war vessels and that Australian sympathy was 'strangely incongruous' with this fact.4

Irony suffused the judgements of Melbourne's Herald also. While S.V. Winter, the proprietor, was in Europe throughout most of 1898, his editor Lt.Col. Reay believed that American hopes for 'benovent neutralty' in a Spanish-American conflict might be 'as doubtful...as the justice of the American cause (for)...Britishers are hardly likely to run at the heels of the Jingo war chariots'.5 Commenting cynically over a month later on McKinley's assurance that he would not become responsible for an 'unholy war', that paper remarked: 'It is remarkable how invariably this sort of thing precedes a wholesale cutting of throats.'6

Melbourne's Catholic newspaper, the Advocate, continued to insist that it could see no clear cause for war in the Maine incident. It preferred to see America accept compensation...without making the crime an excuse for territorial aggrandisement. For:

His long and eager desire to possess Cuba explains, but does not justify, the part Uncle Sam has played in this affair. His good qualities are many, but his character is not faultless.

1 Australian Star, 18 Feb. 1898. The paper viewed Bell as a 'wind-bag' ready to lecture on any topic, regardless of expertise.
2 Daily Telegraph, 21 Feb. 1898.
3 Australasian, 19 Feb. 1898.
4 Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Feb. 1898.
5 Herald, 12 Feb. 1898.
6 Herald, 18 Mar. 1898.
The paper was conscience-bound to blame America (which had refused the prospect of papal arbitration) and not Spain for the friction. Though sentimentally attached to America, it condemned an American-initiated war as 'an unholy one... aggressive and covetous... unjust and reprehensible'. A clear division of Catholic sentiment presented itself—partly for a Catholic power and partly for an Anglo-Saxon one. This contradiction dogged Australian Catholic sentiment.¹

But even the great dailies with a Protestant bias were dour. Some reminded Americans of the cruelties they had inflicted on their own Indians and compared their present altruism as that of the wolf with regard to the lamb.²

One paper described the Republican platform on foreign matters (St. Louis, June 1896) as comparable with 'France electing her chief officer on a platform pledging him to use his influence to make Great Britain give independence to Ireland'.³ Many pointed out that certainly Spain's rearmament indicated how little she trusted America's intentions.⁴ A number of commentators thereby accentuated American hypocrisy.

Frederick Greenwood, influential former editor of the Pall Mall Gazette and St. James Gazette— a freelancing conservative journalist—published a widely quoted article, 'The World's Unrest' in the Argus. He criticized, among other things, America's obsession with the Civil War:

Month after month, year after year there is an increasing outpouring of historiettes commemorative of the awful butcheries called battles which for many good reasons would be better remembered in silence. Only a craving for national glory can account for the unending celebration of the slaughter of Americans by Americans and it is this same hankering no

¹ Advocate, 19, 26 Mar., 9 Apr. 1898.
² E.g. South Australian Register, 29 Mar. 1898.
³ E.g. Age, 31 Mar. 1898.
⁴ E.g. Launceston Examiner, 7 Apr. 1898.
doubt, which on several occasions of late, has
turned half the population of the United States
into a war party.
Greenwood predicted that this jingoism would soon project
America onto the world stage.¹

Ignoble aspects of American expansionism continued to
be aired. The Bendigo Independent reminded Australians
that 'the United States system of government is not the best
in the world' and that 'there is probably as much suffering
and iniquity in New York and Chicago as there is in Cuba'.²
Comparisons were also local. The violence and disorder of
the American Congressional proceedings (April 1898) were far
in excess of any such colonial crudities of a parliamentary
nature it was noted. Some joined with the London Times
which condemned the noisy legislature as a 'national
disgrace' by encouraging avenging factions. The American
Senate - already highly unpopular in Australia - was blamed
for needless bellicosity. Many continued to hope that the
'fearful price' America would be forced to pay for active
intervention would quieten this high-handed ebullience.
It was regretted that, in the process, so many not
responsible for Cuban miseries would themselves suffer.³

Other criticisms were registered. As ever, the Hobart
Mercury spearheaded the most trenchant of the attacks.
America's actions were prompted by a desire for military
and naval glory 'which has become so marked a characteristic
of the American people', it wrote. Further, international
law was a thing which the United States had never observed
while it did not suit them, the paper charged. ¹From the

¹Argus, 9 Apr. 1898. Frederick Greenwood (1830-1909). A
conservative, he influenced public affairs most between 1865-
1880 when he used his pen to support Disraeli against
Gladstone. He had always supported Salisbury. In 1875
Greenwood played a large unofficial role in Britain's purchase
of Suez shares.

²Bendigo Independent, 13 Apr. 1898.

³See, Australian Star, 15 Apr. 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 16
Apr. 1898; Argus, 18 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph, 18 Apr. 1898;
Courier, 19 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 18 Apr. 1898;
Capricornian, 9 Apr. 1898.
outset...they have done pretty much as they darned pleased,\(^1\) ignoring the...decencies of international life.\(^1\) It therefore viewed Jenkins\(^1\) Ear as being as valid an excuse for war at this point as was the Maine.\(^1\) While not condoning American actions, others believed that the United States was caught in a trap of its own policy-making. Republicans had to press on with their large policy or lose face. But there were those who maintained that the real jingoists were the Popocrats\(^1\) defeated in the 1896 election. Their motives in recognizing a Cuban republic was as much to embarrass the Republicans as from their own conviction.\(^2\) To the West Australian, as to others, intervention under the more oppressive Weyler regime was thought to make more sense than during the more conciliatory occupation by Blanco.\(^3\)

Even the generally agreed upon strategic motive for intervention was attacked in the end, and by the Argus, one of its erstwhile supporters. Thus:

"...if Cuba is the key to the American position, Jamaica is the key to Cuba; the Bahamas the key to Jamaica and so we may travel on to Newfoundland and the Isle of Man. The strategists make every place of value, the paper complained, and they are to be called in as expert witnesses and not as judges."\(^4\) Militarism in general was attacked by the Bendigo Independent. The creation of a military structure might for years to come be a menacing element in the Republic. War would also endanger the unity of the Republic by exacerbating class and sectional divisions, it warned. That paper registered the strongest aversion to American jingoism on the Australian scene. Americans were a singularly tetchy, pugnacious, shooting and knifing people desiring...pageant and excitement...sensationalism on a grand scale...and holocausts of corpses

\(^1\)Mercury, 18, 19 Apr. 1898.
\(^2\)E.g. Courier, 18 Apr. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 18 Apr. 1898.
\(^3\)West Australian, 18 Apr. 1898. See also Ballarat Courier, 19 Apr. 1898; Argus, 21 Apr. 1898. Senator Proctor's address to Congress convinced that paper that the Democrats had been for war since 18 March 1898.
\(^4\)Argus, 21 Apr. 1898.
swimming in streams of blood'. They were 'a people ready to popularise McKinley if he casts all judgement to the winds and goes in blindly for slaughter'. This view of the socialist John Gregory Edwards echoed the earlier criticism by De Lome. The recently founded Bendigo Evening Mail of Robert Walker (1894), with a mildly radical policy of its own, likewise complained. 'The American Eagle is likely to become ridiculous over the Cuban affair', it wrote. 'He began to screech too soon and he is screeching too long'. Written on 20 April, this was one of the last criticisms of jingo politics as such. Within a week, militarism - or jingo politics in practice, would be the main focus of anti-American comment in the Australian press.

America's thrusting new international jingo style was therefore criticized by the Australian press from 1895 to 1898 for its nature and motives, its excessive brashness, its foolish and dangerous lack of military backing, its timing and finally, its breach with tradition and imponderable results.

Australian editors also criticized the tangible vehicle of American jingoism - the 'Yellow Press'. There were several reasons for this, among them, an aversion to the exaggeration and violence of the American character and a preference for more restrained and 'responsible' English journalistic models. A concern to stress issues rather than news presentation, and a natural press conservatism regarding the new press forms, similarly operated to bring about such an adverse attitude toward the 'Yellow Press'. Finally, the absence of either the pre-conditions of a malleable reading public or a ruthless circulation war, dulled the prospect of such colourful journalism being duplicated on the Australian scene.

The attack on the tone of sections of the New York press was opened in the first week of January 1898, by the

---

1 Bendigo Independent, 20 Apr. 1898.
2 Bendigo Evening Mail, 20 Apr. 1898.
sober Launceston Examiner. That paper found reporting of
filibustering escapades 'bombastic and overbearing in the
extreme'. It reminded its readers that not all American
newspapers were as flattering to the British as was being
supposed by the press of the Australian mainland. Some
American editors were openly predicting that Britain's
commercial greatness would be America's in a matter of time.
Support for the English was one of mere temporary expediency -
Americans actually posed a long-term threat to Australian
interests. This impression was reinforced by the Age's New
York correspondent. It became evident that British good-
will toward America was not as widely reciprocated as
Australians imagined.

Further disillusion with the New York press was to
follow. William Randolph Hearst's offer of a reward for the
discovery of the perpetrators of the Maine outrage was
condemned by the Telegraph as being
hard to conceive a more obvious and deliberate
insult to the Spanish Government...provoked...
from no other motive than the desire of a
newspaper proprietary to obtain wider
advertisement and circulation for its journal...
and...dishing its rivals at any price.

Such 'wild allegations' regarding 'Spanish treachery'
evoked widespread repulsion. The 'shoddy theatricalism' of
printing in red ink caused the Brisbane Evening Observer to
declare:

...it is difficult to realise a journalism so
demented as to print its papers in ink the
colour of a cockpit just fresh with gore. The
whoop of the mobs which are yellow in France
for Jewish blood [the Dreyfus case] finds
something more than an echo in America over a
wrecked gunboat.

---

1 Launceston Examiner, 4 Jan., 26, 28 Feb. 1898.
2 Age, 19 March 1898. Letter sent 30 Jan. 1898. See also,
Geelong Advertiser, 23 Feb. 1898.
3 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 1 Mar. 1898.
4 Brisbane Evening Observer, 1 Mar. 1898.
Even the Age's American correspondent found the 'gross extravagences and palpable exaggerations' of the New York press disconcerting. 1

This comparison with the French 'gutter press', which had been condemned in Australia for over a decade, indicated 'perverse and depraved taste' existing in America. Davies held it was enough to 'make the observer doubtful of democracy and even question the value of modern journalistic developments'. Hearst's reward was 'bribing unscrupulous men to manufacture evidence'. 2 Surely there could be 'no worse taste and no more ignoble procedure', remarked the Argus. It was clearly unworthy of a 'great nation'. The worst aspect was that in copying and surpassing the abusive tone of the Madrid journals, America was creating a fevered public opinion which might put irresistible pressures on the government. The arrival of more examples of these papers on the eve of war aboard the R.M.S. Moana (Melbourne, 17 April 1898) confirmed the worst fears that Hearst and Pulitzer were between them monopolising Cuban news sources and distorting the general situation. The Philadelphia Ledger was praised by some as an example of a sober contrast to the New York press. For, as the Argus (itself often accused of war-mongering by its rivals) put it: 'War should come as a painful duty, to be honourably faced and bravely discharged and not, as the jingoists of all countries seem to think, as a relaxation or a pleasure'. 3 In its diplomatic and journalistic forms, recrudescence jingoism provoked anti-American sentiment on the Australian scene.

2Mercury, 2 Mar. 1898.
3Argus, 2 Mar., 12, 18 Apr. 1898. See also, Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 3 Mar. 1898.
Yet several factors combined to make America popular in Australia on the eve of the outbreak of the Spanish-American war. A bedrock of sympathy existed due to Anglo-Saxon racial ties so widely publicized during the arbitration excitement. The belief that Spain's colonies would be better off both economically and politically under America helped counteract criticism of America's more selfish motives. Most impressive was the altruism of American concern to prevent further suffering. Strategic interests also played their part in creating a climate of approval for American action. In these ways, acknowledgement of American selfishness became muted and American virtue was able to gradually appear in the best light.

As early as February 1896, the Advertiser regarded America's willingness to recognise insurgents' belligerent rights as justified on humanitarian grounds in the eyes of international law. Another paper believed at the end of that year that no doubt if the question were submitted to the mass of the American people, there would be an overwhelming majority in favour of active intervention, for the Americans regard the people of Cuba much as the mass of Englishmen regard the Armenians.

The Armenian precedent helped prepare Australian opinion for American intervention in Cuba. America's tradition of achieving liberty from a Mother Country through force, also helped acceptance of the notion of American sympathy for Cuba's plight.

The attitude firm that it was America's duty to remove Spain from the international scene. 'Uncle Sam's Sick Man' was Stephen Bonsal's description in the Review of Reviews, a theme taken up by Albert Shaw and

---

1 Advertiser, 17 Feb. 1896.
2 West Australian, 11 July 1896.
3 See, Weekly Times, 26 Dec. 1896; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 26 Jan. 1898.
4 Stephen Bonsal, 1865-1951, was an American journalist, New York's correspondent in several locales including China 1895; Cuba, 1897-8; Philippines, 1901 and Venezuela 1903. In 1913 he became secretary to the Governor General of the Philippines.
others as a fitting indictment. A justification for using ruthless, even illegal means, to achieve humanitarian ends was echoed by 'progressive' elements in the Australian press. The rescue of Senorita Cisneros typified this tendency which received its most effective publicity in the Review of Reviews, a crusader for altruistic interventionism.

Precipitant events such as the De Lome letter, or the Maine disaster, could not obscure the fact for some that:

It would be as just and generous a war as has ever been undertaken by any country...How the Americans, lashed to their duty...by probably the most cleverly conducted and most brilliant press in the world, could have refrained from declaring war against Spain, is somewhat of a mystery.

The case building up for America was making it an 'irrepressible conflict' for some Australian editors.1

'Who is Cuba's Neighbour?' asked the leading editorial of the Brisbane Courier at the end of March 1898. Given the death of a population 'almost equal to that of Queensland out of a population something like that of Queensland and New South Wales combined' and the imminent death of half as many more, 'are facts so tremendous at the close of this nineteenth century, which may be called the century of humanity that we cannot and dare not escape the question of responsibility and of succour'. Europe had clearly failed to prevent a similar tragedy in Armenia, but now...

...the civilized world looks...to America to step in and end the Cuban horror...it is clearly America's place to render...succour...

For the time there will be outcries from a


2 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 29 June, 1897.

3 See e.g. Launceston Examiner, 25 Sept. 1897; Argus, 27 Sept. 1897; Newcastle Morning Herald, 9 Dec. 1897; Geelong Advertiser, 10 Jan. 1898; South Australian Register, 6 Jan. 1898; Leader, 26 Mar. 1898; Bendigo Independent, 28 Mar. 1898.
humiliated nation and from all who put sovereignty before humanity; but the ultimate verdict of history will be on the side of the deliverer.1

The *West Australian* similarly believed that:

...even in a peace-loving age, the doctrine finds but small acceptance that all wars are unjust and undesirable and should America decide to unsheath the sword against Spain the general verdict of the most enlightened public opinion will be that she is fighting in the cause of humanity and civilization. With much less reason has Great Britain intervened again and again to restrain the cruelty and oppression of Indian princes and so-called Kings in Africa. Her mission it has been declared, was not conquest, but good government and stable laws for the people whom she came to free...No sufficient reason can be advanced why America should not accept a no less beneficent mission in Cuba.

Remarkably, both these editorials expressing very similar viewpoints were written on the same day in Colonial capitals 3,000 miles apart.2

This growing consensus of Australian conservative-liberal press opinion, so unwilling to grant other foreign powers the right to copy the paradigm of British interventionism, revealed once again its underlying racial and political bias. Further, publicists now made it appear as hypocrisy that Australia should refuse to accede to this American

---

1*Courier*, 28 Mar. 1898.

2*West Australian*, 28 Mar. 1898. This unanimity may have been a common response to either the Red Cross revelations and/or the 'able, well-informed and dispassionate' article on Spanish cruelty in February's *Blackwood's* (mentioned in the *Courier*, 29 Mar. 1898). As the article in *The Spectator*, LXXX, 19 Mar. 1898, revealed, Anglo-Saxons seemed to be thinking the same everywhere at this time, on this issue. In a sense Australian opinion now joined that of formerly condemned American jingoes like H.C. Lodge, 'Our Duty To Cuba', *Forum*, XXI (May 1896), pp.286-7, thus affirming the notion of 'Progressivism by the Sword'. For similar approving British opinion at this exact time, see C.S. Campbell, *op.cit.*, pp.28-30, especially Hay's perceptions.
interventionism. Worse, it would be a crime against Anglo-Saxon values for America not to intervene.

The consensus increased further in the month that followed. Readers were asked to 'imagine Australia with Cuban conditions in Tasmania or New Caledonia'. It was claimed that appeals to the higher conscience of Christian civilization would commend American intervention to 'all neutral and unprejudiced nations' and the 'sympathy of all right-minded individuals' as the 'shortest or even the only way to peace'. Two precedents particularly informed the commentary: Egypt, occupied in 1882 as one of the first acts of Britain's 'New Imperialism', was cited as a case where Britain had remained as a custodian of good government. The failed Jameson Raid (1896), ostensibly undertaken to relieve the 'helpless women and children of Johannesburg', was similarly quoted. In both cases a desire to share not only the glory, but the burden of Empire was evident.

Consequently, a willingness to accept the primacy of the humanitarian motive as described in McKinley's Message to Congress calling for war powers (11 April), was evident almost everywhere in the press. Further, few were willing as war approached, to challenge the accuracy of the figures on Cuban suffering, or to believe that the American Naval Commission's findings on the external nature of the explosion were wrong, or that America's Cuban Consul, General Lee was exaggerating the picture of Cuban suffering. Thus the bulk of the Australian press aligned its estimate of the 'true' nature of the situation behind America's and Britain's and against the counter-views of most of the presses of Spain, Austria, Germany, Russia, Italy and France.

---

1 See comment in, Brisbane Evening Observer, 30 Mar. 1898; Australasian, 2 Apr. 1898; Maitland Mercury, 6 Apr. 1898; Courier, 7, 13, 18 Apr. 1898.

2 E.g. Melbourne Punch, 31 Mar. 1898; Ballarat Star, 13 Apr. 1898; Australian Star, 14 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph, 15 Apr. 1898; Freeman's Journal, 16 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 16 Apr. 1898.

America it was thought, was now assuming a role that Britain would have taken, given a similar chance of lodging a practical 'humanitarian protest against ruthless tyranny'. For Cuba's plight 'would move a heart of stone', there having been 'incidents connected with the present rebellion which have stirred the imaginations and aroused the sympathies of not merely the whole American people, but of those in the great world without'. Once again blood had proved thicker than water,

and although the cool, calculating logical Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Australian will not be able to approve altogether of the methods employed by Cousin Jonathan, or his eagerness to fight when fighting could be avoided, they will with all their hearts pray that victory may rest with the Stars and Stripes.1

The fabled 'caution and good sense' of the American people was taken as an added reason why the instincts of that people, now pressing the Executive and the Legislature to war, could be trusted.2

'Progressive' editorial opinion in Australia, which ranged through the spectrum of conservative-nationalist-imperialist-racialist-socialist convictions as did progressives in America and Britain, came out overwhelmingly in favour of intervention on humanitarian grounds. Thus common interests of Australian progressives in altruism and reform both at home and abroad was consistently promoted.3

---

1 South Australian Register, 16 Apr. 1898.

2 Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 21 Apr. 1898.

3 Since 1952 a reassessment of progressives has revealed their varied nature. W.E. Leuchtenburg, P.C. Kennedy, S. Haber and A.E. Campbell maintain that progressives were also imperialists on the American scene. Bernard Semmel affirms this opinion for the British Progressives. Barton J. Bernstein and P.A. Leib disagree with the view of Progressives as conservatives. D. Coles warns against semantic confusion in labels for the Australian as well as the Anglo-American cases. This thesis confirms the Leuchtenburg-Haber synthesis of progressives as Imperialists. See comment Chapter One for background and bibliography for references.
America's obvious huge trade and investment losses in Cuba and the conviction that efficient American business methods would lead to commercial prosperity for the Spanish colonies added their weight to the other justifications in America's favour.

The strong commercial ties of the United States and Cuba were evident to Australian editorialists who examined the statistics. Given that 82 per cent of Cuba's trade went to America and only 11 per cent to Spain, many papers believed war was justified to protect such material interests. Others declared that Cuba could only benefit from American annexation and should be America's reward for assistance rendered; though most still complained of the unnatural extension of the Monroe Doctrine that this would entail. Many believed that the best way out of the dilemma for both countries, was for Spain to recoup her losses by selling Cuba to America. The prospect of this happening seemed enhanced by McKinley's election. Some predicted that the new President would not detract from his impulse for renewed domestic American prosperity by encouraging a costly and disruptive war and would therefore push harder for the peaceful solution which purchase suggested.¹ As the South Australian Register put it: 'the Cuban lamb would be better off as part and parcel of the American wolf than as the maltreated pet of the unsympathetic Don'.²

The Philippines came to be considered a special economic prize: 'one of the grandest possessions of any of the Anglo-Saxon races', as one paper described it. Though it was criminal that unimaginative Spain had been allowed to retain possession for so long, it was noted that even that country had extracted about £1,500,000 worth of goods from the islands yearly and had sold them a similar figure in imports. The natives themselves had few champions as self-developers. With the Cubans, the Filipinos were considered

¹See editorials in, West Australian, 11 July 1896; Bendigo Evening Mail, 22 Dec. 1896; Mt. Alexander Mail, 22 Dec. 1896; Geelong Advertiser, 22 Dec. 1896; Advertiser, 25 Dec. 1896; Mercury, 19 Mar. 1897; Age, 31 May 1897; Maitland Mercury, 19 Mar. 1898.

²South Australian Register, 29 Mar. 1898.
by Australians as 'a lazy and cowardly admixture of a race...a pretty bad lot', incapable of realizing the full potential of their rich possessions. By contrast optimists like the Mt. Alexander Mail (from the failing economy of Victoria's Castlemaine) optimistically predicted a boom in the Philippines, following an American or British takeover. 'Is not a marvellous country like this a prize worth winning, one sufficient to repay all the cost of war?' it asked.1

Queensland papers - in particular the Brisbane Evening Observer2 - were insistent that if it were possible, Japan and Germany should be frustrated in their obvious desire to establish any sphere of influence which included the Philippines. If this development was inevitable, it was viewed as preferable that the Japanese should be particularly discouraged from settling any further south than the Philippines, as John Douglas3 had just raised the Australian alarm concerning the Japanese presence in Thursday Island. The prospect of a Japanese version of the Monroe Doctrine4 applying to the Philippines deeply disturbed much Australian opinion, as did the British diplomatic encouragement to Japan.

Probably for ethnocentric as well as political reasons, opinion on American designs for Cuba and the Philippines, especially the latter, benefited from incipient Australian anti-Japanese and anti-German feeling. The knowledge gleaned by cable that American businessmen were anti-interventionist disarmed critics of American selfishness. It was clear that progressive opinion in Australia, while favouring American business dynamism, clearly placed economics behind humanity in its estimate of American justifications. Yet with Adolph Ochs1 revivified

---

1Mt. Alexander Mail, 22 Dec. 1896, 8 Apr. 1898. See also Geelong Times, 28 Nov. 1896; Geelong Advertiser, 11 Apr. 1898; Herald, 5 Jan. 1897; Age, 28 Dec. 1896; Daily Telegraph, 3 Sept. 1897.

2Brisbane Evening Observer, 30 Nov. 1896.

3John Douglas (1828-1904), Premier of Queensland 1877-1879, formerly Agent-General for Queensland in London, still contributed articles to his old employer, the Brisbane Courier in his capacity as returned appointed Government Resident and Magistrate at Thursday Island (1889-1902).
The New York Times most believed: 'Spain blocks the way to peace and commerce. She must go.'

Almost a maxim among those who thought of foreign matters at all, was the conviction that any strong, proud country of European stock would want to possess those islands proximate to it. Both Australia and New Zealand prematurely revealed such an interest for all the reasons pertinent to the 'New Imperialism'. Among the most persuasive of the arguments forming the new rationale of empire, were those presented to a wide reading public by the American theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan, in favour of strategy. They struck a responsive chord in Australia.

For over a generation, most papers in Australia had recognized America's interest in Cuba. The new assertiveness of the Monroe Doctrine, the growing United States fleet and the island's proximity (100 kilometres) made it comparable with Tasmania, New Guinea or New Zealand in Australian geopolitical thinking. German interests in Spanish Cuba were therefore nonsense, claimed the Australian Star, seeking to shift the focus of American resentment.

The people of America will not allow the fate of an American territory to be determined by a State in the middle of the European continent on

1 Quoted in Argus, 21 Apr. 1898. Mid-western American editorial opinion was also against Spanish mercantilism, see Auxier, op. cit., p.533. The economic motive has been given primacy in the works of W. La Feber and W. A. Williams - the 'Wisconsin School' of the 'new left'. However, Australian press opinion stressed humanitarianism as the primary U.S. rationale for intervention.

2 Alfred Thayer Mahan (1840-1914). From 1884 as a lecturer on history and strategy at the United States Naval War College at Newport, Rhode Island, he expounded the idea of sea-power as the key to national expansion and greatness. Australians absorbed his viewpoints in books and articles (especially Harper's) from 1890 onward. The Interest of America in Sea Power was published in 1897. Mahan it appears, developed and popularized the ideas of Admiral Stephen B. Luce, his patron: J.A.S. Grenville and G.B. Young - Politics, Strategy and American Diplomacy (New Haven, 1966), pp.1-38. See also W. E. Livezey, Mahan on Sea-Power (Oklahoma, 1947).

3 West Australian, 11 July 1896; Brisbane Evening Observer, 18 Dec. 1896.
the other side of the great Atlantic Ocean and if this latest piece of German bluster proceeds from the German Emperor, it will probably cost him even greater humiliation than the historic message to President Kruger.1

Monroeism thus translated into terms of existing Australian resentments (German New Guinea and German trade) was readily assimilated.

Sir Langdon Bonython's paper agreed with the estimate of the London Times' foreign editor, Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace, that Cuba was the 'Constantinople of the West' - the most important of the Antilles. Its position in the Mexican gulf athwart the route between the mouth of the Mississippi and Panama - threatening or protecting the Anglophobe southern and western states, was its leading feature and made it a special case to American interests for traditional as well as future considerations.2 The appeal of 'Manifest Destiny' was again voiced as being among those reasons best justifying American expansion.3

Mahan's most effective publicist in Australia was the 

---

1 Australian Star, 20 Dec. 1896.
3'Manifest Destiny' had earlier (1830-50) referred to the idea that fate had decreed the inevitable physical expansion of the U.S. to the Pacific. It was given a new form by John Fiske, American publicist of Social Darwinism, in an article in Harper's, Mar. 1885. He maintained that Anglo-Saxons due to the logic of 'survival of the fittest' were destined to rule over less gifted races and bring civilization and peace to the entire globe. Josiah Strong's (1885), John W. Burgess's (1890) and James K. Hosmer's (1890) works further expounded this idea to Australians. Carl Schurz's caution on 'Manifest Destiny', pp.737-46, Harper's October 1893, though prematurely anti-annexationist, more closely reflected Australian estimates of American aspirations. A debate on whether the new 'manifest destiny' was a continuation of the old has been conducted between Julius W. Pratt (Chicago) and Frederick Merk (Harvard). The Advertiser and others implied a territorial right and an ideological justification: a mixture of old and new concepts.
THE SCENE OF WAR.

Australasian, 23 April 1898.
Summarizing Mahan's views of the Caribbean as being America's Mediterranean and Cuba's position as being 'unique' in the possession it gave of easy interior lines between two harbours on opposite sides of the island - checking the risk of blockade - the *Argus* concluded:

Sooner or later it is evident that the United States will strike a blow for the prize upon which their gaze has been fixed so long and which they have now been taught to believe essential to the safety of their great maritime routes. Its acquisition will place them upon a naval equality (so far as mere position goes) with any of the other powers which still hold stations in these waters. With the expansion of American interests overseas and the virtual sovereignty she has already claimed over the projected canal, this equality will become necessary to her and the American nation will be easily brought to view it as worth a sacrifice to secure.1

In this way, the strategic argument was accepted in Australia as an integral part of the United States' conception of its own national interest - one that was both consistent in ends and changing in means.2

1*Argus*, 5 Apr. 1898.

The Maine catastrophe (15 February 1898) evoked sympathy for America in Australia. Papers such as the Geelong Advertiser allowed their natural bias to lead them to favour the quick assumption 'that the work of destruction was that of an enemy'. It believed '...those who know the Spanish character can understand how a plot may have been entered into to destroy the vessel'.¹ Most of the Australian press, considering it wise to suspend judgement pending the publication of the findings of the American Naval Commission, nonetheless believed with the South Australian Register that 'Britons throughout the Queen's vast empire will sincerely condole with the families...suddenly bereft'. This, because 'the citizens of the United States are more to us than strangers'.²

On the day that news of the disaster was received, the last Federal Convention being held in Melbourne³ interrupted its proceedings to send President McKinley a combined message from the Premiers through the New South Wales Premier, George Reid (18 February):

They (the Premiers) desire to convey through you to the American nation and especially the relations of those stricken down by the sad calamity, the earnest and sincere condolence and sympathy of the people of their colonies.

The reply the next day from W.R. Day, Acting Secretary of State, was in grateful acknowledgement of the touching condolences of the Australian Premiers. In the presence of such overwhelming sorrow, sympathy like this from our kindred beyond the seas touches the American heart very deeply.⁴

The Barrier Miner was among those who felt 'It is only in the hour of peril or calamity that we feel [the] true

¹Geelong Advertiser, 18 Feb. 1898.
²South Australian Register, 18 Feb. 1898.
³This session finished the task of revising the draft constitution in March 1898. See J.A. La Nauze, The Making of the Australian Constitution (Melbourne, 1972), pp.203-39.
⁴Telegram’s texts in cables e.g., Argus, 21, 22 Feb. 1898. My emphasis.
significance of the sentiment of kinship so frequently heard expressed. 1

George Reid accentuated this renewed racial sympathy even further in his defence of the Premiers' message. He had been attacked by some (particularly his old enemy, the Melbourne Punch) for 'blowing his own trumpet' in not sending the message through normal channels - either the Colonial Governors, Agents General or the British Secretary of State. He was asked by reporters (22 February) why he had not taken sufficient satisfaction in Sir Julian Pauncefote's expression of 'intense and universal' sympathy expressed toward Americans in their loss, or in the messages of the Queen, the British Prime Minister and the Prince of Wales. Reid's reply was spirited. He spoke of '...a calamity practically to the close relations of the Australian people' and asked,

what would be said of a critic who, when a calamity happened to a member of the same family, hesitated to convey his sympathy until he could find some opportunity of doing it through someone more loosely connected with the bereaved?

The Argus however, was one that found the American reply 'very gratifying' and viewed the two telegrams as putting 'in a more vivid light than any yet presented, the feelings of kinship which do animate members of the great Anglo-Saxon races...'. 2

The Weekly Times agreed that despite the carping, the Premiers' cable was a direct and cordial recognition of the Australians by the United States and it voices clearly the sentiment that Australians and

1 Barrier Miner. 22 Feb. 1898.

2 Argus. 23 Feb. 1898. My emphasis. Melbourne Punch, 3 Mar. 1898, p.179, published a cartoon showing Lord Brassey complaining to Reid trumpeting sympathy to Uncle Sam across the waters: 'George, what is this - sympathy or advertisement?'
Americans are kindred people. A fine message has evoked a still finer and more touching reply.1

As much as anything, the exchange revealed the hesitant assertion of an independent Australian identity, seeking as on other occasions to communicate in its own way and in its own right directly with a fellow Anglo-Saxon relation on a new and friendly basis.2

The critical Chinese situation (December 1897-April 1898) made for an upsurge of friendly feeling toward America. Britain's apparent diplomatic assurances regarding Cuba were seemingly returned with a new feeling of gratitude and co-operation on America's part, it was believed. In fact, such assurances did not exist in the form the Australian press contemplated. Undoubtedly, American fellow-feeling was exaggerated, especially in relation to American intentions regarding support for Britain in China. Nonetheless, the expectation of a defensive alliance of the two powers against a possible coalition of European enemies in a struggle for the governance of and commerce of the world gave point and urgency to much of Australian press concern for America in early 1898.

Australian editorialists presented conflicting viewpoints on the desirability of America's fostering another Caribbean 'Black Republic' and on the selfishness of America's motives. As well, the nature of America's real military strength and the role of McKinley in the crisis were debated.

Throughout 1896 and 1897, considerable Australian debate centred on whether America would allow Cuba to become another 'Black Republic' in the Caribbean if given her

---

1Weekly Times, 26 Feb. 1898.

2A year before the Maine occurred the American correspondent of the Sydney Morning Herald (13 Feb. 1897) made the remarkable prediction that McKinley would fervently wish for a chance event to 'mark out a particular course as an inevitable necessity'.

freedom. Whereas it was believed that America would prevent the creation of another Haiti as the Times Havana correspondent and Sir Spencer St John called it; the problems remained of how to prevent renewed civil war in Cuba and an infusion of 'extremely low type of blacks' into America following liberation. Not only Australian, but American and European opinion was split on the efficacy of annexation, given the need to establish order in Cuba without exacerbating the prospect of future discord within America through the 'colour question'.

Confusion over ends and means continued until the 'Teller Amendment' of 20 April 1898 was passed by Congress, disclaiming any intention on the part of the United States to exercise sovereignty or control over Cuba, leaving government to the Cubans after restoring peace. This solution made intervention in Cuba costly and idealistic in the opinion of Australian editors, but solved the problems posed by annexation. The authority of Edward John Phelps, former United States ambassador in London and Lord Bryce, was quoted extensively against a takeover. As the Bendigo Independent put it, '...the restless, ignorant and ill-conditioned Cubans would be a constant thorn in the side of the clever and go-ahead Americans'. Past precedent indicated that attempting to govern a mixed African, Spanish and Indian population could be disastrous, especially as the former Mayor of Havana, Don Segunda Alvarez had already pointed out in the North American Review.

---

1 Prejudice against Haiti had been in evidence since the 1830s and 1840s when a succession of revolutions occurred. By 1887 conditions were very bad on the island following the island's virtual bankruptcy in paying France an indemnity of 90 million francs. Prejudice was deepened by the historian Froude's derogatory observations. By 1889, Australian papers had decided that coloured republics were dismal failures. E.g. Age, 13 Aug. 1889.


3 Courier, 12 Apr. 1898. Bryce quoted from New York Outlook interview.

4 Bendigo Independent, 13 Apr. 1898.

that such governance, whatever its potential genius, would not be welcomed. Significantly, the Philippines were left out of the discussion.¹

Granted that there would be limited economic benefits, was American motivated by selfish considerations? The answers in the Australian press were various.

America had now worked itself into the awkward position of being unable to turn any profit from intervention short of annexation. Policing autonomy would be at best a thankless task and undoubtedly a troublesome one. Some editors, by noting the powerful lobbying of the tobacco and sugar interests in Congress and contrasting it with the reluctance of East coast businessmen to intervene, illustrated how American material interests blew hot and cold by turns on the issue. Albert Shaw was one who looked frankly to the southern and western sections of the United States to perform a distasteful moral duty, so obviously less attractive to Americans when shorn of its profit motive. Australian editors became openly angered at the devious diplomacy of General Woodford, America's Minister at Madrid, who on 22 September 1897 had presented a clear ultimatum to Spain and as promptly denied it. Some suspected that America was unwilling to fight for a good cause, regardless of cost.²

¹Australian Star, 13 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 16 Apr. 1898; South Australian Register, 20 Apr. 1898.

²For editorials relating to this, see, Geelong Times, 28 Nov. 1896; Geelong Advertiser, 22 Dec. 1896, 11 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 28 Dec. 1896; Queensland, 16 Jan. 1897; South Australian Register, 14 Dec. 1896; Review of Reviews, 20 July 1896, p.104; Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Sept. 1897; Argus, 27 Sept. 1897.
Australia's Free Trade press constantly accused the Protectionist Republicans of seeking a quarrel to divert attention away from monopolistic economic abuses at home brought on by the new high tariffs.\(^1\)

Like Napoleon III before Sedan, the party in power feel that the domestic affairs of their country will soon demand a serious reckoning unless they embroil their countrymen in a foreign quarrel and then appeal for support on the grounds of patriotism wrote the *South Australian Register.*\(^2\) American belligerence was based on 'a growing desire...to emerge from the chrysalis state and take a place as one of the powers of the world and to become a large manufacturing and exporting nation', wrote the *Launceston Examiner.*\(^3\)

But the situation remained confusing: war could either worsen class, economic and sectional tensions, or alternatively unite the country. Democrats were either selfless crusaders, unalloyed jingoies or devious Machiavels attempting to embarrass the Republicans. Cuba could be either a course of profit or a costly millstone. 'Sentiment and greed' became the shortest summary of America's mixed motives.\(^4\) Such argument over the degree of idealism or self-interest as motives for American


\(^2\) *South Australian Register*, 30 Sept. 1897.

\(^3\) *Launceston Examiner*, 7; 10, 31 Mar. 1896, 2; 18 Apr. 1898. See also *Melbourne Punch*, 31 Mar. 1898; *Argus*, 13 Apr. 1898; *Bendigo Advertiser*, 16 Apr. 1898; *Herald*, 20 Apr. 1898.

involvement has continued to the present day.\(^1\)

Despite general enthusiasm for him following his victory over Bryan in the 1896 election, McKinley had remained for Australians, as for others, something of an unknown quantity. Only as the rush of events forced the American executive to decisive action did Australian opinion attempt to focus on the man and his use of the office. In doing so, editors joined a historical debate which still continues.\(^2\)

Given the precedent of Cleveland's anti-imperialism, many papers expected him to resist the aroused public opinion of his country as effectively as Salisbury was doing in Britain during the China crisis. To withhold aggression should be the 'common-sensed' policy of a 'peace-loving statesman like McKinley', thought the *Queensland Times*.\(^3\)

Others feared that with Sagasta, he might 'be the creature of fate and of an excited populace', following the release of the Naval Commission's findings. As Smalley described it (and most agreed), the President held 'the keys of the situation'.\(^4\)

McKinley's message to Congress on the 11 April 1898, instead of clarifying the situation, at first made it more

\(^1\) As Robin Winks has pointed out in his chapter 'Imperialism' in *A Comparative Approach to American History* (Voice of America, 1968), p.291, these contradictory motives worked in a similar way in European imperialism to make any 'entire people appear to be hypocritical'.

\(^2\) All the strands of the Australian debate have been taken up in American works, especially John L. Offer's unpublished Ph.D. 'President McKinley and the Origins of the Spanish-American War' (Pennsylvania State, 1957); Paul S. Holbo, 'Presidential Leadership in Foreign Affairs: William McKinley: the Turpie-Foraker Amendment', *American Historical Review*, LXXII (July 1967), pp.1321-35. McKinley is defended from older charges of weakness (Halle, Pratt, Millis, Wisan and others) by his biographers, Margaret Leech, *In The Days of McKinley* (New York 1959) and H. Wayne Morgan, *William McKinley and His America*, op.cit., summarized in the same author's *America's Road to Empire* (New York, 1965), esp. pp.60-3.

\(^3\) *Queensland Times*, 31 Mar. 1898.

\(^4\) E.g. Advocate, 26 Mar., 16 Apr. 1898; *Freeman's Journal*, 16 Apr. 1898; *Tocsin*, 24 Feb. 1898.
ambiguous. During the week in which Congress deliberated on whether to give McKinley war powers, the Australian press grappled with the new realities of sudden Presidential bellicosity; the constitutional relationships involved in the United States decision-making process and the likely nature of that decision.

Criticism took much of its lead from the London Times whose cabled view was that the Executive, by leaving the decision for war to the Congress, had renounced responsibility. Remembering the Crimean crisis, the Argus likened McKinley to '...another Earl of Aberdeen... wringing his hands at the idea of war (while allowing) the nation to drift and events to shape themselves'. At the 'crisis of his fate' the President had shown himself weak, believed the Sydney Morning Herald. South Australia's metropolitan dailies defended his admirable caution and desire to follow correct government procedure thus appearing, constitutionally at least, 'absolutely in the right'.

That war had actually been made inevitable and not avoided, became daily more clear. Congress, it was now believed, was sure to declare for war and McKinley had only shifted the onus of decision. 'Open, unmistakable and humiliating' retreat was now viewed as the alternative. The Australian Star criticized the Message as 'opportunist... instinct with the spirit of a magnified policeman'. Maurice Low, described in the Australian press as 'one of the ablest... writers of current history', highlighted McKinley's dilemma in February's National Review: respond to Congress and country and declare war, or respond to the anti-war policies of commerce and finance? Many believed that the situation had now gone too far for even a Cleveland to master. Astute observers gathered that war had been declared in all but name and fleet movements seemed to confirm this judgement. Now the Argus concluded of McKinley:

1Argus, 31 Mar., 13, 14 Apr. 1898.
2Sydney Morning Herald, 13, 21 Apr. 1898.
3South Australian Register, 13 Apr. 1898; Advertiser, 13, 16, 18 Apr. 1898.
4Australian Star, 13 Apr. 1898.
5Age, 14 Apr. 1898.
He is really an unknown quantity and every friend of humanity will hope that events will take a favourable turn for him and that in any case he will be found equal to his difficulties, which must be great and to his responsibilities which in any case must be enormous. 1

Comment for the week 13-20 April centred on the fascinating prospect of a constitutional deadlock between President and Congress - especially the Senate - over the decision for war. Some commentators believed that Australian constitution-makers had been afforded a lesson in the wisdom of creating a strong, responsible executive allowing for prompt decision-making and avoiding the possibility of an American-style confrontation with the Legislature over divided powers. The Senate's back-down in the face of strong counter-opinions from the Lower House, similarly provided an illuminating illustration of how an Upper House need not be unresponsive to the popular will. 2

In this way a strong executive and a flexible Senate were further confirmed in the minds of many Australians as commendable elements in the Australian constitution in contrast to the American experience. 3 Many could not escape the judgement that McKinley, by calling on Congress for a decision, had done little to enhance the powers of his office or establish a reputation as a strong leader.

Why was Australian editorial opinion so interested in the naval and military detail surrounding the conflict? Even in a country obsessed with defence, did it reflect a more general climate of opinion of the times when the chief participants - battleships - were considered the most powerful index of national might? Was it a technical

1 Argus, 16, 21 Apr. 1898. McKinley is still relatively opaque. He left few revealing papers.

2 This and other strands of the debate on McKinley can be traced in the following: Sydney Mail, 2 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 5, 16 Apr. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 13, 21 Apr. 1898; Courier, 13, 20 Apr. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 13 Apr. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 13 Apr. 1898; Ballarat Star, 13 Apr. 1898; Bendigo Independent, 13 Apr. 1898; Leader, 16 Apr. 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 16 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph, 15, 18 Apr. 1898; Weekly Times, 16 Apr. 1898; Bendigo Evening Mail, 20 Apr. 1898.

3 For American constitutional parallels see Erling Hunt, American Precedents in Australian Federation (New York, 1930), pp.99-167. Australian ideas on American executive powers were confused.
curiosity concerning the performing capacity of the other new paraphernalia of battle - torpedoes, submarines, mines, guns, armour? Was the interest more atavistic - a test of the physical, moral and racial calibre of the two opponents? Was it perhaps merely entertainment - the desire to watch from afar, some great international game? Was it a morbid fascination with the prospect of witnessing a larger nation pounding to death a smaller, weaker one, thus performing a national catharsis - a purging by Aristotelian 'pity and terror'? Or was it more 'down to earth' - a genuine concern that by involving Europe, the war would involve Australia willy-nilly in Britain's train?

Whatever the reason - and comment suggests a mixed combination of the above elements - the military and naval debate involving estimates of America's chances, was, in the eighteen months before the outbreak of war, something of an academic exercise. For most believed in and hoped for American victory, in the light of her overwhelming relative resources and supposed racial superiority.¹ The only doubt remaining was whether Spain would be capable of sustaining a

¹The following contain much of the debate: Geelong Advertiser, 22 Dec. 1896; Brisbane Evening Observer, 13 Sept. 1897, 21 Apr. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 7 Mar. 1898; Geelong Times, 16 Mar., 19 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph, 19 Mar. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 24 Mar., 18 Apr. 1898; Ballarat Courier, 7 Apr. 1898; Advertiser, 18 Apr. 1898; West Australian, 18 Apr. 1898; Leader, 9 Apr. 1898; Bendigo Independent, 13 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 16 Apr. 1898. This paper predicted by 11 days Commodore Dewey's top-secret departure from Mîrs Bay, China, to fight Admiral Montojo at Manila Bay (1 May 1898). In fact McKinley himself was not as generally ignorant on the Philippines as has been popularly portrayed by H.H. Kholstaat (1923) and others. He contemplated on 25 Feb. and finally ordered 24 Apr. (executed 27 Apr.) Dewey's sailing: Richard W. Leopold, 'The Emergence of America as a World Power: Some Second Thoughts' in Braeman, Bremner and Walters (eds), Change and Continuity in Twentieth Century America (Ohio, 1984), footnote, p.20.
satisfying military spectacle. Among expected beneficent results were the expansion and professionalization of the American Army and Navy and nothing less than the emergence of the United States as a World Power, shrinking no more from the responsibilities which the position entails upon her - especially in the Pacific.

At the end of the first week in April, 1898 the Ballarat Courier summed up the position well: 'The great American republic is casting its Munroe [sic] doctrine to the winds.' Further, the jingo spirit in the republic was not quelled by the removal of the Venezuelan question to the cooling chamber of arbitration. It was only diverted and it has found food for its fire in the Cuban rebellion.

During this Easter period, the Sydney Morning Herald voiced the dilemma of Australian opinion: 'the phases are kaleidoscopic in their rapidity', it regretted, 'and at this distance all that we can be certain of is that the last words of peacable negotiation seem to have been uttered.' But the paper went further. It visualized the struggle in abstract terms: as,

the quarrel of the Old World with the New, of the Old Order, which, though it is its proud boast that it changeth not, is yet forced to change, giving way to the New. Spain is the emblem today of monarchical institutions, of the last decaying theories of European privilege and autocratic ideals, whilst America typifies for us all the ideas that have sprouted from the first seed of modern democracy. The two countries represent the opposites of political thought and the two countries face each other today prepared for one of those stern grapples which have, time after time, made theories good or utterly exploded them.

---

1 Estimates of relative strengths were a combination of Brassey's yearly Naval Manual and guesswork, though W.F. Hindson's military commentary was perceptive and helpful during the discussion.


3 Ballarat Courier, 7 Apr. 1898.

4 Sydney Morning Herald, 8 Apr. 1898.
Melbourne Punch, 28 April 1898.

THE FIRST SWOOP.
In a similar manner the Ballarat Star predicted the "grand, instructive and ironic "Decline and Fall of the Spanish Empire in the West". That end it believed, would be deservedly just for,

Spain has long represented a dying cause, an effete and iniquitous system that dates from the middle ages; the United States on the other hand, brings to bear the broad and liberal ethics of modern Christianity and civilization.1

Australian press opinion gathered the final summation in such persuasive, simplistic terms. Despite telling points made against America and for Spain, there was little doubt as to which side the Australian public would wish to award the honours in the wordy debate on whether the United States would be justified in intervening in Spain's colonies.

---

1Ballarat Star, 13 Apr. 1898.
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Australian readers were greeted on the morning of 21 April 1898 with the announcement: 'WAR DECLARED: TO BEGIN ON SATURDAY: AMERICA WILL ATTACK'. With maps and supplementary cover, the press informed the public of McKinley's one-day ultimatum which demanded Spanish evacuation, or hostilities to commence at 6 a.m. Saturday morning. At least one paper saw the humorous side of the declaration as 'not unlike a theatrical announcement of a new comic opera, save that it lacks the suggestion to "take tickets early to avoid the crush at the door"'. It guaranteed Australia's position as interested spectator. All early cables posted at newspaper offices were 'eagerly perused' by large crowds 'cheering for the success of the American troops'.

At the 9 p.m. interval on Saturday night of 21 April, the proprietor of the Royal Theatre in Adelaide, Mr. Hautrey, announced that the white light hoisted on the General Post Office tower by the Chamber of Commerce, had signified the war's outbreak. The band struck up 'Yankee Doodle' to cheers from the audience and the play was forgotten. In other theatres of the city, the scene was repeated. Interwined flags of America and Britain were common sights in the dress circles and foyers.

From the beginning it was a stage war. To the Argus '...thousands of men...feel as if they are sitting in an opera-box at a great theatre, viewing the most exciting of dramas'. For the Perth Morning Herald, the war satisfied

---

1 See cables and editorials in the following: Argus, 21 Apr. 1898; Australian Star, 21 Apr. 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 22 Apr. 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 21 Apr. 1898; Australasian, 23 Apr. 1898; Maitland Mercury, 23 Apr. 1898.

2 South Australian Register, 25 Apr. 1898.

3 Advertiser, 25 Apr. 1898.

4 Argus, 1 June 1898. See also Review of Reviews, 15 June 1898.
Australians' 'appetite for sensation'.¹ As for more sombre minds, we were 'umpires watching experiments' in the efficiency of the latest weapons.²

On Tuesday 19 April, approximately a hundred Australians 'who have their fighting instincts strongly developed', offered their services to Colonel Bell, the United States Consul, for duties with American forces, particularly cavalry regiments. Neither Bell in Sydney, nor Bray in Melbourne, could offer such volunteers hope of service, though obviously flattered and amused by the Australian advances. The scene was repeated in other capitals. C.A. Murphy, the United States Consular Agent in Adelaide, was besieged by a 'large number' of Australians, including three trained nurses, who wished to assist in the fighting, though at least one official expressed the suspicion that their ultimate interest was more in obtaining a free passage to the Yukon goldfields.³ In fact all public officials had been urged to strictly apply the provisions of the 'Foreign Enlistment Act', prohibiting Australian participation. As neutrals, 'it is useless for Australians to think of having a hand in thrashing England's ancient foe', regretted the South Australian Register.⁴

The Southern Cross attempted an explanation: 'It is perhaps the mere effervescence of youthful blood which makes so many Australians offer their services to the American government. There must be a passionate fighting strain in the native-born Australian, since he cannot hear of fighting going on under any sky without being eager to take part in it!'⁵ Brisbane's Evening Observer added: '...it must be galling to these enthusiastic souls to find themselves

¹Perth Morning Herald, 4 July 1898.
²Mt. Alexander Mail, 8 Aug. 1898. See also Queenslander, 20 Aug. 1898.
³See cables in following: Argus, 20 Apr. 1898; Age, 28 Apr. 1898, rumoured that a thousand Canadians had volunteered; Ballarat Courier, 26 Apr. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 30 Apr. 1898. F.B. Freehill, the Spanish Consul claimed that several Spaniards in Sydney had volunteered, Advertiser, 27 Apr. 1898.
⁴South Australian Register, 26 Apr. 1898.
⁵Southern Cross, 29 Apr. 1898.
pulled sharply up by the remonstrances and warnings of Major General French, or even by the proclamation of our Deputy-Governor in the Government Gazette Extraordinary.¹

More soberly, other papers accused the volunteers of a range of impure motives from insincere gasconading, to want of prospects at home, vain women hunting and a desire for a military pension.²

With memories of the Shenandoah in mind, Captain Currie, Chairman of the Department of Trade and Customs, read a memo at the Marine Board meeting warning all pilots, light-house keepers and ship-owners that 'the country and the British Empire might be involved in serious consequences if any Victorian shipowner had business contracts with either of the belligerent powers'.³ The warning was typical of those issued in other ports in Australia.

All social forces in Australia seemed to contrive toward sympathy for America. A pro-Federation audience in the Centenary Hall, Sydney, was led in three cheers for America by A. Copeland, M.L.A., from 'brothers in Australia', for a 'campaign in the interests of humanity'.⁴ In Stuart Street, Ballarat, on the Saturday night of the outbreak of war, a huge crowd assembled outside the Star office, to gather the latest bulletins and listen to the playing of Prout's band in the rotunda opposite. At 9 p.m., a programme of American airs was begun amid cheers; a rocket display from Burrows' Union Hotel; coloured lights and the discharge of pistol shots from the top of Davies and Franklin's warehouse. Spectators on the Hotel Balcony led 'Marching Through Georgia', changing the words from 'Hurrah, hurrah, we bring the jubilee!', to 'Hurrah, hurrah, the Cubans shall be free'. As the Ballarat Star put it: 'The demonstration was throughout spontaneous, as well as of a highly exciting character and left no doubt as to the

¹Brisbane Evening Observer, 30 Apr. 1898.
²E.g. editorials in, Advocate, 30 Apr. 1898; Australian Star, 30 Apr., 3 May 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 17 June 1898.
³Age, 30 Apr. 1898. For the Shenandoah incident in Melbourne, see Footnote one in Introduction.
⁴Australian Star, 23 Apr. 1898.
sympathies of the bulk of the local public being with the Stars and Stripes. A special war issue of that paper attracted a stream of people to the newspaper office for five hours, until another edition of many thousands of copies were run. In this, there was shades of the United States own jingo press.

Elsewhere there were similar scenes. In Sydney, the Australian Star claimed, 'the feeling of intense sympathy with America was without disguise; perfect strangers addressed each other in the streets on the subject and the general anxiety to learn the latest intelligence was never more keenly marked. Many felt with Castlemaine's leading paper, 'that the present duel...is our war.' To Adelaide's great press conservative, 'in the colonies of Great Britain, the popular manifestations of feeling within the last few days have been even more marked than in the United Kingdom itself.'

Interest was not without humour. One wag scrawled over the cabled capture of a Spanish ship on a Melbourne newsboard: 'America - won by six wickets'. 'The White Squadron', a play with an international diplomatic theme, showing at the Sydney Lyceum had an 'American night', 1 May, attended by Colonel Bell, W. C. Rennie and a 'wildly enthusiastic audience'. Norton's Truth ran funny fictitious cables on the war. The Melbourne Punch reported the witticisms of two fictitious observers in balloons above the action in the Caribbean and South China Seas. Madame Melba, singing Rossini's Il Barbiere in San Francisco, compromised by singing the 'Star Spangled Banner' during the lesson scene

1Ballarat Star, 25 Apr. 1898.
2Australian Star, 25 Apr. 1898.
3Mt. Alexander Mail, 26 Apr. 1898.
4South Australian Register, 26 Apr. 1898. See also Brisbane Evening Observer, 29 Apr. 1898.
5Australasian, 30 Apr. 1898.
6Truth, 24 Apr., 1 May, 12, 26, 30 June, 21 Aug. 1898.
7Melbourne Punch, 5, 12 May, 9, 16 June, 7 July 1898.
in her costume of a Spanish senorita, with 'amazing effect'.

Colonel Bell at this time seemed the very embodiment of an expansive America. Constantly interviewed, he saw the volunteering of 300 members of New South Wales' defence forces and 17 trained nurses in one week, as 'an evidence of the good feeling on the part of your people toward us'. He raged against P.B. Frechill, the Spanish Consul in Sydney for claiming that Spain was better prepared for war than America, and at Major General French for suggesting that Australian troops were superior to America's volunteer corps. 'It is a good thing the duello is not in fashion, or we might have the eloquent Colonel challenge both Consul and General', joked the Sydney Mail. Bell was soon to add Cardinal Moran to his list of combatants. Many papers found it enjoyable to 'draw' the peripatetic Colonel. This was done only teasingly, as he was in fact widely admired for his sincere interest in developing Australian-American trade.

All the anti-Spanish sentiment building up during the preceding three years was now released in a journalistic flood during 1898, mitigated only by a little sympathy for the country's open humiliation in the eyes of the world. Following Manila Bay, the Bendigo Independent claimed, 'Australian boys of today should (now) readily understand why the old British buccaneers held the Spaniards in contempt and why their compatriots of a couple of centuries of later growth, the frontiersmen of the Western States, had much the same feelings of regard and admiration for their Spanish neighbours as a Queensland shearer has for the Chinese cook on the station....'

Norton vilified the Spaniards as 'personally and morally dirty, traitorous, cruel, vindictive, lazy scoundrels'.

---

1 *Age*, 25 June 1898. Melba's letter to a friend in London was republished in the *Age*. She hoped her action would work for 'a pleasanter state of affairs for both countries in the far-off future'.

2 *Sydney Mail*, 30 Apr. 1898.

3 See comment in, *Australian Star*, 23 Apr., 13 May 1898; *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 6 May 1898; *Truth*, 8 May 1898; *Freeman's Journal*, 14 May 1898.

4 *Bendigo Independent*, 7 July 1898.

5 *Truth*, 8 May 1898.
It was Australian racial prejudice in full flower. Catholic attitudes were often ambivalent. Catholic newspapers in Australia were openly proud of the patriotism shown by Catholic-Americans in their country's cause and equally embarrassed that the backward transgressor was a Catholic country par excellence. A division occurred. The Sydney Freeman's Journal, taking a lead from Archbishop Ireland, McKinley's intermediary with the Pope, became clearly biased toward the concept of an American humanitarian mission. Melbourne's Advocate was just as clearly biased toward defending Spain's reputation and criticising the notion of an Anglo-American alliance.

Most confused of all was Cardinal Moran. His dilemma was satirised by the Melbourne Punch:

Was ever Cardinal so undecided?  
With other foes I could have prayed  
for either,  
But as it is - I'd better pray for neither.

At the annual breakfast of the Hibernian Society in Sydney, the Cardinal attacked prejudiced Protestant reports. In an interview with the Catholic Press, in early May, he lashed out at American jingoism for undermining Spain's position in Cuba and grossly exaggerating the nature and extent of the Filipino insurrection. He warned of America's involvement of the Empire in a war for China's markets. Colonel Bell instantly attacked him for muting the role of Spanish

---

1 See comment in, Southern Cross, 29 Apr. 1898; War Cry, 19 Nov. 1898; Australian Star, 9 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 10 May 1898; Launceston Examiner, 9 May 1898; Melbourne Punch, 16 June 1898; Ballarat Star, 7 July 1898; Advertiser, 15 July 1898; Geelong Times, 15 July 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 18 July 1898; Courier, 18 July 1898; Cooigardie Miner, 21 July 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 22 July 1898; Bulletin, 30 July 1898; Age, 6 Aug. 1898; Spectator, 5 Aug. 1898; Sydney Mail, 13 Aug. 1898.

2 Freeman's Journal, 7, 14 May 1898.

3 Advocate, 30 Apr., 7, 14 May, 18, 25 June, 9, 30 July, 6, 13 Aug., 3 Sept. 1898.

4 Melbourne Punch, 5 May 1898.

5 Catholic Press, 7 May 1898.
cruelty and mismanagement in bringing on the war. But the Catholic press defended the Cardinal unanimously. They did this while praising America's good intention and pointing out America's own turbulently violent past.¹

What swung Catholic bias more toward the American side was the fact that Irish-Catholic opinion in Australia had moved the centre of gravity of sentiment toward that country, and the realization that by backing Spain, the Catholic argument was losing itself in a dying and dishonoured cause. An aged Timothy Fogarty of Redfern in a letter to the Freeman's Journal recounted how, as an Irish-Catholic, he had fought for Spain in 1835 and been thoroughly disillusioned with Spanish cruelty and divisiveness. He opted for America out of gratitude for the assistance rendered that country in 1846 during the frightful potato famine.² Once the argument regarding the supposed correlation between Catholicism and "national decay" had been effectively rebutted by Monsignor Vaughan and others in the pages of the Catholic Press,³ Irish-Catholics felt freer to assert their nationalistic preference over and above their religious bias. Spain as underdog and former Irish refuge excited some sympathy,⁴ but America as base for 'Home Rulers', employer and rewarder of Irish naval and military valor and subject of Archbishop Ireland's paeans of mystic national praise, attracted a far more enthusiastic response in the hearts of the many Irish-Catholics in Australia.⁵

Australian Jews were less equivocal about their position. Spain's expulsion of 300,000 Jews since that significant year 1492, had resulted in their viewing the New

¹E.g. Monitor, 22, 29 Apr., 27 May, 17 June, 1, 8, 22 July, 26 Aug., 16 Sept., 14 Oct., 18 Nov. 1898, 27 Jan. 1899. Attacking the Cardinal were the Liberator, 7, 14, 21 May, 16 July, 10 Sept. 1898; Truth, 8 May 1898; Courier, 12 May 1898; Toecin, 30 June 1898; Victorian Churchman, 9 Sept. 1898; Presbyterian Monthly, 1 Aug. 1898.

²Freeman's Journal, 30 Apr., 14 May 1898.


⁴E.g. Marion Miller, 'The Spanish Mother' in Austral Light, October 1898, p. 604.

⁵E.g. Record, 23 Apr. 1898; Monitor, 29 Apr. 1898; Advocate, 30 Apr., 21 May, 4, 18 June, 2, 8 July 1898; Leader, 4 June 1898.
World as a home of tolerance and freedom. They took pride in the fact that Rodrigo Sanchez, who first sighted the New World, was Jewish. Rabbi Landau took pains to inform the Sydney press that 50,000 out of the 700,000 volunteers in the American Army were Jewish. This evidence of Jewish patriotism should silence 'venomous tongues...for ever more', claimed the Jewish Herald. The Sydney Mail was one paper that commented favourably. With delight at the irony of history, the Jewish Herald remarked: 'Kinsfolk of those ill-treated Spanish Jews have joined hands with a free and liberty-loving people to bring Spain to her senses and raise her to a sense of right and wrong.'

By contrast, worker reaction was almost invariably hostile toward America. The Tocsin republished the fraternal greetings of The People, a New York worker's journal, to its Spanish co-workers, claiming that they had no cause for quarrel except with their mutually exploitive capitalist masters. As 'G.M.B.' put it:

Than avoid this murderous confusion,
For why should our forces be slain,
Supporting the Fatman's delusion,
And to crush the poor people of Spain?

The Brisbane Worker quoted La Socialista of Madrid to the same effect. Among anti-war materials from Bishop Potter, William Dean Howells and Charles Francis Adams, a petition addressed to 'The Workers Of America' claimed that American capitalists would exploit the natives of the occupied territories and that the real purpose of the war was to divert attention away from worker grievances at home.

There was other anti-American opinion. 'Uncle Sam is moving under the cover of philanthropic regard for the Cubans', held the Ballarat Courier, 'but there is not a little feeling that the United States are 'bullying the smaller power'. In a sustained burst of denigration, the Tocsin claimed:

---

1 Jewish Herald, 29 Apr. 1898.
2 Sydney Mail, 14 May 1898.
3 Ibid. See also, Evening News, 6 May 1898.
4 Tocsin, 6, 30 June. The 'Fatman' was Labor's shorthand for capitalist.
5 Brisbane Worker, 9 July 1898.
6 Ballarat Courier, 3 Apr. 1898.
A lot of low, mean and contemptible American thieves and society criminals, backed up by the most selfish of speculators and the dirtiest journalists in the whole world have set out to steal the rich lands of Cuba... The bombastic humbug, cant and hypocrisy of these Americans is very edifying. The Americans as a nation can hardly be said to have attained civilization. The people who can be made to believe that the cause of humanitarianism could be allied with a war of aggression, and a war of revenge, must be both ignorant and immoral... If the Americans are acting like blackguards, the proper thing is to say so. Those who cannot... because of racial sympathies are but cowards.

By becoming imperialists, Americans were joining 'the great scoundrels of the world', the paper believed. Others were not happy with American expansion for a variety of military, social, economic and political reasons.

As at an earlier date, jingoism was a focus for criticism of America. The 'hi-cockalarum-Hail-Columbia-Screaming Eagle' style of American patriot and his Australian barrackers came in for equal criticism. Norton re-nicknamed the Sydney Morning Herald from 'Granny' to 'Herod' for her 'new-born love of slaughterings'. John Farrell praised the Quakers and other 'stay-at-homes' for their unusual heroism. An amoral national madness had gripped the nation - a disappointing development in a democracy, some held. The image of 'half-naked and desperate men fighting savagely hand to hand in scrub and trenches says little for the advancement of civilization', complained the Sydney Mail. That the excitability of Americans was a Latinate, not an Anglo-Saxon

1 Tocsin, 7, 14 July 1898.

2 See editorials in: Age, 23 Apr. 1898; Capricornian, 23 Apr. 1898; Barrier Miner, 25 Apr. 1898; Tocsin, 28 Apr., 30 June 1898; Evening News, 30 Apr., 16 May 1898; Australian Star, 2 May 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 10 May 1898; Herald, 17 May 1898; Monitor, 20, 27 May 1898, 13 Jan. 1899; Advocate, 28 May 1898; Bulletin, 28 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 15 June, 28 Dec. 1898; Mercury, 13 July 1898.

3 Truth, 1, 8 May 1898 ref. to Sydney Morning Herald, 30 Apr., 3 Aug. 1898.

4 Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 23 Apr., 2, 14 May, 18 June 1898, 30 Jan. 1899.

5 Sydney Mail, Ibid.
development in the national character, was a common observation. Hitherto, Americans had enjoyed a reputation for dourness and sobriety that had won them affectionate respect abroad. These traits were now seen in a new light as evidence of a less popular 'cold and fickle' people. To the Australian Americans were 'a nation of sentimentalists, japanned with utilitarianism'. American women were often blamed for stimulating a jingo ethos, and McKinley for not restraining it.

That other traditional source of anti-American feeling, the 'Yellow Press', was again attacked with renewed vigour as the war advanced. Circulation battles, sensation-seeking, misleading stories, 'Steadism' (falsely generalizing from particulars), were all criticized. W.G. Smalley in particular, was deflated by Australian journalists for his 'self-advertisement and bumptiousness'. However, a vocal minority of influential newspapers defended the bulk of the American press for heroic and selfless service to humanity in providing a thorough news-coverage of the conflict.

Economic, as well as more social manifestations, held the interest of the Australian press as the war unfolded.

Anxiety was expressed for the safety of the Mariposa on her regular mail-run from Sydney to San Francisco, carrying on her April-May voyage, £350,000 worth of Australian gold.

---

1 Australian Star, 1 Sept., 8 Oct. 1898.

2 For varied comments, see editorials in South Australian Register, 25, 26 Apr. 1898; Herald, 23 Apr., 10 June, 2 July 1898; Advertiser, 4 July 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 7 July 1898; Evening News, 11 July, 31 Aug. 1898; Review of Reviews, 15 July, 15 Sept. 1898; Capricornian, 23 July 1898; Age, 14 May, 23 Sept. 1898; West Australian, 3 Jan. 1899; Argus, 12 Jan. 1899; Bendigo Advertiser, 23 Apr., 10 Dec. 1898; War Cry, 23 Apr. 1898; Freeman's Journal, 23 Apr. 1898.

3 Editorials in, South Australian Register, 23 Apr. 1898; Southern Cross, 29 Apr. 1898; Advertiser, 29 Apr., 6, 31 May 1898; Australian Star, 26, 30 Apr., 28 May 1898; Launceston Examiner, 5, 6 May 1898; Advocate, 14 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 25 May 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 23 June 1898; Argus, 25 June 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 5, 11 Aug. 1898; Age, 3 Sept. 1898; Mail and Mercury, 6 Sept. 1898; Ballarat Star, 5 May 1898; Australasian, 7 May 1898.
As declared contraband of war, coal was more vulnerable. At the beginning of April, it was known that ten coal ships, each carrying 50,000 tons cargo, were on the high seas from Newcastle, bound for Manila or Ilo Ilo. Fifteen were afloat from the same port, headed for San Francisco; nine under the American flag. In the first week of the war, the Saranac, with an American captain and mate, was captured by the Spanish in the Philippines. A month later, another Australian collier, the J.V. Troop, was seized by Dewey. Such interruptions to commerce suggested to many the urgent need for federation of the Australian colonies. That Spain could disrupt the valuable American trade, worth approximately £2 1/2 million to Australia, was irritating. Ship owners worried about developments, whether the hazardous voyage of the Tythonus from Port Pirie to Cartagena in Spain, or an anticipated rise in American or Manilan demand for Australian fruit and vegetables, meat, wheat, leather and hides.¹

Commercial disturbance quickly followed. In the first two weeks of the war, the price of Australian flour rose by £1 a ton; American No.2 Red Winter Wheat rose by 3d a hundredweight and American kerosene was subject to panic buying which raised its price by 3d a gallon. Broken Hill welcomed the significant rises in the price of copper, lead, spelter, tin, silver and pig-iron.²

As the war advanced, the strategic role played by coal

¹Cables and business columns of the following, contain comment: Argus, 2, 17, 18, 20 Apr. 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 28 Apr. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 29 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 23, 29 Apr. 1898; Age, 29 Apr. 1898; South Australian Register, 27 May 1898; Courier, 18, 20 Apr. 1898; Sydney Mail, 23 Apr. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 26 Apr. 1898; Advertiser, 27 Apr. 1898; West Australian, 27 Apr. 1898.

²See cables and business columns of Brisbane Evening Observer, 29 Apr. 1898; South Australian Register, 26 Apr., 4 May 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 4 May 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 4, 18 June 1898; Age, 29 Apr. 1898.
in the new naval warfare became increasingly obvious. Shenandoah-style demands for the valuable fuel were a constant expectation. Newcastle, the coal port on Australia's east coast was now considered, 'as fine a conquest as the taking of the flagship of the enemy'.

Insurance premiums on sea-carried goods were instantly increased by 50 per cent by the New York underwriters, for goods carried in American vessels. Since neither the United States nor Spain were signatories to the Treaty of Paris, they reserved the right to issue letters of marque and to privateer (though they actually refrained from doing so). As the commercial columns of the Melbourne dailies made clear, most Australian shipping was safe, being carried in British vessels under a neutral flag. Nonetheless, the Underwriters' Association of New South Wales, acting under cable advice from London, increased war rates on business to and from Australia, Honolulu, New York, and San Francisco, by 5 per cent in American-owned ships and a quarter per cent in British-owned ships. The rate for coal carried by American ships from Newcastle to any port on the West Coast of the United States was increased by 3 per cent. Insurance rates even for neutral vessels travelling to Manila were considered prohibitive, whilst those to Java, China and Japan were up by one per cent.

Bloody bread riots in Italy were an unfortunate by-product of the general wheat shortages produced by the war. In mid-May wheat sold in Britain for 6/- a bushel; in New York for 5/3d and in Melbourne for 4/7d. Though this was an improvement on former prices, Australian wheat suffered by being long distances from the chief markets and from a commitment of her crop to South Africa. European shortages foreshadowed future markets and further revealed British

---


2 Commercial columns of *Australasian*, 2 Apr. 1898; *Weekly Times*, 2 Apr. 1898; *Barrier Miner*, 22 Apr. 1898; *Argus*, 20 Apr. 1898; *Age*, 29 Apr. 1898.
vulnerability in times of war.¹

That America appeared headed toward a monopoly of the world’s tobacco trade with her possession of Cuba and the Philippines, was viewed as economically desirable for the good, cheap product which would result for Australia and for the stimulus it would bring to the formation of a rival Australian tobacco industry.²

Protectionists hoped that Australians could win back some markets lost to America if the war persisted. Others hoped that the flow of gold to the United States — amounting to £2,890,000 in the four months since the Maine disaster — could somehow be staunched.³

Few could have been displeased with the developments in trade with the Philippines during the latter part of 1898. Queensland meat was especially sought after, due to the greater shipping distances from San Francisco to Manila and the new needs of Puerto Rico and Cuba for American beef. George Craig was only one urging Australia to ‘energy, speculation and trade courage...to arise to the happy and unexpected occasion’. Counsellor McEachern, on behalf of McIlwraith, McEachern and Co., was contracted in early September to sail the Duke of Sutherland from Queensland to Manila with 1,500 tons of meat and 700 to 800 tons of vegetables bought in Victoria and shipped to Brisbane.⁴

Similar shipments at the end of the year came to the attention of American producers and provoked Herbert Collingwood of the Rural New Yorker to angry verse:

---

¹Comment in special articles and commercial columns of —
Sydney Morning Herald, 5 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney),
10 May 1898; Argus, 10 May 1898; Courier, 11 May 1898;
Bendigo Advertiser, 12 May 1898; South Australian Register,
14 May 1898; Age, 6 May 1898; Bulletin, 28 May, 18 June 1898;
Truth, 26 June 1898.

²Geelong Times, 6 May 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 8 June
1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 18 Aug., 25 Nov. 1898; Warrnambool
Standard, 28, 30 Nov. 1898.

³Freeman’s Journal, 7 May, 1 Oct. 1898; Newcastle Morning
Herald, 18 June 1898.

⁴See comment in — Brisbane Evening Observer, 26 Aug. 1898;
Mailand Mercury, 27 Aug. 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 1 Sept.
1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 7 Dec. 1898; South
Australian Register, 24 Aug. 1898; Age; Correspondent’s letter
published 3 Dec. 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 17 Jan. 1899;
What’s this I hear? Australia has the job of selling sheep
To feed our Yankee boys in blue? That makes my dander creep!...(etc.).

But the general economic boom anticipated at war’s end, was
intimated by the representations of T. Green of the
Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce who suggested via the good
offices of F. Goding the United States Consul in Newcastle,
the extension of Australian trade to Hawaii.

Total costs of the war were variously computed. By
one estimate, the war was costing each combatant £1 million
a day. 'More triumphant democracy!' scoffed Sydney's Daily
Telegraph when it was learnt that 90 per cent of the extra
American taxation was taken up by the wage-earners and middle
class, while plutocrats absorbed only 10 per cent of the burden which had increased from £30 million to £520 million.
These costs reminded Australians of the relative cheapness
of the armed peace and were a warning of the costs to be
anticipated from a general European conflict.

Military affairs occupied a large field of attention in
the press coverage of the war. Most pressing was the matter
of Australia's own defence, given the prospect of European
intervention. Debate between Sir Saul Samuel, Sir Henry
Norman and Colonel Hutton at the Royal Colonial Institute,
London, on Imperial Defence, aroused interest, as did the
series of articles in the Argus on Australian defence
written by the naval strategist H.W. Wilson. Major General
French exploded a mine in Sydney Harbour to test the efficacy

1Poem appears in Robert L. Beisner, Twelve Against Empire,

2Newcastle Morning Herald, 22 Aug., 18 Nov. 1898.

3Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 13 June, 10 Aug., 28 Dec. 1898.

4See editorials in - Mt. Alexander Mail, 30 May 1898; Brisbane
Evening Observer, 1 June 1898; Freeman's Journal, 4 June 1898;
Liberator, 5 June 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 7 June 1898;
Melbourne Punch, 9 June 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 15 June,
31 Aug. 1898; Advertiser, 18 June 1898; Maitland Mercury, 12
July 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 10 Oct. 1898; Geelong
Times, 29 Oct. 1898; West Australian, 3 Jan. 1899.

5See e.g. Australian Star, 21 Apr. 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail,
21 Apr. 1898; Southern Cross, 22 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph
(Sydney), 23 Apr. 1898; Melbourne Punch, 5 May 1898;
Warrnambool Standard, 28 May 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 21
July 1898.

6E.g. Argus, 21, 25 Apr. 1898.
of this means of defence. On all sides, federation, if for
defence only, was urged. George Craig held that Australia
must have relatively more trained men in readiness than
America at the time of her attempted invasion of Cuba.¹
A Queensland paper warned:

Unless we can do better with our money and
enthusiasm than Spain has done, both will be
wasted...we must face the music of paying for
our posterity...The best way to ensure the
colony from collapse at some critical juncture
is to let the world see we are ready for war.²

Unpreparedness and bungling in American army
preparations provided a stark commentary on the Australian
situation. Slackness in coastal defences, batteries, mines,
fortresses, militia, training, equipment, reinforcements and
general fitness, aroused much adverse comment. Frank X. Cicott,
a prominent New York financier visiting Sydney in July 1898,
claimed that such ill-preparation betokened America's sincere
peaceableness. America, most agreed, had been lucky in
drawing Spain as an opponent.³ Melbourne Punch moralised:
'\nA good lesson to America is a good lesson to Australia and
we shall be lucky if we do not live to regret the neglect
from which our defences suffer'.⁴ Craig compared sections of
Australian discipline with that of the 'cowboy' attitude of
Roosevelt's 'Rough Riders'.⁵

An egotistical interest in observing the 'dash and

¹Maitland Mercury, 25 June 1898.
²Capricornian, 14 May 1898; Courier, 26 May 1898; Brisbane
Evening Observer, 1 Aug. 1898.
³See comment in - Coolgardie Miner, 25 Apr., 14 June 1898;
Mercury, 3 May 1898; West Australian, 5 May 1898; Bendigo
Independent, 24 May 1898; Herald, 29 Apr., 27 May, 11 June,
12 Nov. 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 28 May 1898; Bulletin, 4 June
1898; Australian Star, 6 June 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston),
8 June 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 2 July 1898; Geelong
Times, 5 July 1898; Australasian, 9 July 1898; Argus, 8 Aug.
1898; Leader, 27 Aug. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 27 Aug.
1898; Herald, 12 Nov. 1898; Evening News, 25 June 1898;
Australian Star, 29 June 1898; Herald, 7 Dec. 1898; Sydney
Morning Herald, 29 Nov. 1898, 3 Jan. 1899.
⁴Melbourne Punch, 9 June, 1 Sept., 5 Nov. 1898.
⁵Maitland Mercury, 20 Sept. 1898.
courage of the race animated much of the war interest. American's special aptitudes in invention, mechanics, chemistry and natural science it was hoped, would come to their aid. Advances in submarine torpedo boats, wireless telegraphy and aerial dirigibles were expected. Names such as Short, Holland, Langley and Maxim did provide some evidence of 'alertness, intelligence and audacity' generally expected, though explosive shells and quickfiring guns did little to hasten the era when war was unthinkable. ¹

It was hoped that the war would be 'short, sharp and decisive'. Yet America's slow mobilization seemed to mock that hope. Nonetheless, America had destroyed its image of 'all bluster and no fight'.² Stephen Bonsal's 'The Night After San Juan' illustrated how bloody the struggle could be.³ Though the United States' marines were praised by the Evening News, 'there are...tens of thousands of men in Australia who would campaign till further orders on bread, milk and coffee and feel better off when they left than when they began', scoffed the same paper, when American soldiers on Cuba complained of their rations.⁴ Discussions of strategy attracted comment in the Australian press by Admiral Colomb, Fred T. Jayne and especially George C. Craig, author of Federal Defence. Writing for the Maitland Mercury, he had sent to Washington for the most recent copy of the Army Register and was able to make accurate assessments. He praised American adoption of the Australian 'bushranger hat'.

¹Mt. Alexander Mail, 24 Aug. 1898; Evening News, 25 Apr., 7 May 1898; Argus, 3 May 1898; Capricornian, 21 May, 2 July 1898; Australasian, 21 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 23 Apr. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 2 July 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 23 Apr. 1898; Queensland Times, 28 Apr. 1898; Herald, 30 May 1898; Advertiser, 1 June 1898.

²See editorials in - Australasian, 23 Apr. 1898; Ballarat Star, 11 June 1898; Age, 25 Apr., 9 July 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 25, 26, 30 Apr., 2 Aug., 24 Sept. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 2 Aug. 1898; Barrier Miner, 10 Aug., 31 Dec. 1898; South Australian Register, 25 Apr., 4 May 1898; War Cry, 30 Apr. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 6 May, 23 Sept. 1898.


American ships, because of their newness and the revolution in naval tactics, were expected to provide much interest. Manila Bay quieted all debate regarding the relative values of the men or their capacity to handle new machines. T.A. Brassey, son of Lord Brassey and one of the world's leading naval experts, claimed when he arrived in Australia in early June, that 'brains in the conning tower' would decide future battles at sea. Americans had shown how battles could be fought with 'energy, despatch and the minimum of cost'. With £10 million expenditure scheduled by the United States Navy Board following the war, many predicted that the American navy could become the 'first navy in the world'. 'R.C.B.', a Melbourne columnist, described to his fellow-Australians the impressiveness of the battleships such as the Brooklyn, with their high speeds and great coal supplies. To many, the war had reconfirmed the necessity of strengthening the British navy both in Atlantic and Pacific waters. \(^2\)

All realised that the war's result would turn on sea-power. Mahan's appointment to the United States Naval Board affirmed this and assured an aggressive policy for the American navy. \(^3\) The Advertiser hoped that a great American naval victory would bring the war to a rapid close. \(^4\)

\(^1\)Maitland Mercury, 23 Apr., 3, 17, 30 May, 17 June 1898.

\(^2\)These and allied materials in special articles and editorials in - Mt. Alexander Mail, 21 Apr. 1898; South Australian Register, 23 Apr., 10 June 1898; Australasian, 23 Apr., 20 Aug. 1898; Courier, 25 Apr. 1898; Age, 27 Apr., 11 June 1898; Evening News, 29 Apr., 20 Aug. 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 3 May 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 4 May, 15 Aug. 1898; Melbourne Punch, 5, 12 May, 22 Dec. 1898; Truth, 15 May 1898; Maitland Mercury, 20 June 1898; Liberator, 27 Aug. 1898.

\(^3\)See editorials in - Leader, 23, 30 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 29 Apr., 20 June 1898; Ballarat Courier, 29 Apr. 1898; Argus, 6 May 1898; Evening News, 4 May 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 13 May 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 18 May, 17 Sept. 1898; Southern Cross, 20 May 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 27 July 1898; Melbourne Punch, 28 July 1898; Review of Reviews, 15 Sept. 1898; Mercury, 2 Jan. 1899; Sydney Morning Herald, 21 Jan. 1899.

\(^4\)Advertiser, 25 Apr. 1898.
before the battle at Manila, the Launceston Examiner predicted that 'every nation with pretensions to power will, within the next decade, be possess of a strong navy'. The battle had affirmed that 'never in recent times has there been afforded a finer lesson of the value of the sea-keeping power'. At the end of 1898, the Sydney Mail predicted a visit by splendid American warships sometime after the war.

Because of Australia's own vulnerability as an island open to invasion, intense interest was aroused by the projected American invasion of Cuba. Complicating the Cuban situation were the intractable insurgents themselves, the difficult climate and the tropical diseases, especially yellow fever. Slow preparations for the invasion were blamed on the general difficulties of democracies in waging wars. Nonetheless, Australia's press was rudely impatient at the delays of General Miles and at the prolongation of Cuban suffering. When finally landed (14 June) the force was criticized for confusion and ill-discipline. As the struggle ensued, the value of the Cuban insurgents as combatants and their intractability as the end of American fighting against Spain was ending, provoked warm debate.

1 Launceston Examiner, 28 Apr. 1898.
2 Sydney Mail, 30 Apr., 23 July, 10 Dec. 1898.
3 Sydney Mail, 23 Apr., 10 June, 2 July 1898; Advertiser, 25 Apr., 21 May, 20 June, 7, 16 July, 13 Aug. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 26 Apr., 7, 25 May, 5, 6, 21 July, 5, 13 Aug., 17, 20, 25 Nov. 1898; Singleton Argus, 26 Apr., 5 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 25 Apr., 9, 24 June, 5 July 1898; Evening News, 27 Apr., 27 May, 7 June, 4, 6 July, 28 Aug. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 28, 30 Apr., 9, 16 June, 6 July, 11 Oct. 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 30 Apr., 18 July 1898; Age, 30 Apr., 5 May, 30 July 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 9 May, 3, 29 June, 6 July 1898; Australasian, 7, 25 May, 9 June 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 28 Apr., 6 July 1898; Capricornian, 28 May, 16 July 1898; South Australian Register, 16 May, 1 June, 5, 8 July 1898; Leader, 21 May, 4 June 1898; Argus, 28 June, 9, 29 July, 10 Oct. 1898, 28 Jan. 1899; Freeman's Journal, 6 Aug. 1898; Bulletin, 30 Apr., 21 May 1898; Geelong Times, 4 May, 28 June, 11, 18 July 1898; Launceston Examiner, 19, 26, 27 May, 6, 9 July, 1 Nov. 1898; Courier, 29 Apr., 7, 16 July 1898; Ballarat Star, 2 May 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 3, 7, 24 May, 1 June, 6, 8 July, 25 Oct. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 24, 26 May, 17 June, 7, 12, 14, 25, 30 July, 12 Aug., 3 Sept., 1898, 13 Jan. 1899; Liberator, 11 June, 9 July 1898.
Rumours of war have an unaccustomed interest for Australians¹, asserted the Maitland Mercury.¹ The rumours regarding possible naval actions in the Mediterranean or North Atlantic, provoked an undue interest. The action off Santiago (3 July), whose harbour fortifications were said to resemble Melbourne's in their impregnability, caused much jubilation when Commodore Schley destroyed Admiral Cervera's escaping fleet. The discrepancy in losses was as great as in the Manilan action and it was seen that to all purposes, the struggle was over. Sydney's American citizens cabled McKinley: 'Humanity triumphs. Sydney rejoices. We salute "Old Glory".' The heroism of Lieutenant Hobson in attempting to blockade the harbour entrance, and in the courteous Spanish reception of him as prisoner, fascinated the Australian press in the same way as did Dewey's halt for breakfast before completing the destruction at Manila Bay.²

While the cable was still intact to Hong Kong, Australians on 25 April were among the first to know of the sailing of Dewey's Pacific Squadron. As well, it was known that Manila was defended by 6 Spanish cruisers, 11 gunboats and 12,000 regular Spanish troops. Admiral Pearson, commander in chief of the Australian Royal Naval Squadron, when interviewed in Sydney, anticipated an important clash in Manila Bay. The press in Australia waited expectantly.³

Early reports were of a Spanish victory. The Advertiser

¹Maitland Mercury, 21 Apr., 5, 11 July 1898.
²See following editorials: Queensland, 23 July 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 30 June, 9, 20 July 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 10 May, 18, 23 July 1898; Review of Reviews, 15 July, 15 Sept. 1898; Southern Cross, 10 June 1898; Ballarat Courier, 10 June 1898; Advocate, 4, 11 June 1898; Bendigo Independent, 30 June, 19 July 1898; Herald, 16, 21 June, 6 July 1898; Australian Star, 26 May 1898; West Australian, 5 May 1898; Mercury, 13 July 1898; Truth, 22 May 1898.
³See the following editorials: Bendigo Advertiser, 25 Apr. 1898; Australasian, 30 Apr. 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 30 Apr. 1898; Evening News, 30 Apr. 1898; Courier, 30 Apr. 1898; Age, 30 Apr. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 2 May 1898; especially George Craig in Maitland Mercury, 27 Apr. 1898.
in particular, was completely misled (3 May). Adelaide's second morning daily newspaper, working from a different cable service and exercising its traditional caution, hailed what it called 'The Battle of Cavite' as a brilliant victory, comparing it with Nelson's performance at Aboukir Bay. To many, it rendered the Australian Labor Day celebrations 'the most memorable for half a century', due to the battles' symbolism as a victory for humanity at the very doors of Australia. At a stroke the Americans had gained valuable coaling and naval stations in the North Pacific from a 'decadent' European power; proved their naval superiority; presaged their ultimate victory, and repeated the British record of emerging as a world power by first defeating Spaniards at sea. The smashing victory had been gained with a panache that appealed strongly to the Australian imagination. For Australians who viewed the result as guaranteeing Australian security in a strategically vital area, the victory was received, in the words of the Maitland Mercury, as though it was 'our own'.

An annoying silence followed, due to Dewey's cutting of the cable to Hong Kong. In a letter to the Age, W. Warren, Australian manager of the Eastern Extension and China Telegraph Co., defended the bravery of Australian and other cable operators in the area. When Robert Wright of Singleton wrote to his father from Belinas and Manila as a cable employee, he was as much interested in discussing the

---

1 Advertiser, 3, 6 May 1898.

2 South Australian Register, 3, 4, 5 May, 5 July 1898.

3 Maitland Mercury, 25 June, 27 Aug. 1898. For other comments see: Brisbane Evening Observer, 3, 11, 14 May 1898; Evening News, 3, 4 May 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 4 May 1898; Australian Star, 3, 11 May 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 3 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 4 May 1898; Ballarat Star, 4 May 1898; Ballarat Courier, 4 May 1898; Argus, 4 May 1898; Queensland Times, 5, 14 May 1898; Melbourne Punch, 5, 12 May 1898; Launceston Examiner, 5 May 1898; Australasian, 7 May 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 7 May, 5 July 1898; Geelong Times, 10 May 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 12 May 1898; West Australian, 5 May 1898; Sydney Mail, 4 June 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 4 July 1898.

4 Age, 25 July 1898.
results of the Australian cricket tests against England, as he was in recounting his adventures. Despite Dewey's forebearance and tolerance in an awkward international situation, a confrontation situation with Aguinaldo, the insurgent leader, was seen to be developing. Spain's military and national reputation was at the nadir.  

Spain's internal domestic situation was expected to be at such a pass as to make peace a daily possibility. Others predicted at least another attempt at rescuing the national honour by military means. Following the Santiago victory by the Americans, newspapers summed up the military lessons of the war: the swift torpedo destroyer had been rendered innocuous. America's capacity to mobilize quickly had been found wanting. Vigilant scouting had paid naval dividends. The efficiency of a heavier ratio of guns to armour and the necessity for accurate fire had been illustrated in the naval battles. Dynamite shells, delivered by the Vesuvius on Matanzas were frightening, but generally, shore fortifications had proved remarkably effective under fire. The value of coal and of taking the war to the enemy were also lessons to be learnt. Above all, vigilance was pressed by strategists such as Mahan writing for the London Times and Vice-Admiral Colomb in the Pall Mall Gazette.  

---


2 Editorials and articles in the following: Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 14, 30 May 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 3 June 1898; Ballarat Star, 11 June 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 16 June 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 1 July 1898; Courier, 9 July 1898; Evening News, 19 July 1898; Geelong Times, 4, 21 June 1898; West Australian, 4 June 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 16 June 1898; South Australian Register, 17 June 1898; Australasian, 18 June, 9 July 1898; Barrier Miner, 21 June 1898; Maitland Mercury, 22 June 1898; Southern Cross, 8 July 1898; Argus, 9, 18 July, 10 Aug., 5 Sept. 1898; Courier, 8 Aug. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 10 Aug. 1898, 24 Jan. 1899; Melbourne Punch, 11 Aug. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 11 Aug. 1898, 21 Jan. 1899; Perth Morning Herald, 6 Sept. 1898; Review of Reviews, 15 Sept. 1898; Australasian, 9 June 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 22 Aug. 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 23 Aug. 1898; Australian Star, 29 Nov. 1898; Freeman's Journal, 1 Oct. 1898.
Tickwell in the *Age* cautioned: 'To Australians who may one
day have to repel invasion by a formidable seapower, the
matter [of defence] is of absorbing importance'. As
anticipated, the war meant the stimulation of large naval
and military organizations in the United States on a
permanent footing - a prospect 'enough to make [Monroe]
weep', in the opinion of the *Bulletin*.2

Most important was the Australian perception of the
political effects of the war.

Evidence of a great racial power alliance, which had
been building up for over three years, now appeared likely
of consummation. As the *Ballarat Courier* put it following
the battle at Manila:

> We have had here in Ballarat, raptures of
> anticipatory joy over the prospect of union, of
> the larger than our own Australian federation,
> which shall weld together all the English-
> speaking races. We have sung 'Yankee Doodle'
> and 'Hail Columbia' and 'God Save The Queen' all
> in one unbroken strain of the bigger patriotism
> which includes the whole composite race in the
> same grand aspiration after a family compact of
> peace.3

On his arrival in Britain just following the battle of
Manila Bay, Lord Brassey claimed: 'These colonies would
 gladly welcome common action between Britain and America in
the large affairs of the world'. During May, the concept of
a 'Pan Anglican League' as the *Sydney Morning Herald* called
it, continued to fascinate Australians:4

> ...To crown their work, the Stars
> and Stripes
> And Southern Cross unfurled,
> United with Old England's flag,
> Shall dominate the world.

wrote John Plummer in his 'A Song of Anglo-Saxon Union';

---

1 *Age*, 6, 10 Aug. 1898.
3 *Ballarat Courier*, 23 Apr., 6 May 1898.
4 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 Apr. 1898.
typical of the enthusiasm of the times. Detraction was inevitable. The Advocate scoffed that the new amity arose from British insecurity and from common anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic sentiment. Michael Davitt spoke for many Catholic Irish in Australia when he telegraphed a New York newspaper that an alliance would 'ill-serve the Irish cause'. The 'Anti-British Alliance Association' of New York was frequently mentioned for its influence. C.W. Dilke was quoted for his belief that Britain's troubles with the French in West Africa and the Russians in the Far East were responsible for the courting of America. Norton believed that the British elite actually despised Americans for their crass materialism and believed that their expressions were hypocritical. As for Australian enthusiasm for an alliance, it was bathetic, a 'temporary hysteria, a mental affliction to which people of young countries are remarkably prone'. The Bulletin published J. Liddell Kelly's 'Anglomurkan National Anthem' to satirize gush of the 'Anglo-Saxon Idyll' variety:

---

1 Australian Star, 25, 29 Apr., 14 May 1898. See also editorials and articles in the following: Mt. Alexander Mail, 21 Apr., 13 May 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 22 Apr., 7, 19 May 1898; Leader, 23 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 23, 26 Apr. 1898; Weekly Times, 23 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 25, 26 Apr., 16 May, 10 June 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 26 Apr. 1898; 20, 23 May 1898; Maitland Mercury, 26 Apr., 2, 16 May 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 26 Apr. 1898; Geelong Times, 26 Apr. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 27 Apr., 16 May 1898; Advertiser, 28 Apr., 19 May 1898; Launceston Examiner, 29 Apr., 4 May 1898; South Australian Register, 4 May 1898; Age, 7, 14 May 1898; Queensland Times, 17 May 1898; Sydney Mail, 11 June 1898; Argus, 9 May 1898; Evening News, 16 May 1898; Courier, 16 May 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 16 May 1898; Inquirer, 20 May 1898.

2 Advocate, 23, 30 Apr., 4 June 1898.

3 Freeman's Journal, 23 Apr., 28 May 1898; Monitor, 20 May 1898.

4 Truth, 22, 31 May, 12 June 1898. See also, Herald, 25 May 1898.
...Hurrah for Bullanjonathan!
  Three cheers for J ohnansam!
The Anglomurkan nation
  Is bound to lick creation;
Geewilkins! Tarnation!
Godam! and likewise Damn!...

But the overwhelming weight of opinion favoured union. George Craig urged: 'Australians should favour with all their might the inevitable Anglo-American alliance...This Anglo-American sentiment should be continuously cultivated throughout the colonies...'

Several events seemed to favour the development: Chamberlain and Salisbury were well received in America when their speeches hinted at alliance prospects; the Queen's birthday was cheered by American soldiers in camp at Tampa; the United States' ambassador spoke of a mutual 'sacred mission of liberty and progress' at the Mayor's Banquet at Mansion House; Olney spoke of 'a patriotism of race, as well as of country' to the students at Harvard; Alfred Austen wrote 'A Voice From The West' and Grace Ellery Channing answered with a frankly racist appeal in September's Scribner's. Anglo-American understanding in the face of German pretension at Manila; the Penny Post; the Anglo-American Commission meeting in Quebec to arbitrate Canadian-United States differences; the American wives of Curzon, Chamberlain, Bryce and Churchill, were all taken as portents. Two dinners held simultaneously in early June were meant to encourage the impulse. One was held at the Hotel Cecil; the other at the Colonial Club, the latter arranged by several active and ex-Agents-General of Australasia. Henry Norman, Sir Horace Tozer and Lord Brassey were prominent at both. Letters, postcards, visitors and magazines from overseas were all encouraging. The Mt. Alexander Mail spoke of America as a 'sister

---

1 Bulletin, 4 June 1898, 28 Jan. 1899.
2 Maitland Mercury, 30, 31 May, 15 Nov. 1898.
commonwealth'.

At least one conservative swung away from the alliance notion. The article in the Times on 27 May called 'Union of the British Empire' was attacked by the Hobart Mercury for stating: 'Next after our relations with the United Kingdom, our relations with the United States are the most important to our welfare'. This, the Mercury believed, was misleading and inaccurate. Australia cared as much for the Cape as for the United States, the paper held. It could not see how America fitted into schemes of Imperial Federation. Davies daily as usual overstated the position: 'There is no special tendency toward the United States in the colonies', it said, 'and what is more, no great liking for their doings or belief in their public honesty'. To talk of reliance on the United States was 'unmitigated nonsense and (an) insult to the people of these colonies (who have) ... their own sense of loyalty, their own perception of what is to their advantage and they will think and act for themselves, in the future as they have done in the past'.

The Age attempted a balanced view when it saw from reading copies of the Chicago Chronicle and the Pittsburgh Despatch that the United States' press was far from enthusiastic regarding an alliance. It believed that Australian press opinion had been misled by the unrepresentative Anglophilism of spokesmen such as Depew and

1 Mt. Alexander Mail, 6 Aug. 1898. See comment in following editorials: Barrier Miner, 27 May 1898; Argus, 27, 28 May, 13, 23 June, 2, 10, 26 Sept. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 28 May 1898; Australian Star, 26, 28 May 1898; Courier, 2, 28 June 1898; Sydney Mail, 4 June 1898; Southern Cross, 10 June 1898; Ballarat Courier, 10 June, 19 July, 24 Oct. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 10, 20 June, 6 July, 26 Aug., 5 Oct. 1898; Age, 26, 27 May, 11, 21 June, 6 Aug., 17 Sept. 1898; Leader, 18 June 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 27 June, 15 July 1898; Evening News, 17 May, 8 Aug. 1898; Liberator, 2 July 1898; Melbourne Punch, 7 July 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 14 July 1898; Australasian Independent, 15 July 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 15 July, 8 Aug., 7 Oct. 1898; Capricornian, 23 July 1898; Geelong Times, 12 Aug. 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 13 Aug., 14 Nov. 1898; South Australian Register, 29 Aug. 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 10 Sept. 1898, 31 Jan. 1899; Mt. Alexander Mail, 17 June, 3 Oct., 29 Nov. 1898; Spectator, 30 Sept. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 10 Oct. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 12 Nov. 1898.

2 Mercury, 16 May, 1 July 1898.
SHOULDER TO SHOULDER.

South Australian Critic, 7 May 1898.
Smalley. The Advocate praised the Age for 'courage and honesty' in correcting perceptions. The Melbourne Punch criticized the Age's 'cheap and nasty' views. Some pessimists, however, wished to warn Britons that due to the Monroe Doctrine's belligerent and unpredictable developments, they were either on a collision course with America, or would be drawn into a China conflict by them.

But with various counterbalancing pro-alliance tendencies - meetings, visits, cavalcades, messages, contributions - continuing to receive good publicity in the press, especially Chamberlain's flattering article in Scribner's (December), the Launceston Examiner ventured at the end of 1898: 'The race never stood in a stronger position before the world than it does at this moment.'

'What has become of Federation since the dailies began to run to large frantic headlines about America and Spain?' asked the Bulletin and several others. Some claimed that the local variety of federation was but a prelude to the 'grand world Federation of the English-speaking races'. As the Argus put it: 'he who votes "No" on June 3 (1898) casts his ballot against both'. Therefore, wrote the Warrnambool

---

1 Age, 21 June 1898.
2 Advocate, 4, 25 June 1898.
3 Melbourne Punch, 7 July 1898.
4 Argus, 23 June 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 27 June, 15 July 1898.
7 Bulletin, 7 May 1898.
8 Argus, 28 May 1898.
Standard: '...let us ring out the cause of disunion and ring in that of union, not only in this island continent, but throughout the lands where the British people or their descendants dwell.' In these and other ways the Spanish-American war was made to serve the cause of federal union in Australia.

One ostensible reason for the intensity of Australia's focus on events was apprehension at European intervention, with the fear of invasion and the precipitation of an Anglo-American alliance as results. This involved a fascination with the defeat of once-powerful Spain, with all the internal upheavals that that was expected to produce and the fear of aid by Austria, France and particularly Germany on behalf of the monarchic principle, but especially to share in the dispersal of Spain's Empire. Regarding the latter development, the Australian Star moaned, 'from the Australian point of view America would be a better neighbour than Germany, but we fear that our wishes are not likely to be consulted'. George Craig insisted that 'a strong Australian protest should be sent to Lord Salisbury and Mr Chamberlain against any German seizure of Spanish soil in the Pacific'. Others considered it 'Teuton arrogance' that Germany should meddle in the Philippines or intend taking compensatory territory in Samoa.

The worst insult that newspapers could produce against

---

1Warrnambool Standard, 17 May, 7 June 1898.
2See editorials in: Melbourne Punch, 5 May 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Apr. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 14 May 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 17 May 1898; Evening News, 23 June 1898; South Australian Register, 23 June 1898.
3Australian Star, 6 May 1898.
4Maitland Mercury, 21 June 1898.
5See editorials in: Perth Morning Herald, 25 Apr. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 4 May 1898; Herald, 6 June 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 22 June 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 22 Nov. 1898; Advertiser, 7 June 1898; Launceston Examiner, 13 June 1898; Geelong Times, 25 Apr. 1898; Courier, 18 June 1898.
apathy toward military or federal efforts, was to convict Australians of a Spanish 'tiredness' in their approach. Two anarchist explosions in Melbourne on 1 June aroused some sympathy toward Spanish and European domestic problems. Better estimates had it that the Spaniards were a simple, brave people sadly misled by an arrogant elite with antiquated approaches. It was ultimately considered charitable to Spain herself to relieve her of troublesome possessions. Australians, it was argued, could then return to their simple kindly estimates of Spain as either the home of brave discoverers such as De Quiros, or as the original breeder of the inimitable merino.¹

Equal concern was shown with the fate of specific Pacific possessions. Hawaii had long been expected to fall to America. Its annexation would 'not appreciably stir Australian pulses' thought the Advertiser.² The observation was accurate. Most Australian newspapers had exhausted the topic of Hawaiian annexation by 1898. When annexation became a reality on 7 July, comment revolved around Hawaii's strategic location athwart the British Columbia-Australian mail and cable run and the desirability of this being in 'Anglo-Saxon' rather than Japanese hands. Its significance was not lost, however. The Australasian saw it as 'probably the most important event in the modern history of the United States...the birth of a new policy'.³ 'Ave Caesar!' gloomed the Bulletin: 'Now the Yankee will want to be in the China pie and all over the globe'.⁴ But Major General French, who was in charge of the defence of New South Wales, speaking

¹The bulk of references for this section on Spain is really overwhelming. A very small sample is Ballarat Star, 25 Apr. 1898; Spectator, 29 Apr. 1898; Courier, 4 May 1898; Mercury, 10 May 1898; Freeman's Journal, 30 Apr., 7 May, 11 June 1898; Advocate, 30 Apr., 14 May 1898; Victorian Churchman, 13 May 1898; Liberator, 9 July 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 12 May 1898.

²Advertiser, 18 May 1898, 16 Jan. 1899.

³Australasian, 16 July 1898.

⁴Bulletin, 16 July 1898.
at the New South Wales Commercial Travellers' Dinner (1 August) held:

...there is no Power we would rather see dominating the Pacific Oceans. Established as a great military and naval Power in the Pacific, the American Republic would surely safeguard the Australian Commonwealth from the predatory designs of alien peoples intent upon territorial aggrandisement...Australia will have abundant reason to bless the Stars and Stripes.1

Interest after this focused on the three commissioners travelling on the Mariposa bound for Sydney from San Francisco and the methods whereby they would convert the island into a distantly governed American dependency.2

Of even greater concern was the fate of the Philippines. To retain those would mean 'a new chapter in the world's history will have begun', claimed the Evening News.3 A host of factors argued against American withdrawal: the leaving of an undesirable power vacuum in an internationally tense area and the unpreparedness of the natives for self-government being the most commonly stressed. Yet the awkwardness of governing this difficult and distant terrain, with hostile natives and a primitive civil service, was instantly recognized. As Stead put it: 'The Americans have not got the Philippines. It is rather the Philippines that have got them'.4 Nonetheless, Americans resident in Sydney

1 Australian Star, 2 Aug. 1898.
2 In general, see editorials following: Perth Morning Herald, 7 May, 13 Sept. 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 1 June, 13 Aug. 1898; Evening News, 17 June 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 20 June 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 13 July, 15 Dec. 1898; Maitland Mercury 16 July 1898; Herald, 2 Aug. 1898; Australian Star, 2 Aug. 1898; Geelong Times, 11 Aug. 1898; Monitor, 9 Sept. 1898; Age, 17 Sept. 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 27 Sept. 1898; Inquirer, 12 Aug. 1898; Argus, 30 Dec. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 16 Dec. 1898.
3 Evening News, 4, 5, 10 May 1898.
cabled McKinley after Manila Bay: 'Our prayer is: Hold the Philippines.' This Australian sympathy was recognized by the Boston Congregationalist. 1

Even before the battle of Manila, Sir George Clarke, Agent-General for Victoria in London, suggested to his State's Premier Sir George Turner, that representations be made to Her Majesty's Government regarding the future of the Philippines. From Melbourne, on 12 May, Sir George replied to the effect: 'It is most important on strategical grounds that the Philippine Islands, which dominate the Australian trade route to the East, should be in the possession of a friendly power.' This message Clarke presented to Chamberlain. Lord Brassey, the Victorian Governor and W.P. Reeves, Agent-General of New Zealand, were also asked to assist in those representations. Other Australian Colonial Premiers were telegraphed by Turner, inviting them to support his initiative. Of those Premiers asked, Kingston of South Australia, Byrnes of Queensland and Reid of New South Wales were unenthusiastic, the latter even rude, regarding the proposal. Only Braddon of Tasmania and Seddon of New

---

1 See editorial comment in the following: South Australian Register, 28 Apr., 19 Nov. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 4, 5 May, 9, 22 July, 27 Aug. 1898; Maitland Mercury, 5 May, 20 Sept. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 6, 12 May, 17 Aug., 1, 23 Sept., 30 Nov. 1898; Age, 16 June 1898, 4, 16 Jan. 1899; Southern Cross, 17 June 1898; Bendigo Advertiser, 23 May, 21 June 1898; Monitor, 24 June 1898; Bendigo Independent, 24 June 1898; Liberatér, 13 Aug. 1898; Courier, 2 Aug., 20 Sept., 3, 17, 30 Nov. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 19 July, 17 Aug., 20 Sept. 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 15, 16 June, 7 Oct., 2, 16 Nov., 1 Dec. 1898; Evening News, 29 Sept. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 24 May, 1 Nov. 1898; Barrier Miner, 7 May, 12 Dec. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 11 May, 3 Nov. 1898; Mercury, 12 May 1898, 5 Jan. 1899; Melbourne Punch, 12 May, 7 July, 10 Nov. 1898; Ballarat Courier, 12 May 1898; Sydney Mail, 4 June, 6 Aug., 22 Oct. 1898; Perth Morning Herald, 4 July 1898; Geelong Times, 19 July, 24 Nov. 1898; Australian Star, 16 Nov. 1898, 18 Jan. 1899; Australasian Independent, 15 Dec. 1898; Freeman's Journal, 14 Jan. 1899.
Zealand promised any aid. All viewed the message as premature. ¹

Though the Brisbane Evening Observer praised Turner’s action as a 'bold stroke of policy', it added that 'public opinion will be inclined to think that Victoria’s interference has been unwarranted'. ² The Australian Star saw it as 'a clever and remarkable thing...Turner’s representations...have not been made too soon'. Yet it criticized the action for alarming other powers; increasing Australia’s Imperial responsibilities and as a piece of blatant self-advertisement. ³ To Sydney’s Daily Telegraph, it was a ridiculous and embarrassing piece of misrepresentation and trouble-making. ⁴ The Coolgardie Miner saw it as an inducement to American expansion. ⁵

Brisbane’s Courier was frankly astounded. Turner’s action was 'injudicious...indecent...(and) so unlike (Turner) that we are tempted to ask who is really behind him pulling the wires of this business'? ⁶ Perhaps Turner had been misled into thinking that Clarke was paving the way for a well-planned political coup; or, in the jockeying for positions in the coming Federation, that he needed to balance the public effect of Reid’s telegram concerning the Maine disaster. In any event, all agreed that the matter was best left until the war’s end. The Advocate saw it as being potentially misread by the Americans as an attack on their possible stewardship. ⁷ Others claimed that it was stupid to protest about the existence of every Power athwart an Australian trade route

¹ Age, 17, 18 May 1898; Sydney Morning Herald quoted telegram 21 May 1898. For full text see Australasian, 21 May 1898.
³ Brisbane Evening Observer, 17 May 1898.
⁴ Australian Star, 17 May 1898.
⁵ Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 18 May 1898.
⁶ Coolgardie Miner, 18 May 1898.
⁷ Courier, 18 May 1898.
⁸ Advocate, 21 May 1898.
and further, that it was presumptuous for a mere colony to do so. 'We ought to be certain our interests are involved before we speak,' cautioned the Sydney Morning Herald. Turner had really only served to reconfirm to a sensitive group of distant and disunited colonies, how little voice they had as yet in the councils of Empire. Maybe that had been his intention.

Viewed along with the situation in the Philippines, most other concerns with American military occupancy seemed minor. It was recognized that behind that archipelago loomed the China market and its myriad problems of control and rivalry. That American ownership of the Philippines would assist Australian exploitation of that market, was taken for granted.

Regarding Samoa, with the news of the renewed Malietoa-Mataafa rivalry and the breaking down of the tripartite condominium at the end of the year, it was hoped that the Americans would fill the breach being vacated diplomatically by Britain in the face of new German pressure. Dr. Brown, Secretary of the Australian Wesleyan Missionary Society was only one who believed that Australians should themselves be more concerned about this slipping away of their Oceanic

---

1 Sydney Morning Herald, 21 May 1898. See also: South Australian Register, 24 May 1898.

2 For editorial comment see: Argus, 25 Apr. 1898; West Australian, 9 May 1898; Mercury, 12 May 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 14 June 1898; Geelong Times, 17 June 1898; Leader, 13 June 1898; Advertiser, 20 June 1898; Melbourne Punch, 11 Aug. 1898; Brisbane Evening Observer, 12, 13 Aug., 17 Dec. 1898; Maitland Mercury, 20 Aug. 1898; Australian Star, 16 Dec. 1898; Herald, 29 Dec. 1898; Age, 2 Jan. 1899; Table Talk, 13 Jan. 1899; Perth Morning Herald, 30 Dec. 1898.
What had made the capture of remote Guam interesting to some Australians were the letters of 'G.E.C.', an Australian bandsman-volunteer who had somehow entered an American cavalry regiment and had been present when the American warships Australia, City of Sydney and Charleston had confronted the unprepared Spanish officials on the island. German pretension in the Carolines and Ladrones was as resented as the American presence was welcomed.

Puerto Rico's seizure was praised for the efficient and relatively bloodless way the Americans had taken a strategically important, richly endowed and well-defended Caribbean island.

Much interest now flowed in the direction of the Central American Canal scheme. Senatorial concern was praised for imagination and criticized for belligerence toward Britain. That a canal would shorten distances from New York to Melbourne by 3,290 miles and allow Australian agriculturalists to exploit the winter-bound markets of the northern hemisphere were seen as points in the scheme's favour, even

---


3 See editorial comment in: South Australian Register, 29 June 1898; Geelong Times, 7 July 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 7 July 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 3 Aug. 1898, 11 Jan. 1899; Age, 11 Jan. 1898.

4 Brisbane Evening Observer, 5 May 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 16 May 1898; Maitland Mercury, 20, 30 July 1898.
A ROWDY FAMILY.

Melbourne Punch, 1 September 1898.
if Americans decided to dominate the Canal's construction. The American traveller T.D. McKay on his arrival in Sydney reaffirmed the advantages of travel that the Canal would have for those wishing to visit the United States' Southern and Eastern seabords before continuing on to Europe. The Pacific cable proposed to link America's West Coast, Honolulu, the Philippines and Japan, was encouraged for the linkages it would form with projected Australian Pacific cable networks.1

Almost immediately after the battle at Manila Bay, the Sydney Morning Herald gave expression to what was to become an increasingly common opinion:

Whatever else may happen it is clear that the States are now an international force that must be reckoned with, not only at sea, but by Europe...Now that the United States have burst the fictitious swathes of the Monroe Doctrine it is apparent that no great question can be settled in future without reckoning on an active American interference as a factor in the situation. All this works good for England and for British interests at home and abroad. Ours is an age of great international combinations, of enormous overseas expansion and of eager trade rivalry.

America it was held, was at a crisis point in her development. Her heritage both racial and national suggested that she should go on, with the approval of her Anglo-Saxon peers, to 'civilize' the Philippines and elsewhere.2

---


2 Sydney Morning Herald, 9 May 1898. See also, Australian Star, 11 May 1898; West Australian, 12 May 1898; Mt. Alexander Mail, 13 May 1898.
This new power excited hopes of future humanitarian benefits and assistance to weak or worthy countries. But it was also recognized that the exercise of such power would excite jealousy and should teach humility. Others feared it would encourage Americans to be even more assertive, aggressive and corrupt.¹

Joseph Symes judged that 'World Power' must revolutionize American thought, politics and institutions.² Ever the most astute commentator on American affairs, the Launceston Examiner agreed:

The United States is on the eve of a politico-industrial revolution. It is fast approaching that condition when its progress and its foreign trade expansion will become synonymous. It wants outside markets and trade and to get them must accept foreign responsibilities.³

Bonython recognized that all along the difficulty for the United States had been 'to distinguish between an expansion which is legitimate and necessary and a policy of simple aggrandisement which has no excuse at all'.⁴ McKinley's Message to Congress in early December 1898, was therefore greeted as the most important since the time of Monroe, 63 years before. Gratifyingly, it appeared to reconfirm friendship with the British Empire, as well as officially announce the beginning of America's course as an Imperial power.⁵

¹See editorials in: South Australian Register, 6 July 1898; Age, 2 Aug. 1898; Geelong Times, 13, 27 June 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 14, 28 June, 6 July 1898; Courier, 21 June 1898; Ballarat Courier, 22 June 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 2 July 1898; Ballarat Courier, 5 July, 2 Aug. 1898.

²Liberator, 13 Aug. 1898.

³Launceston Examiner, 8, 10 Oct., 20, 31 Dec. 1898.

⁴Advertiser, 13 Aug. 1898.

Though events had made 1898 'a critical year in the history of the century' in the opinion of many, it had produced for America a collection of problems not easily disposed of. In Cuba and the Philippines the natives were taking less kindly to America's presence than had been anticipated. America had inherited the bitter dregs of an Empire it was claimed: mullattoes would exacerbate the already tense racial problem at home. A lack of trained officials would make government difficult for some time, while increasing the powers of the Executive in an unfortunate way. Imperial power was expected to change the temper of Americans to a more martial character.1

Aguinaldo's declaration of independence against the American occupying forces (5 Jan. 1899) brought into sharp relief the dilemmas of the new American Empire. To some Australian observers it was a gross ingratitude. To others the cry,'The Philippines for the Filipinos' was understandable. With the appointment of a Philippine Commission to study this situation (20 Jan. 1899) and the Cubans under Gomez becoming restive, it was clear that America's problems had only just begun.2

Anti-Imperialist ideas began to stir some Australian imaginations from mid-July 1898 and grew in appeal in the

---


early new year, 1899. The Mt. Alexander Mail was one of the first to predict that the election of 1900 would turn on the question of acceptance or rejection of the new imperialism. At war's end, the paper announced:

Though successful, [the United States] is in no wise to be envied. She has lost a large number of brave men by military slaughter and camp sickness, has expended an enormous amount of money, and has regained in return only some wasp hives.¹

To the Mercury, an American Empire was the abnegation of all the human ideals which America stood for: freedom, equality, and the 'repudiation of the royal vices and national ambitions of the old world'. That paper later deplored the precedent of 'benign interventionism', which America had introduced, for its mischief-making potential.² The Review of Reviews introduced a wider audience in Australia to the anti-imperialist writings of Carnegie, Schurz, Bryce, Goldwin Smith and others, and the work of the Anti-Imperialist League.³

Yet at first, the American peace terms were accepted in Australia as being welcome and magnanimous. From mid-July it was known that preliminary negotiations, using the good offices of Jules Cambon, the French Ambassador at Washington, were being undertaken. These efforts were applauded. The Advertiser believed it would be a satisfactorily contracted peace, knowing the 'dour patience' of the Americans as negotiators. Further, 'The establishment of any loose claims on the islands, or handing them back to Spain would be a

¹Mt. Alexander Mail, 18 July, 8 Aug. 1898.
cause of alarm to Australia...the progress of negotiations is therefore full of interest to these colonies, 1 European interference in the peace terms, resulting in a squabble over the spoils, was also feared. From 12 August, a protocol provided that a proper peace treaty be signed.2

When the peace commission met at Paris (1 October), it was criticized for its tardiness. When signed on 10 December, the peace was hailed by the Newcastle Morning Herald as concluding 'an important chapter in the annals of human history'.3 The Senate debate over the treaty (concluded February, 1899) demonstrated to some observers the power of such a body in deciding the destiny of a nation. Whereas the ratified treaty (6 February) ensured Cuba's ultimate freedom, it took in the Philippines (for which $20 million was paid Spain in compensation), Guam and Puerto Rico in a way that made their futures ambiguous.

Among the happier results of the war were seen to be the new solidarity of the Northern and Southern, Eastern and Western sections of the United States. Other gains were the advent of a neutral hospital ship service (e.g. the Solace) and the supposed rise in status of negroes and women due to their contribution to the war effort. The urbanity

1Advertiser, 15 July 1898.

2See editorials in: Mercury, 13 July 1898; Geelong Advertiser, 14 July 1898; Southern Cross, 22 July 1898; Sydney Morning Herald, 1 Aug. 1898; Warrnambool Standard, 3 Aug. 1898; Launceston Examiner, 5 Aug. 1898; Sydney Mail, 6 Aug. 1898; Geelong Times, 9 Aug. 1898; Herald, 9, 15 Aug., 7 Dec. 1898; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 8 Aug. 1898; Courier, 12 Aug. 1898; Newcastle Morning Herald, 11 Oct. 1898; Melbourne Punch, 10 Nov. 1898; Ballarat Star, 10 Nov. 1898; Coolgardie Miner, 12 Nov. 1898; Leader, 3 Dec. 1898.

3Newcastle Morning Herald, 13 Dec. 1898.
with which the rival military leaders treated each other, was taken as an indication of an increasingly humane approach to war.

"Our American cousins are feeling good. There is no doubt about it," remarked the *Sydney Morning Herald*. ¹ That the good will would generally redound to Australia's benefit was taken as grounds for quietly condoning American's euphoria.

Due to the brevity, lack of bloodshed and momentous results accompanying it, few Australians in the New Year would have argued with American ambassador John Hay's cliché-description of the struggle as 'a splendid little war'. ²

¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 Dec. 1898.
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AMERICAN EMPIRE, 1899-1901:

THE AUSTRALIAN RECEPTION

Considerable debate and discussion surrounded the events of the three years 1899-1901, during which Australia finally became a federated nation, and the American Empire was consolidated.

Due to its relative proximity, Sydney-siders in particular and Australians in general, took an intense interest in the international events unfolding in Samoa. A ten day voyage from Apia, Sydney was, after Auckland, one of the first to know of latest developments on the islands and was anxious to transmit that intelligence to London and the world. An interest in the assertion of Australian, British and New Zealand interests was accompanied by a friendly concern for America and a deep hostility toward the 'treacherous' Germans. Strategically athwart the sea and projected cable route from Sydney to Vancouver, the islands were considered important, especially as coaling stations in times of peace or war. But what could replace the failing tripartite condominium that had attempted to govern them for a decade? This was the question that dominated attention as events unfolded throughout 1899.1

During the royal quarrel that sprang up as a result of a High Court decision in favour of the rule of young king Malietoa, most Australian Catholics backed the older, more popular Catholic candidate for the kingship, Mataafa. Yet they vigorously denied rumours of manipulating the chief and quoted the old Reverend Alphonse Faigle, a missionary

---

for 33 years on the island, who died in Sydney 7 March 1899, in their support.¹ As the decision had been handed down by an American court, and as the Germans actively encouraged Mataafa's defiance, feelings ran high and a general tribal war, involving the European Powers on opposite sides, was expected.²

Australian newspapers took sides. The Sydney Morning Herald was the most prominent among those friendly to the German case.³ The many organs backing Britain and America nonetheless found it difficult to condone the firing of their warships, on the order of the senior American commander, at the Mataafan natives. An offer by Premier Seddon of New Zealand, of a battalion of 500 infantry to assist the British cause was derided as land-grabbing and praised for its far-sightedness by the Argus⁴ and Age⁵ respectively. The general situation in the islands had not been so tense since the time immediately preceding the Apian cyclone in 1899.

Pleasure at the new Anglo-American co-operation, or disgust at their use of force on defenceless natives animated much of the response. The Australian squadron was poised to sail as the High Commissioners of the three Powers arrived on the island of Apia to restore order and work out a new solution. By that time several English and American sailors

³Sydney Morning Herald, 30 Mar., 3, 4 Apr. 1899. See also, Evening News, 30 Mar. 1899; Brisbane Evening Observer, 1, 3 Apr. 1899; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 1 Apr. 1899; Courier, 1 Apr. 1899; Herald, 3 Apr. 1899; South Australian Register, 4 Apr. 1899; Newcastle Morning Herald, 4 Apr. 1899; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 5 Apr. 1899.
⁴Argus, 3 Apr. 1899.
⁵Age, 4 Apr. 1899.
had lost their lives in fighting Mataafa's forces. Though Germans became placatory, Catholics in Australia with renewed belligerence and led by Cardinal Moran, attacked the London Missionary Society and the Anglo-American combination for supporting an unpopular candidate because of his religious and national prejudices.

At the Japanese Fair in Sydney to aid the Marist Fathers in mid-May 1899, Cardinal Moran regretted that Admiral Pearson - in charge of the Australian Auxiliary Squadron - had not been allowed to proceed to the islands to prevent what he termed as being 'deliberate murder', precipitated by a third-rate commander. He labelled the United States 'a very dangerous power', bent on making the Pacific Ocean a new American lake. The natives' crime, it appeared to the Launceston Monitor, had been their desire to elect their own king. The Protestant response was instant. Angry repudiations of Moran's charges culminated in the meeting by a hundred Protestant clergymen at the Sydney Town Hall to denounce him. Catholic press organs sprang loyally to the defence of the Cardinal. His effect on dampening enthusiasm for the Anglo-American policing actions was marked, in the press at least. To many it seemed incredible that a collection of around 40,000 natives and 500 whites could create such national and international anxiety.
Review of Reviews familiarised Australians with the concern overseas. Forecasts of a settlement were pronounced during the end of June.¹

A new political arrangement in Samoa placing control under the control of a single governor invited all the old intrigues and tensions. The kingship was abolished in favour of a parliament of three members, representing the three Powers. This temporary arrangement was replaced on 10 November 1899 by a broader agreement. To the dismay of some Australians, Britain withdrew from the group in favour of a division between Germany and America and was compensated by Germany with the Solomons. Though many spokesmen such as politicians Sir George Turner, William Lyne and G. Holden; religious men such as Dr G. Brown and the Reverend I. Rooney and merchants such as G.W. Waterhouse of Sydney, rationalised the decision on strategic, trading or missionary grounds, it was generally considered by the press that Germany had scored a diplomatic coup, having caught Britain off-balance due to the need to cultivate Teutonic good-will during the Boer War, just begun.²

Australians grumblingly accepted this diplomatic contingency, but resolved that after federation, Australia's interests would be more boldly made known. Seddon's annexation of the Cook group in October 1900, was viewed as a direct result of the Samoan disappointments and a desire to secure Australasia's Pacific heritage, even without the Mother Country's ponderous approval. That America had secured an excellent harbour in Pango and had generally asserted 'Anglo-Saxon' interests with vigour throughout the negotiations, produced some editorial pleasure in an otherwise gloomy situation. It was often accepted among editors that America would represent the racial, perhaps

¹Review of Reviews, 15 May, 15 June, 15 July 1899.

even the national, interests of Britain and Australia in that part of the Pacific.\(^1\)

There was also unrest in Cuba. However, many newspapers such as the *Sydney Morning Herald*, believed that the 'business-like and practical spirit' of the Americans would overcome the new difficulties with the former Cuban insurgents.\(^2\) A glittering economic, social and political future for the island continued to be predicted, although basic sanitation and hygiene had to first be re-established. Cubans appeared to settle down more quickly than the Filipinos - perhaps from war weariness - and were often used as an example of the beneficial rule which followed acquiescence. Yet many others agreed with General Shafter who looked upon the undisbanded Cuban insurgents as a potential source of trouble.\(^3\)

General Wood had supervised a constitutional convention for the Cubans in November 1900. Senator Orville Platt's amendment, sponsored by Secretary of War Elihu Root, in effect gave the United States a quasi-protectorate over Cuba (2 March 1901).\(^4\) To most of the Australian press it appeared that Cubans were being allowed to govern themselves to a degree, but the *Tocsin* regarded American actions as oppressive.\(^5\)

Difficulties in Hawaii were also generally predicted.

---


\(^{2}\) *Sydney Morning Herald*, 7 Feb., 21 Apr. 1899.


\(^{4}\) For editorial comment see: *Geelong Times*, 28 Feb. 1901; *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 19 Mar. 1901; *South Australian Register*, 8 Apr., 18 June 1901; *Brisbane Evening Observer*, 12 Apr. 1901; *Protestant Banner*, 13 Apr. 1901.

\(^{5}\) *Tocsin*, 11 July 1901.
The Freeman's Journal accused the Protestant missionaries of backing the Queen's downfall and believed that America had irritated Hawaii's Catholics. ¹ Others predicted trouble with the island's 40,000 half-breeds. ² The South Australian Register held that the extension to the islands of American import duties was strangling Australian trade to the island and that the use of low-paid native labour in sugar plantations was fattening wealthy corporations and lowering wages at home. ³

The sale of the Carolines to Germany, instead of an American takeover, was almost universally regretted by the metropolitan press. ⁴

Newspapers continued to be intrigued by the renewed talk of opening a canal route through Central America. Newcastle was particularly apprehensive about the loss of West Coast United States¹ markets in her coal trade, fearing new competition from British vessels, able to return home the shorter distances with cargoes of wheat. ⁵ Some anticipated the existence of two rival isthmian canals. Certainly work was expected to be complete on one or other of them within a decade. Where the French had failed, it was confidently expected that the ingenious, energetic and progressive Americans would succeed. It was considered that a canal would be the visible symbol of the new Manifest Destiny thrusting America into the Pacific. ⁶

When the first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty replaced the

---

² E.g. Review of Reviews, 15 Apr. 1899.
³ South Australian Register, 11 Mar. 1899.
⁴ Editorial comment in: Brisbane Evening Observer, 6 June 1899; Sydney Morning Herald, 6, 8, 21, 27 June 1899; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 7 June 1899; Courier, 7 Oct. 1899.
⁵ Newcastle Morning Herald, 7 Feb. 1899.
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty (5 February 1900), Australians responded in much the same way they had done over Samoa. They were in fact, frustrated at the British diplomatic performance and what it appeared to surrender of British power, but acquiesced, being aware of the need to keep on friendly terms with America, now that the Boer War had placed the British Empire in a vulnerable position. A swift construction of the long-delayed project was looked for as compensation.  

McKinley was attacked for allowing the Senate to ratify what was obviously an unacceptable treaty (20 December 1900). The treaty was considered unfair and insensitive to long-held British ambitions in the Panama-Nicaraguan area. The Sydney metropolitan press was anxious for work to begin on the canal. Sydney regarded itself as the first major Australian port of call by Panama shipping, reversing the old Suez situation. Others were happy enough that American and European trade competition in the Pacific might be curtailed by the Canal’s construction.

Conclusion of the second Hay-Paunceforte Treaty, 18 November 1901, conceded most points to the Americans, including finally, fortification of the canal. By this time in Australia, impatience had overcome scruples. There were thanks enough that the Anglo-American canal squabble had not proved serious.  

What would happen regarding Anglo-American relations during the 'scramble' for China also occupied the editorials of the Australian press. The imminence of a European clash continued to serve as a spur for racial alliance and a stimulus to colonial unity.  

1 See editorials in: Argus, 7 Feb. 1900; Perth Morning Herald, 8 Feb. 1900; South Australian Register, 8 Feb. 1900; Age, 9, 10 Feb., 23 Apr. 1900; Launceston Examiner, 13 Feb. 1900; Review of Reviews, 15 Apr., 15 May, 15 June, 15 July 1900.


trade, the Perth Morning Herald stated. Anglo-Saxon domination could hold open the door for Australian wool, wheat, meat and timber it held. Final agreement by the Powers, (albeit informally), on United States Secretary of State John Hay's 'Open Door' declaration to secure equality of commercial opportunity was announced in Australia by Stead's Review of Reviews, 15 March 1900 - five days prior to Hay's official notification. Sir Earl Grey viewed it as a significant departure from previous American diplomatic policy, but congratulated the United States on their initiative, as did some liberal-conservative newspapers in Australia. Some press commentators could sense the Boxer Revolt's arrival in early 1900. When it erupted later in June, the urgent need to cooperate with America and other Powers to retrieve a desperate situation was recognized. Chamberlain requested the assistance of Australia's Auxiliary Squadron and William Lyne also volunteered the New South Wales Naval Brigade, while Victorian naval forces also expressed a willingness to go. 'England's Last Hope' - the third contingent of infantry volunteers - also showed themselves eager. Some agreed with Sullivan, the member for Queanbeyan, that this involvement made better strategic and commercial sense than did the South African participation. The Daily Mercury urged caution in the expenditure of further colonial blood and treasure. By contrast, the Argus thought of the Australian troops as forces in a sacred cause...against...barbarism China had startlingly awakened. For many weeks editorial attention focused on the fate of those in Pekin until their relief by the international forces, 14 August 1900.

1 Perth Morning Herald, 8 May 1899.
2 Review of Reviews, 15 Mar., pp.302-3, 15 May, p.565, 1900. There was perhaps, little flurry regarding the 'Open Door' by the press as the principle had been long upheld by British diplomacy.
3 See editorials in: Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 27 July 1900; Capricornian, 16 June; 7 July 1900; Age, 3 July 1900; Ballarat Courier, 9 Aug. 1900; Geelong Times, 3 Dec. 1900.
4 Maitland Mercury, 2 July 1900.
5 Argus, 1, 15, 25, 27, 30 June, 7, 10, 17, 18, 20, 26, 30, 31 July, 1, 3, 17, 20 August 1900.
Pleasure with American military cooperation in bringing about order was replaced by irritation at her diplomatic intransigence regarding the wording of the joint note to be presented by the Powers to China. Many viewed the action as contradictory and hypocrical. Some approval of the United States returned when she stayed to 'mop up', and in the process confronted Russian ambitions in Manchuria.¹

Australian press opinion regarding the Philippines was full of encouragement from the liberal-conservatives toward those newly assuming Imperial burdens. Simultaneously, and especially among the more radical-liberal press, there was sympathy for the aspirations of Aguinaldo and the insurgents who had declared an independent government. 6 February 1899, following the ratification of the Treaty of Paris by the Senate - itself assisted in passage by the loss of American lives in the Philippines. Conservatives claimed that hot-blooded, primitive Malays suffering under years of Spanish tutelage, were not ready for self-government, nor had they the national character to sustain it if won. Filipino sympathizers respected the natives¹ courage as warriors and as defenders of their own right to self-government and the exploitation of their own resources. Others were in a quandary. They were desirous of seeing America firmly entrenched in the islands to forestall a Japanese or German takeover, but not at the expense of a protracted guerilla conflict; the sacrifice of world opinion, or collision with British interests in the area. In some important ways, those newspapers which aligned themselves definitely on one or other side of the pro and anti-imperialist debate on the Philippines at the beginning of 1899, were to provide a clue as to their later attitudes regarding the Boers from the end of 1899 to 1902.²

¹For editorial comment, see: Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 13, 27 Dec. 1900, 31 Jan., 2, 29 Mar. 1901; Geelong Times, 27 Dec. 1900; Catholic Press, 29 Dec. 1900; Argus, 29 Dec. 1900; Brisbane Evening Observer, 14 Jan., 11 Mar., 7 May 1901; South Australian Register, 11, 23, 29 Mar. 1901; Advocate, 7 Sept. 1901.

²Editorial comment in the following: Newcastle Morning Herald, 1, 7, 8, 10, 22, 24 Feb. 1899; Brisbane Evening Observer, 2, 11 Feb. 1899; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 2 Feb. 1899; Freeman's Journal, 4 Feb. 1899; Leader, 4 Feb. 1899; Advertiser, 6 Feb. 1899; Evening News, 7 Feb. 1899; South Australian Register, 8 Feb. 1899; Courier, 8 Feb. 1899; Geelong Times, 8 Feb. 1899; Ballarat Star, 8 Feb. 1899; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 10 Feb. 1899.
As the debate continued, some held that America would lose face if it handed the islands back to Spain, or offered them to another Power. The insurgents lost some considerable Catholic sympathy when atrocities committed by them on Catholic clergy and civilians were publicized. As a primarily conservative group, Catholic papers joined other newspapers believing that peace and stability over unruly natives needed to be asserted with the bayonet, if need be, as had been recently achieved at Omdurman. Others wondered whether elusive commercial gains would be worth an exhausting and inglorious jungle conflict. Yet another group continued to argue that American involvement was necessary to prevent other nations using the excuse of instability in order to interfere in a way unwelcome to Australian security and interests in the Far East.¹

With immediate military results not forthcoming, the Catholic Press (almost alone among its peers, except for the Advocate which enjoyed the American discomfiture) argued that it was hypocrisy and murder to impose the peace of the desert on the unwilling islanders.² Others hoped that a little more determined application of force would produce the desired result. An indulgent view of the natives as 'half-devil and half-child' (Kipling's phrase) held that only a short-sightedness on behalf of the natives prevented their enjoyment of the kind of 'beneficent despotism' that the British had imposed in India. With disease and hard fighting claiming an increasing number of American lives (70,000 troops were ultimately sent), it was felt that America's


²Catholic Press, 25 Mar. 1899; Advocate, 1, 29 Apr. 1899.
NOT HIS FIRST SMOKE, EITHER.

Melbourne Punch, 31 August 1899.
marvellous luck had at last run out. The *Newcastle Morning Herald* versified:

The pig has tied him up in knots,  
He don't know what to do;  
He’s doubtful whether to cut the string  
Or see the business through.

America's position was held to be increasingly 'unenviable'. General Otis's conduct of the war was censured by overseas pressmen in the Philippines for suppressing the true nature of American difficulties and losses. With the Filipino's fighting ferociously, some newspapers such as the *Geelong Times* and the *Hobart Mercury* co-opted the anti-imperialist arguments current on mainland America to accuse the Great Republic of materialistic greed and the sad abnegation of long-held ideals of freedom, equality and self-government. When the Boer war began, such criticism became muted. Many held that Americans were labouring in the same vineyard, and criticism of American actions was usually only in retaliation for notable attacks by organs of America's press. Even Aguinaldo's capture, 23 March 1901, did not end the war. It dragged on until 16 April 1902 and was officially terminated 4 July of that year, almost immediately following the Treaty of Vereeniging, which ended the Boer War (31 May 1902). The war had been almost as sanguinary as the latter struggle: 4,234 Americans and

---


2 *Newcastle Morning Herald*, 29 Apr. 1899.

3 *Geelong Times*, 12 June, 6 July 1899, 8 Oct. 1900; *Mercury*, 2 Aug. 1899.
20,000 natives killed at a cost of $600 million. Americans were learning the true meaning of Empire.1

Australians continued to cultivate the Manilan market. Peace, it was hoped, would bring a progressive business government which would purchase fruit, preserves, canned goods, frozen meat and other items from Australia. Admiral Dewey's large transport, the Celtic, arrived in Sydney harbour to take on such supplies for his return trip to the United States in mid 1899.2 In Brisbane, the flourishing frozen meat trade with the Americans in the Philippines was expected to increase with the return of H. Hopper, a competent Chicago meat preserver, who had returned to the city after a trip which included an assessment of Far Eastern markets.3 Certainly coal markets had grown in the area. For commercial reasons alone, Australians could look forward to an established peace.4

Religious newspapers continued their mutual editorial assaults in vigorous attacks upon, and fervid defences of, the role played by the Catholic Spanish clergy in precipitating the Filipino revolt.5

Whether the 'New Imperialism' as applied to America was a healthy development or a retrograde one, was debated thoroughly in Australia's press. Conservative-liberals such as the West Australian and the South Australian Register usually stressed the need for America to develop a responsible attitude in order to rise to the occasion.


2Sydney Mail, 17 June 1899.

3Brisbane Evening Observer, 12 Apr. 1901.


5E.g. Liberator, 3 June, 23 Sept. 1899, 7, 14 Sept. 1901; Monitor, 4 Aug., 1 Sept. 1899; Austral Light, 1 Apr. 1901.
demanded by her new sense of manifest destiny and international mission.\(^1\) Others believed that the traditional American foreign policy of isolation was best suited as a vehicle of American ideals of government and hoped that the election of 1900 would see a reversion to this older policy. Most were aware of the need for government changes in the States to cope with the new situation, and an 'Executive Despotism' was feared. The Philippines Commission was often scoffed at as only offering the natives a token participation in their own government. Others held that the governance of the Philippines would provide a happy hunting-ground for opportunists and adventurers of all kinds: the scum of American society. Throughout 1899 and 1900, the Philippines were the focus of anti-imperialist arguments as expounded by antipodean commentators.\(^2\)

The *Advocate* in particular, took delight in publishing from overseas sources, large accounts of the proceedings of the Anti-Imperialist League, founded 17 February 1899, and the opinions of Cleveland, Bryan, Hoar, Bishop Potter and others involved in it.\(^3\) But when Lord Brassey was attacked by the San Francisco *Monitor* for his suggestions on praiseworthy British Imperial precedents, that paper's Launceston Catholic namesake defended the Australian experience of the British *imperium*, which it suggested, had been wholly efficacious.\(^4\)

As the war progressed, anti-imperialist sentiments were expressed by other Australian organs with equal evidence against those interfering with Filipinos, Boers or Chinese and those exploiting them under a veil of misconceived ideals.\(^5\) The *Tocsin* heavily backed the excoriating proceedings of the 'Peace and Humanity Society of Victoria'.\(^6\)

\(^1\) *West Australian*, 9, 21 Feb. 1899; *South Australian Register*, 15 Feb. 1899.


\(^4\) *Monitor*, 26 May 1899.


W.T. Stead's Review of Reviews familiarised Australian readers with a broad range of anti-imperialists by quoting their articles: Goldwin Smith; 'Mr. Dooley', (the creation of Peter Finley Dunne); Mark Twain, David Starr Jordan (who was to visit Australia); ex-President Harrison; Charles Francis Adams; Andrew Carnegie; Carl Schurz; William James; E.L. Godkin; Charles Eliot Norton; Edward Atkinson and others. Anti-imperialist sentiments in United States' newspapers were also often quoted (e.g. San Francisco Argonaut, New York Tribune, New Bedford, Mercury and Minneapolis Tribune). When Cardinal Moran wished to take an anti-imperialist stance against excessive British interference in affairs of the new Australian nation, he quoted American precedents. Australians he held, 'owed much to the United States, for it had modelled out the liberty and independence which Australians today enjoyed'. The tone of Moran's attacks appeared to derive from the arguments of the American anti-imperialists, current at the time.

Many predicted that the American presidential election of 1900 would turn on the question of 'anti-imperialism'. Maurice Low in the National accurately predicted in August 1899 the candidates and the issues. The election would involve McKinley against Bryan with gold or silver, protected

---


2See editorials in: Argus, 21 July 1899; Age, 9 Sept. 1899; Evening News, 18 Sept. 1899; Advertiser, 18 Oct. 1899. The Chicago Record's survey of anti and pro-imperialists in the United States conducted in mid 1900, was of particular interest: catholics were ambivalent; labour was against, protestant clergymen, businessmen, physicians and lawyers were in favour and New York evenly divided on expansion. A narrow majority of the populace appeared to be anti-imperialist. It is a pity for the researcher that a similar survey was not conducted in Australia during the Boer War.

3Catholic Press, 5 Oct. 1901. Moran's attacks appeared to be against Chamberlain's interference in the Alien Restriction and Military Organization Bills. See comment on Moran in Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 19 Sept. 1901; Melbourne Punch, 26 Sept. 1901; Capricornian, 28 Sept. 1901.
or freer trade but above all, pro or anti-expansionism, among the major issues to be decided by the electors. His views were well-known in Australia. Whereas attacks on trusts and city-bossism absorbed much editorial attention, the real focus of interest lay in whether Bryan would unleash renewed Anglophobia, associated with pro-Boer and general anti-Imperialist elements in the American population. Though it was conceded that Bryan had toned down his attacks on the American and British financial Establishments, he was still feared in Australia for potential economic and political irresponsibility.1

As in 1896, but not to the same extent, McKinley's victory in November was hailed by most of the Australian press with relief. Once again 'Bryanism' had been defeated, and a friend of Britain's re-installed, it was held. The status quo, involving a cautious imperialism, the gold standard and business progress, had been seemingly reinstated. As well, parallel elections in Great Britain, Victoria and Canada, had also apparently endorsed 'Imperialism' for another four years. The election results wounded, but did not kill the arguments of anti-imperialist advocates in those countries.2

1 Australians continued to be fascinated by these elections. See editorials in: Age, 9 Sept. 1899, quoting Low, 22 Oct. 1900; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 27 Dec. 1899, 18 Apr., 5, 10 July, 8 Sept., 1, 6 Nov. 1900; Brisbane Evening Observer, 18 Apr., 3 Nov. 1900; Launceston Examiner, 19 Apr., 25 June, 12, 14 July, 4 Sept. 1900; Sydney Morning Herald, 23 Apr., 27 June, 1, 6 Nov. 1900; Australasian, 19 May, 14 July, 11, 25 Aug., 13 Oct. 1900; South Australian Register, 8 June, 17 Oct., 5 Nov. 1900; Review of Reviews, 15 June, 15 July, 15 Aug., 15 Sept., 15 Oct., 15 Nov., 15 Dec. 1900, 15 Jan. 1901; Newcastle Morning Herald, 10 July 1900; Argus, 24 Aug., 7 Nov. 1900; Geelong Times, 8 Sept., 22 Oct. 1900; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 18 Oct. 1900; Perth Morning Herald, 27 Oct. 1900; Brisbane Evening Observer, 3 Nov. 1900; Courier, 6 Nov. 1900; Australian Star, 3, 6 Nov. 1900; Advertiser, 5 Nov. 1900; Coalsadie Miner, 6 Nov. 1900; Bendigo Independent, 7 Nov. 1900; Ballarat Courier, 7 Nov. 1900. As before, Catholic and Labor newspapers took little interest in the election.

2 Editorials in: Australian Star, 8 Nov. 1900; Age, 8, 9 Nov. 1900; Advertiser, 8 Nov. 1900; Brisbane Evening Observer, 8 Nov. 1900, 6 Mar. 1901; Maitland Mercury, 8 Nov. 1900; South Australian Register, 8 Nov. 1900; Courier, 8 Nov. 1900; Argus, 8 Nov. 1900, 18 Jan., 16 Mar. 1901; Perth Morning Herald, 8, 10 Nov. 1900; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 8, 17, 27 Nov. 1900, 7 Mar. 1901; Sydney Morning Herald, 8 Nov., 17 Dec. 1900; Launceston Examiner, 9 Nov., 24 Dec. 1900; Ballarat Star, 9 Nov. 1900; Newcastle Morning Herald, 9 Nov. 1900; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 9 Nov. 1900; Mt. Alexander Mail, 10 Nov. 1900;
Apparently the so-called 'new imperialism' had triumphed over its opponent ideologies. As an abstract topic it was much discussed in the Australian press throughout the period 1899-1901.

The Daily Telegraph, borrowing a phrase from the British Saturday Review, dubbed the United States 'The Young Imperialist'. With the new wave of popularity attached to the topic of imperialism by Britishers such as Rudyard Kipling and foreigners such as Edmond Demoulins in his Anglo-Saxon Superiority: To What It Is Due, the title seemed apt. America it was held, had grown up. The country was now impelled by the same economic and emotional motivations as older European powers. Perhaps given its energy, size and genius, the United States would one day outstrip them all: such were the early assessments.

The Australian colonies were themselves not proof against this fashionable craze for imperialism. They had openly coveted Samoa; swiftly entered the Boer War; sent troops and ships to China and mentioned often a Monroe Doctrine of their own. Article writers from overseas articulated Australia's coming strength and ambition: Hugh H. Lusk in the North American Review; Charles Conant and Charles Burton Adams in the Atlantic Monthly and in

---

Footnote continued from previous page:

Geelong Times, 12 Nov. 1900; War Cry, 17 Nov. 1900; Freeman's Journal, 17 Nov. 1900; Liberator, 17 Nov. 1900; Australasian, 10 Nov., 1 Dec. 1900.

1Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 18, 25 Feb. 1899.


particular, an anonymous article in the British Spectator. ¹
In the latter, Australians were beheld as aggressive, adventorous, materialist and progressive in trade and commerce: a people who would 'never rest fully satisfied within their boundaries'. By 2,000 A.D. they were expected to dominate Asiatic trade. If Imperialism was the 'new Pan-Britannic religion', in the opinion of the Bendigo Independent at the beginning of 1901,² then Australia was a devotee. As the Launceston Examiner put it in October 1901: 'The Australian ideal is to become a great Pacific nation and eventually to become overlord of the southern seas.'³ Most newspapers confidently believed that Papua, the Solomons, Fiji, Tonga and islands belonging to European powers in their area would become part of this future Empire. How then was it possible to criticize America's Pacific and Caribbean Empire without being hypocritical?⁴

When the Trinity College Dialectic Society debated the 'Morality of Imperialism' with Lord Brassey as a speaker, the debate which followed concluded with the argument that expansion was essential to self-preservation and that nations must grow with their rivals or die.⁵ When the Victorian Minister for Works complained that the military element was too prominent in the first Commonwealth Day procession that marked Australian Federation (1 January 1901), he was admonished that it was a militaristic age - that only nations which could wield force would have influence. Christianity

¹Entitled, 'What Australia Is To Be'.
²Bendigo Independent, 2 Feb., 9 July 1901.
³Launceston Examiner, 7 Oct. 1901.
⁴See editorial comment in: Daily Telegraph (Launceston) 5 Apr. 1899; Australasian, 8 Apr. 1899; South Australian Register, 6 Feb., 2 Dec. 1901; Ballarat Courier, 16 Feb. 1901; Maitland Mercury, 19 Feb. 1901; Herald, 23 Apr. 1901; Bendigo Advertiser, 30 Oct. 1901; Argus, 21 July 1900; Geelong Times, 30 July 1900; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 25 May 1901.
⁵Argus, 7 Aug. 1899; Australasian, 12 Aug. 1899.
⁶Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 12 Aug. 1899, 8 Jan. 1901.
had little to do with it. The old, 'establishment' Catholic Freeman's Journal claimed toward the end of 1899: 'we are about to found what will ultimately prove to be the Greatest Power in the Southern World'.

For those seeking moral justification, there was the concept of Kipling's 'White Man's Burden', introduced into Australia in mid-March 1899 by Stead's Review of Reviews. The poem had originally appeared in February's McClure's and Stead seized on it as presenting the quintessence of the case for a self-sacrificing, humane and responsible imperialism. Empires were burdens, not advantages. They were an exhausting task to the righteous, whose onerous job it was to uplift ignorant native peoples and mitigate the crueller effects of imperial adventurers. To Stead, 'It is an international document of a high order of importance...a direct appeal to the United States to take up the policy of Expansion.'

The doctrine had instant appeal; not only to Americans, but Australians. It justified their own hopes and ambitions for the future; it rationalized their support for America; it gave meaning and logic to belonging to an Empire and having Imperial aspirations; it answered the charges of the anti-Imperialists; it made Imperialism respectable, and (until World War One) fashionable.

Australia's press was smitten. Norton lampooned the poem; Deakin in an excellent, long editorial in the Age (1 April 1899) intellectualized up on it; The Tocsin and Bulletin satirized it and though some rejected it, or suggested alternative 'burdens', few newspapers ignored it and most editors

1Freeman's Journal, 9 Sept. 1899. See also comment in: West Australian, 12 Aug. 1899; Advertiser, 16 Aug. 1899; Capricornian 26 Aug. 1899.


3Truth, 19 Mar. 1899.

4Age, 1 Apr. 1899. Age office files reveal Deakin as this editorial's author.

5Tocsin, 1 June 1899.

6Bulletin, 10 June, 22 July 1899.
rationalized the civilizing mission. It explained what Americans were doing in the Philippines and Britons in the Transvaal. Colonies, in Stead's words, were 'fines imposed by destiny'. In Mahan's terms, one matured into these responsibilities by a natural and inevitable ageing process of growth and development. 'It is to be hoped that the will of the wisp of foreign dominion may never attract us as it is now attracting our American cousins', Deakin wrote in the Age. But despite his editorial rhetoric, the prospect of assuming future burdens in the fullness of time was not anathema to him. Colonies were sobering responsibilities: a product of strength; not jingoistic playthings and foibles of youth. Empire it was commonly felt, was part of Australia's own ultimate destiny.

'Liberal Imperialism', voted into Britain in October 1900, was a form of liberalism that had been long followed by Australians, held the Sydney Morning Herald: one compatible with their pride and place in what the Argus called 'an Empire of happy Commonwealths'. Rosebery had predicted a century of 'keen, intelligent, almost fierce international competitions'. Americans were often seen as indulging instinctively in an irreversible trend: a Darwinist action (with unavoidable messy side-effects) for ethnocentric and progressive ends. It was consistent therefore for editors to see Empire as a part of America's inevitable destiny as well.

Competition might take other forms. Economic, as well as political, Imperialism had been unleashed in 1898 it was felt, not always with the most fortunate results.

1See editorials in: Launceston Examiner, 27 Mar. 1899; Warrnambool Standard, 23 Mar. 1899; Ballarat Courier, 24 Mar. 1899; Bendigo Advertiser, 1 Apr. 1899; Review of Reviews, 15 Apr. 1899; Sydney Mail, 22 Apr. 1899; Newcastle Morning Herald, 31 May 1899; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 21 June 1899, 8 Apr. 1901; Capricornian, 4 Nov. 1899; Brisbane Worker, 11 May 1901; Mt. Alexander Mail, 27 Nov. 1901.

2Sydney Morning Herald, 29 Dec. 1900.

3Argus, 1, 2 Jan. 1901.

4Bendigo Independent saw the logical end of this competition as an Armageddon of the nations, 28 Feb. 1901.

From 1899 to 1901 America was experiencing an economic boom, following the Spanish-American War. It bred an optimism bordering on arrogance in the American future. America's economic supremacy was constantly discussed in the overseas magazines entering Australia. Such writers as Brooks Adams, Andrew Carnegie and Ray Stannard Baker were often quoted. It was generally considered by them that the economic centre of gravity either had, or was in process, of moving from the Old to the New World, centering somewhere on the Great Lakes. American predominance in the production of coal, the manufacture of steel, and cheap, but skilful engineering projects, was becoming legendary. It produced a love-hate relationship in Europe which had considered itself to the turn of the century as the world's work-shop.

Now the hard facts of economic competition with protection-fostered industries using cheap, hardworking labour, abundant resources, labour-saving machinery and managerial skill were leaving their mark on relative production rates. In these years Americans began to win contracts away from the British in railway lines, locomotive and bridge building and markets in other items.

Some colonial protectionist editors, remembering how ruthless and unfeeling British freetrade had been toward imports of Australian primary products, were at first less concerned at seeing British and other European industry 'in decay' than were Europeans themselves. (American-European trade rivalry in secondary production would increase the prospect of cheaper and better goods it was held.) More capital would mean an increased world trade, and a greater general prosperity.

Following Australian federation, more editors became distressed by overseas economic developments. Many who followed Joseph Chamberlain's line, began to argue that Britain was becoming America's debtor to an alarming degree and that the Mother Country's needs in food and raw materials could be more gainfully supplied by countries of the Empire. Existing economic trends would shortly result in Britain as a

---

second-class world power, if allowed to continue. Coming at a time when the new nation coveted increased trade and strong backing in Pacific affairs, American economic precociousness helped speed acceptance of notions of imperial trade preference with all but a few die-hard free-trade editors of the Australia press.¹

There were some specific economic irritations. The most pronounced of these concerned new American shipping and the protection of American trade. With stiff tariff duties to be paid, it was difficult for Australian colonies to share in the new prosperity, many editors claimed. Especially was this so in the case of the renewal of the San Francisco Mail Contracts. The application of restrictive new shipping laws meant these were to revert to Spreckles¹ lines and be carried in all-American vessels, cutting out the New Zealand shipping of the Union Company Steamship line from Honolulu to Auckland. The prospect of renewing the New South Wales-New Zealand subsidy was several times discussed in the Colonial Parliament of the former. The unsuccessful voyage of the Warrinoo seemed to indicate some of the difficulties involved in trading with Samoa and Hawaii.

A selfish disregard of reasonable reciprocity made the future of Australian trade and British shipping with these Pacific possessions a fairly gloomy one. Sydney's Chamber of Commerce expressed its unhappiness on the topic with a letter to the New South Wales¹ Premier and by an address requesting support from Chambers of Commerce in the other Australian colonies. Perhaps only a federal voice would be effective, it was argued. When the Sierra appeared in Port Jackson shortly after federation, there still seemed to be little that could be done to win reciprocal benefits for the mail run. Compromise had to await a loosening of the

Newcastle Morning Herald, 8 Nov., 26 Dec. 1900, 13 June, 18 Mar. 1901; Launceston Examiner, 27 Apr. 1901; Herald, 19 June 1901; Bendigo Advertiser, 27 July 1901; Geelong Times, 16 Dec. 1901. As ever, the overwhelming success of American protectionist policies also fuelled editorial arguments for such a system in Australia.
American commercial approach. Until then, the colonies expressed a united unhappiness at subsidizing American shipping; although it was more efficient. The difficulty stimulated more talk of an 'All Red' line to Vancouver. Australian-American relations were somewhat soured by this issue to the end of 1901.

Other Australian trade and shipping expressed concern over American competition in coal on America's West Coast and in meat and foodstuffs to South Africa. But massive shipments of gold bullion (£800,000 in one shipload in October 1900) from Sydney to the United States aroused less resentment than previously as fears on currency subsided. The repercussions of the confusing United States' Supreme Court ruling on duties collected from the Puerto Rican trade (May 1901) was generally to the effect that Americans could now manipulate duties more freely in their new territories than in the continental United States. It took until after McKinley's death at the end of the year, for the implications of this decision to become clear.

Mitigating these developments was the work of Colonel Bell. With no remuneration, he represented New South Wales at the International Commercial Congress in Philadelphia at the end of 1899. The presence of Asher Smith in Australia as a representative of the Congress's organization in May and June 1899 was taken as evidence of American business initiative, which, with the employment of more commercial agents in Australia, was commended as an American example for Australian colonies themselves to follow in their trade relations overseas.

---

1 For editorial comment see: Warrnambool Standard, 5 May 1899; Sydney Morning Herald, 15 Nov. 1899, 3 July, 7, 29 Aug. 1900; Newcastle Morning Herald, 3 Aug. 1900; Launceston Examiner, 6 Aug., 13 Sept. 1900; Brisbane Evening Observer, 11 Sept. 1900; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 3 Aug. 1900, 8, 10 Jan., 16 Oct., 29 Sept. 1901; Perth Morning Herald, 30 July 1900.

2 Editors commented in the following: Australian Star, 26 Dec. 1899; Newcastle Morning Herald, 26 Apr., 8 Nov. 1900; Sydney Morning Herald, 11 Oct. 1900; Geelong Times, 28 May 1901; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 30 May 1901; Age (cables), 30, 31 May 1901; South Australia Register, 1 June 1901; Australasian, 1 June 1901; Mt. Alexander Mail, 7 June 1901; Age, 13 June 1901; Review of Reviews, 20 July 1901.
Sir Horace Tozer, Sir Andrew Clarke, Dr. Cockburn and W. Reeves, Agents-General for Queensland, Victoria, South Australia and New Zealand respectively, sailed from Britain to Philadelphia, to represent their colonies at the Congress. Bell sang their praises upon his return to Sydney and proclaimed the Congress a triumph from Australia's viewpoint. Shortly thereafter Bell was recalled to the United States due to his Democratic allegiances in a Republican year, after having served as American Consul in Sydney for seven fruitful years. During his time in office, Australian imports of American goods had increased almost fivefold to reach a figure of $10,392,389 worth in 1899, much of this increase due to his efforts. Not only was he himself popular, but he had helped popularize United States' goods: Machinery, timber, tobacco, kerosene, paper, grain, tools and furniture. Yet return trade remained a third the import figure and still consisted of bullion, specie, wool, coal and hides mainly. At the end of 1901 Bell was nonetheless promoting Australian trade to the London Chamber of Commerce. His work was appreciated editorially.

In his address in November 1901, Bell had told the British that the centre of the commercial world was shifting toward Australia. But this was not the only flattering assessment that the newly-emerging political-economy received. In New England, The Notes of a Democratic Traveller in New Zealand, with some Australian Comparisons, published in 1900, Henry Demarest Lloyd, the famous American author and journalist, compensated for the disappointments of his own country's progressive developments, with glowing praise of the State social-welfare experiments in New Zealand and Australia. Lloyd saw them as providing a model for the future development of democratic capitalist societies and as providing the basis for much of the liberal-progressive


2 Review of Reviews, 20 Nov. 1901.

3 Ibid.
legislation needed in England and America. Solutions to 
problems of land distribution; trade disputes; equitable 
taxation; full employment; insurance and health benefits 
and particularly the co-operation between State and 
individual and capital and labour in producing a reasonably 
homogeneous middle class, were held up by publicists like 
Stead, as pertinent answers to present dilemmas. ¹ Despite 
the scorn heaped upon Australian State-owned services by 
visiting American Senator Eugene F. Loud, Australians were 
generally flattered at this quiet, yet striking 'proof' of 
the superiority of their own political-economy over that of 
the highly publicized American. ²  

This lack of deep-rooted anxiety regarding the economic 
future being placed in jeopardy by United States commerical 
expansion, allowed more friendly energies to be expended on 
the editorial contemplation of an Anglo-American alliance, 
which included Australia. 

Theatrical 'invasions' and religious assertions could 
be looked on with equanimity. At the conclusion of the 
Spanish-American War, an American 'invasion' of theatrical 
talent, ranging from Charles Hoyt's 'Belle of New York', 
and a Georgia Minstrel and Cakewalk company, were quickly 
followed by the Janet Waldorf Classical Comedy Company and the 
Charles Southwell Comic Opera Company of New York. The 
Australian press and public found these aggressions 
delightful and it was noted how close were Australian and 
American tastes in comedy and farce. ³  

Regarding religious developments, the issue of 
'Americanism' about which Pope Leo XIII had addressed a 
letter of reassurance to Cardinal Gibbons, reaffirmed 
acceptability of the patriotic Catholicism of the Dr Ireland 

¹ Review of Reviews, 20 June 1901, pp.661-3: 'Why Not New­ 
Zealandise Great Britain?' - an article based on an interview 
of Stead with Lloyd. Unfortunately, both Bell and Stead came 
into some bad odour in Australia for their too pronounced 
opposition to the Boer War. This tended to mitigate their 
overall influence.  
² See comment in: Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 19 Sept. 1901; 
³ Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 22 Mar. 1899; Quiz & Lantern, 6 Apr.; 
27 July, 9 Nov. 1899, 1 Nov. 1900; Sydney Morning Herald, 
24 June 1899, 23 Feb. 1900; Advertiser, 23 Sept. 1899.
stamp: a decision cheered and welcomed by the Australian Catholic press for its implications.1

There were sobering signs for the pro-alliance enthusiasts. The Melbourne journalist T.K. Dow, who had made a trip throughout the United States inspecting Agricultural Colleges in the Universities and Agricultural Bureaus in the State and Federal governments during 1898, wrote back in one of his long detailed letters published in the Age, 2 September 1899, that during his observations of 4 July celebrations in San Francisco (1898):

I had been reading of the blending of the Union Jack with the Stars and Stripes in the eastern states and I looked around for some blending, but it did not come off. If any British subject in San Francisco owned a flag, he was keeping it for some other occasion. I never saw a British flag until I got to Canada. I was told at Los Angeles that a large number of flags had been got from San Francisco for blending purposes on 'the 4th'. They had no use for them at the Golden Gate...all flags save one seem to be tabooed...It did not transpire during the day that the attitude of England towards America had in any way changed during the last one hundred years, nor was there any reference made to the part which England had taken among the European powers in connection with the Spanish War. They say such things were mentioned in the East, and I left America without being fortunate enough to hear a single word upon the subject...As for sentiment of the desirable sort, I looked for it in vain.2

An article by John Foster Fraser in the Contemporary Review together with Dow's evidence 'proved' to the

---


2 As can be gathered from the lengthy quote, Dow's observations are important for their detail. He commented on California and Stanford, Chicago, Wisconsin, Niagara, New York and Cornell. See Age, 11, 18, 25 Feb., 4, 18, 25 Mar., 8, 15, 22, 29 Apr., 20, 27 May, 3, 10, 24 June, 1, 15, 22, 29 July, 5, 12, 19, 26 Aug., 2, 9 Sept. 1899.
Advocate that the American 'man in the street' cared little for Britain, despite that country's enthusiasm for America. 'Falcon' (Mr Whitelock), a prolific letter writer for the Newcastle Morning Herald and the Grafton Examiner, had long held the same view, though the Catholic Press attacked him for it. Another Australian traveller to the States observed in 1901: 'The Americans seem to hate the British intensely.'

There was other evidence of lack of harmony. Outstanding among these was the poor results of the Anglo-American Commission meeting in Quebec to decide on the position of the Alaskan Boundary. Australian press commentators were usually neutral on the issue. Those partisan considered that Canadian intransigence was giving heat to the lengthy negotiations and that the Dominion was unnecessarily souring Anglo-American accord. (A Commission decided in favour of the American claims in 1904.)

Further discord was revealed in the anti-imperialist arguments, taken up and repeated by some sections of the Australian press. Opposition to the Boer War by substantial numbers of the American people did nothing to improve fellow-feeling; nor did the revival of Anglophobic election bluster in 1900. John Norton held that no gains in friendship could be made until America was rid of her irritating new conceit - a result of their ludicrously tiny war with a decrepit power. Sydney's Daily Telegraph claimed that Americans were simply coldly indifferent toward an alliance that would 'nullify (their) vast gains in national pride and in

1 Advocate, 15 Apr., 9, 16 Sept. 1899.
2 Catholic Press, 13 Jan. 1900.
3 Age, 19 June 1901 anon.
4 See editorial comment in; South Australian Register, 11 Apr. 1899; Australian Star, 27 May 1899; Sydney Mail, 3 June 1899; Argus, 19 June 1899; Newcastle Morning Herald, 26 July 1899; Advertiser, 29 July 1899 (American correspondent's letter); Age, 7 Aug. 1899, 7 Sept. 1901; Advocate, 29 July 1899; Sydney Morning Herald, 9 Aug. 1899, 17 Mar. 1900; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 16 Sept. 1899, 8, 10 Jan. 1901.
5 Truth, 11 June 1899.
national advancement. The New Zealand Minister who preferred to join a future Anglo-American Colonial Zollverein than become a part of Australia was, according to that paper, condemned to a long wait. The alliance impulse it felt, was 'a fad which lacks popular backing' (in America). ¹

Yet there remained in Australia a vast number of incorrigibly optimistic liberal-conservatives in the press who never ceased to hope that their ethnocentric-progressive ideal would be realised, and they seized upon each clue large or small, as a sign of the coming millennium.

Despite the body of evidence to the contrary, many newspapers believed that American attitudes had indeed changed toward the British and had become more friendly. They relied partly on Mahan's widely quoted admonition to his countrymen to cultivate British friendship. An American businessman returning from a successful career in Australia convinced the San Francisco correspondent to the Age that 'the victory of the United States over Spain in the recent war has served to clear away much of the prejudice that once existed among Australians toward this country'. He claimed that an increase in the volume of trade in American goods accurately reflected this trend. ² Especially kind treatment of Lord Herschell who had died during the Quebec Anglo-American Conference combined with American concern for Rudyard Kipling, reported to be dying in the United States were taken with American plans for a 'Peace Jubilee' on the occasion of Queen Victoria's birthday, as

¹Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 4, 9 Dec. 1899, 3, 17 May, 3 Aug. 1900, 3 Jan. 1901. For other editorial comment see: Advocate, 24 June 1899, 26 May 1900; Mt. Alexander Mail, 26 June 1899; Review of Reviews, 15 Oct. 1899, 15 May, 15 June 1900; Catholic Press, 10 Feb., 25 Aug. 1900; Tocsin, 14 Mar. 1901; Argus, 19 Nov. 1899; Liberator, 2 Dec. 1899; Sydney Morning Herald, 2 Dec. 1899, 3 May, 3 July 1900; Australian Star, 9, 19 Dec. 1899; Herald, 30 Dec. 1899; Brisbane Evening Observer, 2 Jan., 5, 16 May 1900; Newcastle Morning Herald, 2 Feb., 5, 28 May 1900; Launceston Examiner, 12 Jan. 1900; South Australian Register, 11 July 1900; Perth Morning Herald, 30 July 1900.

²Age, American letter published 25 Feb. 1899. See also, 3 June, 1 July 1899.
There were special reasons for Australian cordiality. Colonel Bell's gesture in promoting New South Wales' trade evoked a particularly warm response. On the occasion of Bell's leavetaking for America in 1899, an impressive gathering was held at the Sydney Town Hall. 'It is doubtful whether in the history of our colony, any representative of a foreign nation received such an enthusiastic reception', claimed the Sydney Mail.

On the occasion, the Governor said:

Our feeling for America is in no way based on public documents, or upon what diplomats may write or say, but it is a brotherly feeling by which our hearts go out to Americans whenever we meet them.

As well, some Australians were flattered that Senator Bucklin, chairman of a fiscal committee on the United States' Legislature, was in Australia at the beginning of 1900 observing Australian economic practices.

When the new federal constitution was ready to be presented by Colonial legislatures to the British government for approval in the latter half of 1899, it had been made abundantly clear to the public by the presses in all the colonies that since the initial discussions in 1889, a heavy use had come to be made of American precedents in the formulation of that constitution.

For the framers of the Australian federal constitution, James Bryce's The American Commonwealth of 1888 had been a bible. Alfred Deakin considered that their debt to the work was 'almost incalculable'. Inglis Clark in a draft proposal of 1891 was the vital force in the assertion of the primacy of American precedents. With A. Deakin, framers such as I. Isaacs, S. Griffith, E. Barton, R. O'Connor, J. Symons, H. Higgins, B. Wise, J. Quick and R. Garran especially, studied them in depth. Beside Bryce, their principal printed guides appear to have been the Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States by American authors such as Story, Kent and Walker, and Burgess's Political Science and Constitutional Law.

---


2 For press comment see: Sydney Morning Herald, 17, 18 Feb., 25 Apr., 13, 30 May 1899; Age, 21, 27 July 1899; Argus, 30 Jan. 1899; Australasian, 4, 11 Feb. 1899; West Australian, 30 July 1899; Western Mail, 12 May, 4 Aug. 1899.


4 La Nauze, op.cit., p.275.

5 La Nauze, op.cit., p.352.
Even above the Canadian creation of 1867, the earlier American style had been considered the classic example of a modern federation, despite the heavy criticism of American institutions in Australian presses throughout the 1890's. Arguing and illustrating from the rich body of the United States federal practice, the politicians of the smaller and larger colonies bolstered their differing concepts of interest in the Australian variety. American phrasing and judicial decisions directly influenced Australian drafting and provisions, especially on matters pertaining to irrigation, interstate commerce and the regulation of Sunday observance. On residual and specific powers between the general and local governments; on a bicameral system consisting of a House of Representatives based on population and a Senate representing the States equally, and on judicial review, elements were similar. On the issues of a separate executive, the workings of the cabinet system, a Bill of Rights and the powers of the Commonwealth and Senate, matters were significantly different.

In all, the press's role as educator and disseminator to politicians and public regarding these adoptions, adaptations and changes during the formative years since 1899, was very important. There can be little doubt that the sharing of a common ocean as frontier and a common governing principle since 1899, has forged enduring links in the psyches of the two nations, especially in Australia.

To mark the special ceremonies surrounding the first Federal procession, 1 January 1901, the Daily Telegraph suggested that a special invitation be sent to America. 'No nation in the world better knows the value of the step that Australia is now taking than the great Republic of America', it held. American citizens responded by constructing an arch worth $428: the most expensive of any nation's contribution. They had asked for some military token (through Chamberlain) to represent the country and were rewarded with the Brooklyn, Commodore Schley's flagship, during the battle of Santiago Bay. It was the most impressive

---


3 *Daily Telegraph* (Sydney), 8 Nov. 1900.
vessel to visit for some time. 1 As New Zealand's Chief Justice Sir Robert Stout expressed it on behalf of Australians in the November Forum: "For the United States of America there is the warmest feeling of friendship". 2

To an extent, these feelings were reciprocated. Among the congratulatory messages from overseas regarding federation sent to W.H. Fitchett and reproduced in the Australasian Review of Reviews (20 April 1901) was one from Vice President Roosevelt, written 10 December 1900:

All men who are awake to the great movements of our time must watch with keen interest the assembling of the first Parliament of the giant young Commonwealth of the South Seas, whose statesmen have given us so many lessons to those elsewhere engaged in governing democracies, and whose soldiers have shown such sterling valor and efficiency. For America the interest is not only keen, but of the friendliest type and we wish God speed to Australia in the career now opening for her. 3

The attempted assassination of McKinley and his final death (6-14 December 1901) called forth from all shades of Australian opinion shock and outrage. The act was the work of a lone anarchist, Leon Czolgosz, of Polish descent, who had shot the President several times while he was in the process of shaking hands with him during the Pan-American Exposition at Buffalo. It was the third such presidential assassination within the living memory of many Australians. 4

At the request of Barton and his ministers, Lord Hopetoun, Australia’s first Governor General, sent a get-well telegram expressing 'sincere sympathy' and hoping for his recovery that he might 'continue his wise guidance of the destinies of the great people of the United States...'. The Lieutenant-Governor also sent a cable on behalf of the New South Wales Government. Barton despatched a special letter of sympathy to the United States Consul General in Melbourne. 5

The nature of the crime and the blamelessness of McKinley’s character resulted in a vast outpouring of

1 Age, 10 Nov. 1900, 2 Jan., 3 May 1901 (cable); Sydney Morning Herald, 14 Dec. 1900, 26 Apr. 1901.
3 Review of Reviews, 20 Apr. 1901. A message from William Jennings Bryan was also published.
4 Age, 9 Sept. 1901; Advertiser, 9 Sept. 1901; Warrnambool Standard, 9 Sept. 1901.
5 Age, cable, 9 Sept. 1901; West Australian, 9 Sept. 1901.
popular sympathy throughout Australia. Anarchism was seen as a threat to civilization. McKinley, in the vanguard of the civilizing process due to his leadership of a huge group of progressive Anglo-Saxons friendly toward the Empire, seemed symbolically threatened by evil forces. Memories of American regard at the time of Queen Victoria's death at the beginning of the year and kindly thoughts for the man who only the day before in a speech at Buffalo had promised a policy of 'peaceful expansion' and genuine reciprocity animated much of the feeling. 1 Moran's praise was hagiographic:

If he were asked to present...a man who might be linked with true progress and liberty, whose whole anxiety was for the welfare of his people, the person he would present would be the President of the United States. 2

The Liberator 3 and Protestant Banner blamed the Jesuits for the murder 4. The Catholic Press used the opportunity to vilify the Truth as an anarchist 'rag', calling it 'the filthiest and most ruffianly publication in the English-speaking world'. 5 Labour journals used the occasion to explain why anarchism was acceptable and how it was different from nihilism. Nonetheless, the Melbourne South branch of the Labour Party openly dissociated itself from anarchism. 6

1 See editorials in: Mt. Alexander Mail, 9 Sept. 1901; Australian Star, 9, 14 Sept. 1901; Brisbane Evening Observer, 9, 11 Sept. 1901; South Australian Register, 9 Sept. 1901; Launceston Examiner, 9 Sept. 1901; Ballarat Star, 9 Sept. 1901; Ballarat Courier, 9 Sept. 1901; Evening News, 9 Sept. 1901; Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 9, 11 Sept. 1901; West Australian, 9 Sept. 1901; Bendigo Advertiser, 9 Sept. 1901; Argus, 9 Sept. 1901; Sydney Morning Herald, 9, 10 Sept. 1901; Perth Morning Herald, 9 Sept. 1901; Evening News, 10 Sept. 1901; Launceston Examiner, 10 Sept. 1901; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 9, 10 Sept. 1901; Quiz and Lantern, 11 Sept. 1901; Argus, 12 Sept. 1901; Coolgardie Miner, 11 Sept. 1901; Warrnambool Standard, 13 Sept. 1901; Southern Cross, 13 Sept. 1901; Leader, 14 Sept. 1901; Age, 11 Sept. 1901.

2 Freeman's Journal, 21 Sept. 1901.

3 Liberator, 7, 14, 21 Sept., 12, 26 Oct. 1901.

4 Protestant Banner, 14, 21 Sept. 1901.

5 Catholic Press, 14 Sept. 1901. The Truth was a model of propriety concerning the issue, however, 22 Sept. 1901.

6 Toecin, 12, 19, 26 Sept. 1901; Brisbane Worker, 21 Sept. 1901. See also Geelong Times, 18 Nov. 1901; Mt. Alexander Mail, 21 Nov. 1901.
THE LATEST VICTIM.

Melbourne Punch, 12 September 1901.
When McKinley died in a poignant manner, the sorrow in Australia was profound and unaffected. His death became known at 8 p.m. Saturday night. When he received the news, the New South Wales Premier Mr Sec, left the theatre he was attending immediately to send a telegram of condolence through Sir Frederick Darley to Washington. Cardinal Moran sent a message to Cardinal Gibbons on behalf of Australia's Catholics. The Melbourne and Sydney Stock Exchanges sent a cable of sympathy to the New York Exchange. Barton drafted a telegram stating that McKinley's loss was 'profoundly mourned in Australia, where he was regarded as the proved friend of the people of the British Empire'. As well, innumerable civic and business organizations, clubs, consuls, meetings, shipping, State and local government organizations, expressed sorrow by passing motions, adjourning meetings, sending representatives to the Consuls, decorating shop fronts and flying flags at half-mast. On the Sunday morning following the news, in the Churches of city and country, eulogistic sermons were preached, pulpits draped in black and muffled bells rung.\(^1\) To W.H. Fitchett, the assassination sent "strange echoes" throughout Australia.

It touched into new and sudden consciousness the sense of kinship with the American people; and nowhere throughout the civilized world has the sense of sympathy with the great American Republic, in the tragic calamity which has overtaken it,

\(^1\)See editorials in: Advertiser, 14, 17 Sept. 1901; Advocate, 14, 21 Sept.’ 1901; Herald, 16 Sept. 1901; Brisbane Evening Observer, 16 Sept., 30 Oct. 1901; Australian Star, 16 Sept. 1901; Australasian, Independent, 16 Sept. 1901; South Australian Register, 16 Sept., 31 Oct. 1901; Launceston Examiner, 16, 30 Sept. 1901; Age, 16 Sept. 1901; Warrnambool Standard, 16, 19 Sept. 1901; Barrier Miner, 16 Sept. 1901; Evening News, 16, 18 Sept. 1901; Catholic Press, 21 Sept., 19 Oct. 1901; Newcastle Evening Herald, 16 Sept. 1901; Ballarat Courier, 16 Sept. 1901; Daily Telegraph (Sydney), 16 Sept. 1901; Sydney Morning Herald, 16, 17, 19, 20 Sept. 1901; Geelong Advertiser, 16 Sept. 1901; West Australian, 16, 17, 18 Sept. 1901; Ballarat Star, 16 Sept. 1901; Bendigo Independent, 16 Sept. 1901; Perth Morning Herald, 16, 17 Sept. 1901; Mercury, 16, 17 Sept. 1901; Argus, 16 Sept. 1901; Singleton Argus, 16 Sept. 1901; Geelong Times, 17 Sept. 1901; Quiz and Lantern, 18 Sept. 1901; Queensland Times, 19, 21 Sept.

Footnote continued on next page...
been keener than in Australia and New Zealand.¹

If few deaths of non-Australians moved the sentiments of large numbers of people in the way that McKinley's had, then few newly-emerged political leaders abroad evoked such a pronounced enthusiasm with their arrival on the world stage, as did Theodore Roosevelt.

By promising to continue McKinley's policies of commercial reciprocity; an isthmanian canal and a Pacific cable, and due to the force of his own versatile personality and proven strength of character, he quickly captured the Australian imagination.² Irish Catholics admired him for his realistic assessment of Cromwell.³ Protestants were jubilant

Footnote continued from previous page:

1901, Table Talk, 19 Sept. 1901; Southern Cross, 20 Sept. 1901; Capricornian, 20, 21 Sept. 1901; Leader, 21 Sept. 1901. Mr. A.G. Wooley, a visiting American Temperance Lecturer, who read many of the newspaper tributes in various States, said he 'highly appreciated the sympathy therein expressed', Sydney Morning Herald interview, 21 Sept. 1901. See 'Ave Caesar Imperatur' by 'P.M.', Australian Star, 27 Sept. 1901; Australian Star, 17, 19, 23 Sept. 1901; Mt. Alexander Mail, 17 Sept., 20 Oct. 1901; Australasian, 21 Sept. 1901. The telegrams were kindly acknowledged in all instances.

¹Review of Reviews, 20 Sept. 1901.


³Catholic Press, 21 Sept. 1901.
for his interest in missions and staunchly Protestant New England background. ¹ The Singleton Argus claimed that his well-known exploits as a 'Rough Rider' had paved the way for the popularity of the Australian Bushman Corps performing in the Transvaal. ² He was widely championed as a true democrat-independent of political bosses and economic wire-pullers. Only a month after assuming office, the Bendigo Independent was referring to a 'Roosevelt Revolution'. ³

Some editors had been apprehensive regarding his dynamism. Roosevelt's Message to Congress in December 1901 calmed the fears of many regarding the nature of America's new foreign policy. Unlike the belligerent tone expected, the Message was praised for steadiness and maturity; for moderation and consistency. It reaffirmed Monroeism and produced an impression of integrity and security which was reassuring to many Australians at a critical time in their development. ⁴

As the first year of the new century drew to a close, the euphoric new Federation in the South Seas faced an uncertain but hopeful future alongside the sobered, but optimistic, newly consolidated Empire of the United States of America, which shared similar racial and political ideals. It did so largely with feelings of regard and somewhat muted misgivings.

¹ Australasian Independent, 16 Nov. 1901; War Cry, 28 Sept. 1901; Southern Cross, 1 Nov. 1901.
² Singleton Argus, 28 Sept., 5 Nov. 1901.
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Nonetheless after 1901, social, economic and political 'misgivings' there were, up to 1908 in Australian press assessments of the American domestic scene, just as there had been in the period 1889-95.

On the social level it was clear that the situation of the Negro had little improved. The problem he assumed for the whites was still referred to as 'a sort of national nightmare', with the promise of the continued rapid growth of population and accompanying violence. As the Age put it: 'with the best good will toward the American people, we cannot help thinking that they have been amazingly lax in their attempts to deal with their great racial difficulty'. In the case of the racial discrimination concerning the Californian schools question (1907), the Americans were sometimes criticized for not moving with more despatch. 'For if America were, in spite of California, to surrender her Pacific slope to Japanese immigration our white Australia ideal would speedily fade into the shadowy domain of vain unrealisable dreams', wrote the Age. While white violence was still deplored as a solution to those problems and other remedies were preferred, the invitation of a Negro to the White House met with scant approval. Prejudice could be supported by a work such as Par Pierre Lévy Beaulieu's Les Nouvelles Sociétés Anglo-Saxons (reviewed in 1902) which praised the quiet orderliness with which the British had solved their own colour problems in the colonies.¹

America was still considered an unattractively violent country that resorted too often to extra-legal means such as lynching, to solve its crime problem. (Sixty-nine negroes and two whites were lynched in 1906.) As the vast majority of the worst clashes had a racial basis, they were publicised to help point the moral of the efficacy of the White Australia Policy.²


Immigrants in America were criticised by some press organs for transmitting huge amounts of money back to Europe ($50 million in 1908). The cosmopolitanism of the population was noted by the Victorian politician, J.H. McColl, during his visit to America in 1905. According to his estimates the population of Washington D.C. was two-thirds coloured; in New York seventy per cent of names over businesses were foreign, and in Chicago ninety-five per cent were. "The old fashioned Anglo-Saxon Yankee is almost a back number", he complained. 'In cities and trains you do not meet him...the United States are being re-cast'. He blamed cheap foreign labour for frustrating the strike actions of the trade unions. ¹

One Australian woman traveller² to the United States criticized a host of minor irritations in American life through a series of letters to the Age in 1905. They included such social matters as unchecked expectoration by the men; hot air stuffiness in trains and buildings; taciturnity, lack of humour, money-mania and annoying curiosity in the populace; the 'spoiled nature' of the women and their inelegance and noisiness; and the exclusiveness and extravagance of 'society'. Other things complained of were the arrogance of tip-hungry waiters; the expensiveness of the 'a-la-carte' menu; the lack of commercial catering for the pockets of the poor and the impossibility of getting a decent cup of tea anywhere.

She held indictments more serious than those pertaining to life style. The national obsession with automobiles, the unbearable noise and frequent accidents in the cities and the exorbitant hotel costs, were small complaints beside her condemnation of the contrasts in wealth in big cities. After describing the excruciating poverty of the slum dwellers and of some of the 60,000 unfed children in New York and the 10 million destitute in the nation, she concluded: 'there is a growing

²Alice Henry was the possible author of these articles. A pioneering woman trade unionist, she had been a constant contributor to the Argus and Australasian during the 1890's. She travelled to the U.S. in 1905 and was appointed Official Secretary of the Chicago Branch of the National Women's Trade Union League. She performed valuable service in journalism and education in the National Women's Trade Union League until 1919. See Australian Encyclopedia, Vol.4, p.484. The suffragette, Vida Goldstein, who returned from the U.S. in 1902, and Helen Jerome, who was writing travel articles for the Sydney Worker at this time are also possible authors of the articles.
and menacing poverty problem of vast dimensions threatening the future of this great country'.

**American Varieties** by Charles Whittier (1908) attacked New York's suicidal pace and tasteless display; the ugly, dirty, and unfinished nature of Chicago and the ostentatious culture of Boston. Such criticisms when repeated by Australians were sometimes frankly recognized for what they were: 'it is a favourite salve that we give to our own self-complacency when we picture American life as honeycombed with corruption' commented the *Age*. Yet American ignorance of Australia still rankled. In 1908 the *Age* 's San Francisco correspondent wrote:

...many absurd ideas prevail in this country regarding the southern continent. Not one person in 10,000 dreams that it has cities as populous as any in the States, barring the four or five great metropolitan centers. Practically no one is aware of its immense production in grain, wool and gold. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that an Australian book is not to be found on the shelves of any bookseller. American newspapers give no space to Australian happenings except now and again to belatedly record some odd or unusual incident.

In 1905, J.H. McColl had estimated the cost of living to be 25 - 30 per cent higher in the United States than in Victoria. Trusts, in their middleman capacity, he held responsible for this, through artificially pegging prices to turn enormous profits. By contrast, Swinburne noted that producers' co-operatives in the United States were anomalously retarded. Social disabilities, climatic disadvantages, excessive hours of work and need for conspicuous consumption were all believed to hold down the American standard of living to a level generally below that enjoyed by the average Australian.

Exploited child labour; the irrelevant and 'guilty conscience' philanthropy of benefactors; the 'robber baron' mockery of Rockefeller regarding fines for his trust activities and the fact that one per cent of the people owned ninety per cent of the national wealth, periodically

---

1 *Age*, 'An Australian Woman in America', 1, 15, 22, 29 July, 15, 19 Aug. 1905, 10, 18 Aug. 1906, 8 Sept., 6 Oct. 1906; for poverty see also *Times* Correspondent's 'Year Amongst Americans' (1907), in *Age*, 10 Oct. 1908.


3 *Argus*, 5 May 1906; *Age*, 19 June, 21 Oct. 1905.
disgusted most sections of the Australian press. Regarding American books entering the country whose subject was how to achieve 'success', the Age commented:

...at present we have little need of books to excite cupiditity to greater spasms of avarice. The strenuous life is good for a man only when a fair fraction of it is so directed as to make him a better character.

The Australian press was also anxious to make a distinction between money earned 'cleanly' and that earned 'uncleanly'. The shocking conditions of American working women were much discussed through the book of Marie van Vorst, *The Woman Who Toils*, (1903).

As part of the argument to retain State ownership of Australian railways, the private, exploitive ownership of American railways was often condemned.

An unwelcome reminder to Australian editors of the periodic vulnerability of the rich American money market and the prosperity of their own economy was the brief 'bankers' panic' of 1907 in Wall Street. A faulty banking system, together with irresponsible speculation and unchecked monometallism were held as responsible for the brief slump.

The great anthracite coal strike of 1902 in America, which lasted 22 weeks; cost over $22 million and put 146,000 men out of work, cast a bad light on strike actions in general. It pointed the need for efficient arbitration arrangements and (in the eyes of Tom Mann) for public or state ownership of mines. The attack by Ray Stannard Baker on abusive use of trade union power aroused some comment in more conservative circles.

---


2 *Age*, 6 June 1903, 9 Jan. 1904, 14 July, 29 Sept. 1906, 1 June 1907.

3 *Argus*, 6, 17 Aug. 1907.


5 *Age*, 6, 31 Aug. 1907; *Argus*, 30 July 1903; 22 Mar. 1907.


Prodigal wastage of natural resources such as coal, timber, mineral oil, gas, grass and rivers publicised in the *Fortnightly Review*’s ‘Chronique of Foreign Affairs’ and by James Hill in the *National Review*, was viewed as a warning to Australians.¹

But as well, the full spectrum of social, economic and political elements in American life and leadership that had excited disapproval in the earlier period, 1889-1895, were examined in something of a new light during the period 1902-08. Unlike the earlier period of ambiguity, the bulk of the comment was now approving.

Approval was expressed in Australia toward the new spirit of self-criticism and self-renewal animating American society as well as the various ongoing unique accomplishments of that civilization.

After Australian federation, there developed a feeling of sympathy for America - a fellow democracy that evoked a relative degree of jealous and spiteful detraction from the older European aristocracies.

In a way similar to America,² Australia attracted a variety of criticisms from Britain: that the country was uncultured and materialistic, carried a huge national debt, was unintelligently administered and was prey to foreign 'dumping'. These overseas press criticisms were resented for discouraging investment and immigration.³

Other criticisms had been revived. Anthony Trollope,⁴ the well-known English novelist, during his Australian visit in 1871 had maintained that the Australian population 'blew its own trumpet', i.e. boasted too much. Max O'Rell (really the French commentator Paul Blouët) had accused Australians of drunkenness: ('a terrible taste for tippling').⁵ Another critic held that Australian girls talked and walked badly.⁶ The *Argus*,

¹ *Age*, 7 Mar., 4 July 1908. See also *Argus*, 2 Mar. 1905; 26 July 1906; 6 Feb. 1907.


³ *Age*, 9, 12 Sept. 1905.


⁶ An editorial argument raged over the views of the Hungarian intellectual Emil Reich, who in his book, *Imperialism, Its Prices, Its Vocation*, believed that women in America had been 'Imperialised', or unsexed by frontier living - a view with obvious transferability to the Australian situation.
referring to the American novelist James Howells essay 'On A Certain Condescension in Foreigners', reminded readers of that writer's genial disgust at his own country having become a general butt. It remarked: 'The Australian has had to endure almost to the degree of nausea a precisely similar impeachment'.

In 1905, some Australian commentators pointed to the extreme scarification which contemporary American 'muckrakers' such as Upton Sinclair, were subjecting many of their own institutions to and the extreme optimism of Americans abroad regarding their country, despite this self-denigration. An attitude toward such criticisms similar to that of Americans was encouraged. Especially admired was the American style of expatriate loyalty.

Also in 1905, an Australian traveller to Washington recorded of President Roosevelt 'Then he shook my hand and repeated his kind thoughts about Australia, which do me good to remember when I notice and hear the cynical way that Englishmen in London refer to Australia'. Australians felt closer to Americans - past and present, one of the most criticised peoples in the world - in the face of their own 'systematic vilifiers' as the Age called them. After 1903, A.W. Jose, Australia's new correspondent to the London Times determined to reverse the misleading and bad impressions fostered in Britain about his adopted country.

Attracting a great deal of favourable comment from 1902 to 1908 were the findings of the Mosley Education Commission - a semi-formal creation consisting of twenty-three British labor leaders, designed to examine and learn from the several advances in American education.

Many press organs in Australia felt with the Age that it would 'stir us out of our national lethargy on this vital national interest'. The paper considered that American education was 'adapting itself more rapidly to the needs of the people than that of any other country'.

---

1 *Argus*, 29 Aug. 1903.


3 *Age*, 19 Aug. 1905.

4 *Age*, 27 Jan. 1906. See also, *Argus*, 1, 4, 6, 11 June 1906.

5 A.W. Jose, op.cit., p.89, 90, for biographical details of Jose see *Australian Encyclopedia* (Sydney, 1956), Vol.5, pp.147-8.

Praise was lavished on the excellent pupil-teacher ratios; the superior facilities and equipment; the more efficient localised control; the general relation of education to relevancy in work and life and the particular emphasis on technical education for boys and domestic training for girls. Some Australian papers in commenting on the Mosley Report (1904) emphasised the superior higher capital expenditure per child in rural areas.

W.E. Chancellor's comments on a relative lack of competitive examinations in America, were discussed contemporaneously. The Prussian Royal Commission's findings also backed up the Mosley explorations and stressed classroom morale based on positive motivations and a high degree of popular interest. Other American ideas regarding a secularised approach to religion in schools; the superiority of engineering education at the college level; training for practical professions and the educative role of travel were stimulated by the American example.

The Australian metropolitan press sometimes laid claim to an American hero like Alexander Hamilton who was viewed as an indirect influence on Australia's own constitution-makers. On the other hand, there was some favourable comment on A.M. Low's suggestion in the National Review for the inclusion of American names in the Crown's list of birthday honours. On the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, the Argus commented: 'In honouring such a man as Franklin, the Americans honour themselves'. When George Francis Train died in America in 1904 one Melbourne newspaper remembered him in an editorial, as an innovator and 'one of the best known Americans on the face of the globe' - terms much kinder than those used in the papers of his own country. An appreciation of common qualities of heroism was a sincere flattery made by Australian pressmen toward their American counterparts.

The civic pride of cities such as New York, Denver, Philadelphia, Hartford, Brooklyn and Kansas City, prompted by the tree-planting

---

1 Age, 22 Sept., 24 Nov. 1906, 9 Feb. 1907.
2 Argus, 31 Dec. 1902, 4 July 1903, 10 June 1904.
3 Age, 28 June, 4 Oct. 1902.
4 Argus, 24 Feb. 1906.
5 Argus, 18 Feb. 1904.
societies, women's clubs and art leagues of those centres, was held up by the metropolitan press to Australian city-dwellers as an inspiration. The encouragement of the interest of local children in their city's cleanliness and beauty, fostered in clever ways by organizations such as Boston's 'Twentieth Century Club', attacked the older image of such cities as primarily corrupt or commercial. Older misconceptions of places such as Chicago and Washington were revised. The former's élan and the latter's impressiveness were testified to by a number of Australian travellers, while the new 'clean governments' of smaller areas were well-publicised.1

The pluck and vigour that characterized America's approach to the rebuilding of San Francisco, destroyed by earthquake in April 1906, was held up for special praise. A sympathetic response for Australia's Pacific neighbour, with which it had enjoyed contacts for so long, was immediate and strong. Deakin cabled Roosevelt (through the Governor General and British Ambassador at Washington): 'The people of Australia share the sorrow of their American kinsmen in the terrible calamity which has befallen the Pacific Coast'. State governors sent similar messages. The American Consuls Orlando Baker in Sydney and J.P. Bray in Melbourne, received large numbers of callers and messages of sympathy. The Secretary of State replied: 'The President is deeply touched by the many manifestations of sorrow which he has received from Australia. He gratefully appreciates your telegram of sympathy'. Taking advantage of the belief that every Victorian 'would have willingly contributed to relieve the distress', the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce and the Lord Mayor established funds. The University Conference on Sydney's campus sent a message of sympathy to Stanford University for the damage it had suffered. For many days, newspapers were filled with anxious enquiries concerning the safety of the scores of Australians known to have been in California during the disaster.2

Sensitive about world opinion regarding the White Australia policy (Roosevelt in conversation with an Australian thought it should be

1 E.g. Editorials in Age, 7 Feb., 3 May 1902, 2 Feb., 14 Dec. 1907.

2 Newcastle Morning Herald, 21 Apr. 1906; Argus, 20-26 Apr. 1906; Age, 21 Apr. 1906; 1 June 1907.
modified, many organs of the Australian press sought support from overseas newspaper opinion. In America they found it in such suggestions as that of the Pennsylvania State Legislature to regulate race and the opinion of an organ such as the Chicago Inter-Ocean which saw whites as incompatible with Japanese. Even the London Daily Telegraph was quoted for its approval of United States and Australian restrictions - often lumped together in overseas eyes - as a fair thing.

The effectiveness of America's image abroad, which attracted in the two decades 1884-1904 at least 220,000 immigrants a year, compared with a fall-off in intake in the same period in Australia of from 46,000 to 14,000 immigrants, aroused a grudging admiration in Australia. More impressive however some found, was that country's attitude toward excluding the Japanese. Regarding immigration, Victorian M.P., J.H. McColl, who had visited America, wrote in 1905: 'the history of the United States and the present position of matters is pregnant with lessons for us, lessons both to copy and avoid'. Legal Aid societies, designed to protect ignorant immigrants from exploitation, were one such lesson.

If one element dominated the news from America at this time, it was the implacable attack by President and press on the Trusts. American shipping rings, oil and kerosene trusts and Harvester Tractor monopolies were bitterly attacked in the Australian press for their crushing of Australia's infant industries (such as the Commonwealth Oil Manufacturing Co.) and their open arrogance. The evil publicity attending these developments inspired discussion on legislation to frustrate similar monopolistic growths in Australia. The Australian Industries Preservation Bill (1906) designed to prevent the 'dumping' of foreign products, was the fruit of this discussion and paralleled legislation in the United States (1903) and Canada (1904).

1 See 'An Australian Woman in America' for Roosevelt's reactions to 'White Australia'. Age, op.cit.

2 Herald, 24, 28 Sept. 1907; Age, 27 July, 26 Aug. 1907.

3 Age, 12 Sept., 18 Nov. 1905; 16 Feb., 5 Oct. 1907. In 1903, 1,500 Australians were admitted to the U.S.
The attack on the International Harvester trust came to a climax in October-November 1905. The trust had thrown down the gauntlet and Australian legislators had taken up the challenge. 'It is a case which calls for nothing short of prohibition' cried the *Age*, enraged by the American company's deliberate policy of sustaining loss in its attempts to destroy competing Australian producers of agricultural machinery such as McKay's Sunshine Harvester Co. This 'frightful...scourge from America...a scandalous robbery of our farmers by the foreigner' as it was called, whipped up press reaction and tipped the balance against the further intrusion of American trusts into Australia.¹ It illustrated the despatch with which an aroused Australian public and legislature could act, basing itself on well-known American precedents.² The Elkins Act (1903) served as a particular inspiration to Australian anti-trust legislators such as Isaacs and Deakin.³

The 'tremendous wave of socialism and radicalism' sweeping America, described by Maurice Low⁴ in the *National Review* for May 1906 (a view confirmed by the *London Outlook*), was seen by all liberal elements of the Australian press as an encouraging portent. The general American revulsion against the Trusts was widely recorded as a fundamental change-of-heart against the idea of uninterrupted exploitive capitalism. These 'Progressive' developments were well-received in Australian editorial circles.⁵

Civic corruption and other evils in society were mercilessly exposed by the 'muckraking' journals of the period and were thus brought forcibly to Australia's attention. Meat packing, insurance, legislative and legal scandals were ruthlessly exposed. From 1905 the word 'graft' came into increasing use. Ray Stannard Baker's expose of Sam Parkes,  

5 E.g. *Argus*, 2 July, 8 Dec. 1906.
a corrupt labor boss in the New York building trade, portrayed the typical 'grafter'. Tammany Hall still exerted considerable influence during this period and continued to excite fierce periodic condemnation.\textsuperscript{1}

Despite much adverse criticism of plutocracy, the philanthropic and personal qualities of a John D. Rockefeller were sometimes compared with that of the more acceptable Cecil Rhodes. Andrew Carnegie's lavish, continual library grants in this period were often condemned by Australian progressive editors as a sop to the real needs of the people. Some Australian conservative-liberals nonetheless saw merit in the idea. The older rationale of the irreversible accretion of capital in the interests of business efficiency and general prosperity continued to find small voice among Australian conservatives.\textsuperscript{2}

Liberal press organs evidenced pleasure at the phenomenal growth and success of the American Federation of Labor - a body which succeeded in attracting a large membership where the Knights of Labor had failed.\textsuperscript{3} Even the more Australian conservative newspapers could admire a labor organization with the stature of the A.F. of L. for remaining as aloof from political socialism as it did in America.\textsuperscript{4}

In the realm of sport, Sir Thomas Lipton's continual yachting defeats at the hands of the Americans in the America's Cup, instead of exciting indignation as such defeats had often done in the past, were now considered to be teaching the United Kingdom salutary lessons in humility. Australasia's win over the United States in the Davis Cup of 1908, led the \textit{Argus}, which had become a fine sports-reporting paper, to declare of the American team, 'they have taught us much about tennis and proved to us what a fine sportsman an American gentleman is'. The Bill Squires - Tommy Burns boxing content\textsuperscript{5} and following it, the famous world heavyweight championship contest between Burns and the giant negro Jack

\textsuperscript{1}See editorials in the following: \textit{Age}, 28 Nov. 1903, 6 Feb. 1904, 8 July, 23 Sept. 1905, 2 June 1906, 20 July 1907; \textit{Argus}, 11 Dec. 1903, 23 Jan. 1904.

\textsuperscript{2}E.g. Editorials in \textit{Age}, 25 Nov. 1905; 13 Apr., 1 June, 28 Dec. 1907; \textit{Argus}, 20 Oct. 1906; 12 Jan. 1908.

\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Newcastle Morning Herald}, 17 May 1904; \textit{Age}, 1 June 1907.

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Argus}, 29 Dec. 1904; 15 June 1905.

\textsuperscript{5}For the Burns-Johnson fight see \textit{Australia's Heritage}, No.65, (Sydney, 1971, pp.1546-51) discussing the role of Hugh Donald McIntosh, the fight promoter.
Johnson in Sydney at the end of 1908, were considered in some circles as praiseworthy examples of sport aiding international understanding. Jack London, the flower of American sports-reporting, who covered the uneven struggle for the Sydney Morning Herald and the Argus, further enhanced the popularity of white Americans in Australia by praising the sportsmanship of the 20,000 spectators, the stadium organization and facilities and by his clear bias in favour of the smaller white contestant. Through the force of his own personal good nature, Johnson himself did much to enhance the reputation of the American negro in Australia, long appreciated for his talent for entertainment.

Even Wu-Ting Fong, the Chinese Ambassador to the United States, had, in the Daily Mail, praised the competence, independence, intelligence, beauty and vivaciousness of American women. The Australian press joined in what was by this time a world-wide admiration of and interest in this distinctive variety of womanhood. Blackwood's Magazine put it neatly: 'The good American woman is the most active and aggressive of her sex. She has the most decided convictions on social questions'. The Australian press sometimes pictured her as the 'sheet anchor of the country' in times of moral crisis. An American woman of different style - the 'Gibson Girl' - became for the western world in the new century, the archetype of feminine glamour.

As ever, America attracted favourable attention for its successful social experimentation. A number of disparate examples came briefly into focus: the convict farms opening 'difficult' lands in the South; the use of experimental psychology in the treatment of mental disorders such as schizophrenia; the moral-legal implications of euthanasia; the legislation against juvenile smoking, for pure food, prohibiting liquor and discouraging divorce, and the code of ethics drawn up by the United States' legal profession. In some cases they inspired similar efforts


2 Quiz, Table Talk, Lantern, Melbourne Punch and the weeklies of the great metropolitan papers, often carried 'notices' praising visiting Negro entertainers.

in Australia.  

In the world of the theatre, the great American theatrical entrepreneur J.C. Williamson, continued to enrich the cultural life of his adopted country. In 1907-08 he spent ten months abroad – much of it in the United States, engaging outstanding artists to bring to Australia, where they were usually assured of an enthusiastic reception.  

Regarding American fiction, the unfavourable judgment of Lord Jeffreys in the Edinburgh Review of a century before, was now being reversed. After 1902, it was more often characterized as distinct, racy, original, colourful and earthy. Though without grand passion, novels like those of W.D. Howells were considered 'a delectable gain...the English public has begun to appreciate the distinctive worth of the American school of fiction'. Australian editors generally concurred with these judgements.  

A number of books on America received favourable reviews in Australia during 1908. Maurice Low in his America At Home even made 'hustlers' (a term then in use) look good for their tenacity and achievements. Paul Borget's Outre-Mer; Henry James's The American Scene; H.G. Wells's The Future in America; Professor Munsterberg's The Americans, J. Foster Fraser's America At Work and Charles Whibley's American Sketches were reviewed for the light they cast on enigmas in the American character. When the Ballarat Courier explained the swiftness with which America had overcome the depression of 1907, it praised the 'virility and masterful energy of its people'. Clearly the balance of social comment upon America was changing in its tone and emphasis.  

Australian protectionists continued to believe that the key to America's burgeoning prosperity lay in its system of high tariffs. In

---


2 Age, 5 Mar. 1908.  

3 E.g. Age, 16 Aug. 1902; Argus, 26 Mar. 1904.  

1902, they held them responsible for the high United States' government surplus. Editorialy, the argument was pressed hard, with the hope of promoting a similar degree of protection in the New Australian Commonwealth and all its States. Encouragement was thus given to growing concerns such as Beale & Co., whose Sydney piano firm, by producing 4,000 instruments in 1901, made inroads into what had been a virtual German import monopoly. 1

In 1902, Frank A. Vanderlip stimulated much discussion in Australia with his article for Scriber's: 'The American Commercial Invasion of Europe'. America's trade excess of $260 million to Europe since 1895 was explained in Australia as the fruits of a wise policy of having first built up American home industries to a position of relative strength. J.A. Hobson, the famous British economist, was quoted as blaming Britain's relative trade decline on the continuance of free trade. Andrew Carnegie, in a rectorial address delivered at St. Andrew's University, Scotland in 1902, agreed with Hobson and predicted a future protective European economic federation evolving to counteract America's growing dominance. To 1908 and beyond, these themes were amplified (with the use of Mulhall's Wealth of Nations) as America's trading successes continued. The economic moral for Australia was continually pointed by the protectionists. 2

Trade with the United States was healthy and expanding during this period. In 1903, U.S. goods accounted for almost a half of the foreign trade being conducted by the Commonwealth. By 1908 - at 43% - it was almost as high as the peak figure in the decade preceding federation.

Imports from the U.S. were largely responsible for the general steady rise in trade volume. Usually between £4 1/2 and £5 1/2 million in value, they were a continuation of the great jump in the popularity of U.S. goods that followed the Spanish-American war. In one of the highest years for imports, 1903, the U.S. provided Australia with

1 Age, 2 Jan., 4, 12 Mar. 1902. This prosperity had been indicated by the 'skyscrapers' of New York to John Young, an Australian traveller (Sydney Morning Herald, 6 Dec. 1901).

tobacco, timber, machinery and flour worth almost £1/2 million each in value. It provided implements for husbandry, metal manufactures, kerosene and printing paper each to the value of approximately £300,000. Leather, vehicles, tools of trade, boots and shoes and barley were imported to around the value of £100,000 each. The largest single item was £1,139,000 worth of wheat. Mining machinery and railway equipment were popular. In the years 1900-1906, Australian States imported £1,070,816 worth of rails and locomotives from the U.S. Many of these items cut heavily into some former purchases from Great Britain.

Exports jumped to the unprecedented figure of £4,338,701 in 1906, but were usually around £2 1/2 million in value. These figures were not as high as in the years just prior to federation, but were usually triple the value of goods sent during the depression year of 1894. In 1902, when goods were sent to the value of £2,714,424, the most important items were gold and gold coin (£2,092,000 worth from N.S.W.); copper - in blister, matte and ore - to the value of £464,000, from Tasmania; coal and coke to the value of £103,444, from N.S.W.; wool worth £108,688 from Victoria, and the balance in marsupial skins.

Still high in export value, was wool. Despite the restrictions of the Dingley tariff, wool jumped spectacularly in value during this period, until by 1908 exports of this commodity had quadrupled the 1902 figure. In 1906 it was worth an unprecedented £912,679, but this figure never rose above 3% of the total cropped. Australian wools generally benefited from the tariff in relation to others as they discriminated less against greasy varieties. Because of its light-shrinking quality this wool was the type the U.S. generally imported. This feature of the general trade picture must have engendered some good feeling in Australia toward the U.S. from 1902 to 1908, as wool exports continued to increase in value. The figures for coal were the opposite. From 1901-5 the value of coal exports fell to an average of 201,000 tons. As the era of sail passed however, this phenomenon was a general one. The U.S. was Australia's fourth largest recipient of gold in 1906, when £2,195,000 was sent in specie and £144,157 in bullion. (Trade via Ceylon helped confuse the general picture of the ultimate destination of such wealth.)

In all, the U.S. in the period 1902-08, was Australia's third most important overseas customer.

1 Commonwealth Yearbook, No.1, op.cit., p.508.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>IMPORTS</th>
<th>EXPORTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WOOL</th>
<th>% SHARE OF FOREIGN TRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>£4,989,812</td>
<td>£2,714,424</td>
<td>£7,704,236</td>
<td>£212,960</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>£6,368,532</td>
<td>£2,625,399</td>
<td>£8,993,931</td>
<td>£410,604</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£703,998</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>£5,005,387</td>
<td>Figures not available</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>£647,296</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>£4,633,553</td>
<td>£4,338,701</td>
<td>£8,972,254</td>
<td>£912,679</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>£6,765,182</td>
<td>£2,405,401</td>
<td>£9,170,583</td>
<td>£815,254</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>£6,039,753</td>
<td>£2,395,466</td>
<td>£8,435,219</td>
<td>£881,172</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures compiled from *Yearbook, No.1* (Melbourne, 1908). They refer to Australia alone.
The adoption of preferential tariffs ('imperial preference') by Australia in 1907-08, affected the total trade picture with the U.S. very little. Upward trends and ratios remained generally steady. Though smaller U.S. firms found the Australian tariff daunting, U.S. trusts overcame the obstacle easily enough. Increases were not spectacular after 1908. However, though U.S. competition with British goods received some checks, the increases in U.S. imports was greater than for British imports into Australia. In certain new lines such as motor cars and accessories, electrical and radio equipment, films, motion picture and office equipment, American goods were clearly preferred.1

The figures for trade with the new U.S. acquisition, the Philippines, are interesting. Both exports and imports experienced a dramatic increase from 1891 to 1908, especially in the period between the Spanish-American war and Federation. Imports reached their highest figures in 1907 (£95,582). In that year, they consisted of flax and hemp to the value of £65,796, and cigars to the value of £27,502. This was never more than .2% of that country's exports, however.

Import figures are more revealing. Australian traders enjoyed a huge jump in sales following the Spanish-American war. This rose from .40% in the years 1887-91, to .94% in the year 1908. From a low of £24,664 in 1896, trade rose spectacularly to £604,589 worth in 1908. This consisted in that year, of butter worth £46,447; coal worth £190,920; flour worth £90,653, fodder worth £15,128, horses worth £12,134 and timber worth £30,849. The greatest single item exported to the Philippines was meat. This consisted of bacon and hams to the value £6,910; beef worth £151,076, mutton worth £8,056; pork worth £18,017 and other meats worth £4,792. Such trade increases would have provided a further basis for Australian-American good-will at this time.

Slight increases were also recorded concerning trade with Hawaii. Figures are difficult to interpret, due to the inclusion of other islands in the trade, but it appears that the value of trade from 1887-91 was £275,892, approximately. By 1897-1901 it had increased to £350,796 and was worth £396,721 in 1908. The percentage value of this trade dropped from .93% to .62% during the period, however. This was

1In general, see L. Churchward, 'Trade Relations', op.cit., pp.75-7. Also, Age, 8 Aug. 1903, 9 Jan. 1904, 21 June 1905; Argus, 12 June 1905.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Imports</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887-1891</td>
<td>£13,350</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>£117,471</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-1896</td>
<td>£15,869</td>
<td>.06%</td>
<td>£24,664</td>
<td>.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1901</td>
<td>£69,385</td>
<td>.19%</td>
<td>£150,999</td>
<td>.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-1906</td>
<td>£70,669</td>
<td>.18%</td>
<td>£331,047</td>
<td>.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>£89,840</td>
<td>.20%</td>
<td>£436,389</td>
<td>.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>£95,582</td>
<td>.18%</td>
<td>£257,528</td>
<td>.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>£83,601</td>
<td>.17%</td>
<td>£604,589</td>
<td>.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures compiled from Commonwealth Yearbook, No.1 (Melbourne, 1908) p.500.
probably due to the tariff restrictions applying to the annexed
territory and the more severe competition from other traders, including
the U.S. itself. Nonetheless, in the case of Hawaii, the trade balance
heavily favoured Australia.¹

Yet trade in the Orient increased by significant percentages. With
China, from a value of £43,884 in 1887-91 (.15% of total exports), exports
to China rose to £208,601 (or .47%) in 1897-1901. By 1908, the figure
was £280,265. The benefits of the 'Open Door' principle were clear.
Exports to Japan were even more dramatic. From a figure of £39,787 in
1887-91, the figure had increased to £225,086 in 1897-1901, and was
£543,789 by 1908 - a rise from .03% to 1.97% of the total foreign exports.
Clearly, if Japan could be kept militarily passive, it stood to become
Australia's fastest-rising overseas customer. No doubt, this realization
animated some of the enthusiasm for the U.S. as a police-keeper in the
Orient and the Pacific.²

A Naval Bill, similar in terms to the 1904 American bill on domestic
shipping, was urged on the federal government by several newspapers.
The American initiatives, in protecting coastal trade by preference and
subsidy, the appointment of American captains and crews and the provision
of superior food, were especially commended. That such developments
would lead to an ultimate decline in British shipping was denied.³

The low cost of transporting goods by rail in the United States
(.36d per ton per mile) continued to be contrasted unfavourably with
the extremely high cost of similar carriage in Victoria (1.53d per ton
per mile) and other parts of Australia. In 1902 the Age, which had long
fought for better rates believed, 'the United States achievement
represents a rather remote ideal for Australian railway management to
work toward'. ⁴

In the same year that paper urged a bolder Australian policy on
electrification of suburban rail lines on the Ohio model. Similarly,
electric trams on the model of New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco

---
¹Yearbook, No.3 (Melbourne, 1910) pp.604-05.
²Yearbook, ibid.
1902, 17 Apr. 1905; Argus, 16 Aug. 1902.
⁴Age, 10 Mar., 3 July 1902, 29 July 1903.
were generally recommended at a time (1904) when only Bendigo appeared to be listening. As ever, American successes were attributed to superior management. By 1905, Australia was accused by the Age of being fifteen years behind the times in the realm of electric traction. 1

Nevertheless, Andrew Carnegie's The Empire of Business (1902) was occasionally lauded by conservative editors for its portrayal of the American businessman as a professional person of considerable integrity. Carnegie's ideas on profit-sharing, to close the gap between labor and capital, beside enhancing worker keenness and efficiency, were often praised as 'practical philanthropy'. Clearly, America's 'captains of industry' were regarded as being superior to those in less productive countries. Their encouragement of knowledge, invention and skill in the American workforce was also praised. 'In Australia we are in a peculiarly favourable position for benefiting by American experience since we also have a continent to develop', concluded the Age in 1903. 2

During their twenty years of operation in Australia, the American insurance companies had, to 1906, assured the lives of 29,967 Australians for the sum of £12 million. Of those companies, Equitable Life, which closed the writing of new business in Australia due to economic problems in its home office, had insured 16,000 Australians for £6 million (to 1906). An enquiry assured Australians of the solvency of this and other American insurance companies operating in Australia such as the New York Life Insurance Co. and Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York. Australian customers were encouraged to continue to assure themselves with them. 3

The failure of the Chaffey's irrigation efforts at Mildura prompted critics like R.J. Hinton to suggest the successes of California to provide a better lead for the future. The setting up of a Departments of Irrigation at the State level, similar to America's, was urged to tackle the problem of cultivating waste-lands such as those in the


2Herald, 28 July 1903; Argus, 14 Apr. 1902; Age, 21 June 1902, 5 Jan., 14 Apr. 1903.

3Argus, 8 Feb. 1906.
Wimmera. Local experts such as George Swinburne and the American, Elwood Mead, proposed an International Irrigation Conference in Melbourne in 1908, to benefit from American expertise applied to local conditions.

Certain economic innovations in American rural areas provided inspiration for similar Australian projects. The Oregon sugar-beet industry demonstrated to the £60,000 Maffra factory in Victoria, that losses could be sustained while the business survived. Artificial fish hatching, beginning to yield impressive results by 1902, was but one of the benefits of a more scientific approach to farming - one encouraged by the research and advice of American Agricultural Departments in the universities and Agricultural Bureaus in the field. Another result of such research had been control of the fruit fly and codlin moth (1905) by employing their 'natural enemies' - an ecological idea with an Australian ancestry. Luther Burbank's advances in horticulture evoked a widespread interest in rural areas, while the idea of forest reservations and national parks for timber and pleasure so encouraged by the conservation-minded Roosevelt, appealed to all sectors of opinion. The greater mechanization of and superior telephonic communications in rural areas such as California and Indiana, were also brought out in a pointedly comparative way. When Oklahoma was admitted as a State of the Union in 1907, the Bendigo Independent hailed the United States, now composed of 46 states and 80 million people, as 'the greatest and most populous Republic recorded in human history'.

---

1 George Swinburne (1861-1928) was an Englishman who arrived in Melbourne in 1886 and became an engineer and manager of the Melbourne Hydraulic Co. 1888-97. In 1897 he visited the United States and studied electrical developments there. In 1903 he was given the Portfolio of Minister of Water Supply in Bent's government. His important Water Bill was passed in 1905. He was Victoria's Minister for Agriculture from 1904 until he resigned in 1908. He was an important public figure, much interested in Technical Education, to the end of his days. See P. Serle, op.cit., pp.397-99.

2 Age, 26 Feb. 1903, 15 June 1907, 2 Apr. 1908; Argus, 8 Dec. 1908.

3 Bendigo Independent, 22 June, 1908. See also, editorials in Age, 19 Feb., 6 Aug., 1902, 26 Dec. 1903, 14 Sept. 1905, 2 Jan., 13 Mar., 1 June, 3 Sept. 1906, 10 July, 5, 16 Nov. 1907; Argus, 2 Jan., 13 Mar. 1906. For other comment, see Age, 31 Mar. 1902, 26 Feb. 1903, 4 May, 16 Aug. 1904, 18 July 1905.
'There is scarcely any political figure in the world today that commands more respect than does the President of the United States of America', wrote the Age at the opening of 1902. Theodore Roosevelt had quickly gained the confidence of Australians. He was, to use ex-Victorian Premier George Higinbotham's words, the 'still, strong man in a blatant land'—courageous against the trusts; of broad cultural and physical prowess, and a healer of divisions between races and classes. The Roosevelt charisma and its significance was restated by that paper later in the year:

The name of Roosevelt seems to have come upon the world to charm it. The nations at large watch the political and industrial life of America as one of the object lessons of the age. From almost every point of view it is worth watching. America increases her accumulated wealth more rapidly than any other State has done within the ken of history and the increase of her population has almost kept pace with its multiplied opulence. The line of Chief Magistrates, elected by the people, have been mostly men of sterling purpose and high intellectual capacity and he who now sits in the presidential chair promises to equal the best traditions of the White House at Washington.

Roosevelt was a fascinating figure to the Australian, as to the world press, and his political realism—an equal mixture of boldness and caution—was in tune with the conservative-liberalism of the bulk of the Australian press.

In 1903, the Age, whose image of Roosevelt affected its whole view of the nation he led, wrote:

It is not an uncommon thing for Australian writers and speakers to refer to America and the Americans as the shocking example of demoralization in public life. They quote Tammany and the growth of Trusts, throwing in, by the way, a passing allusion to the worship of the Almighty Dollar and consider that they have quite established the rottenness of "machine politics" in the United States. Of course, these are the methods of political charlatanry and they injure only the dupes

1 Age, 2 Jan, 1902.
2 Age, 31 May 1902.
3 Age, 9 Sept., 6 Dec. 1902.
4 E.g., see Newcastle Morning Herald, 23 Dec. 1902.
who permit themselves to be deceived by so shallow a criticism.

To the Age, 'a corrupt people do not choose men of inflexible honesty to rule over them'. Seemingly, to her new power status, America had added integrity and respect. Roosevelt served as an advertisement for clean government and successful democracy. Roosevelt's sage Messages to Congress, whose theme revolved around solidarity, were praised for their high tone and educative function. In 1907, the Age apotheosised Roosevelt as 'incontestibly the loftiest and strongest ruling spirit of the age'.

One paper desired his re-election in 1908, 'in the interests of calm and sober government; in the interests of social reform and morality as they affect the American people and in the wider interests of humanity at large' - especially in the encouragement he gave to the causes of the worker and world peace. In his battle against the Trusts, he had awakened the public conscience; intelligently used the powers of his great office, and created 'one of the most remarkable revolutions the world has ever seen without a gun or a barricade, but simply by laws and the law courts'. Not only was he admired for his strength and vividness, but also for his Americanness. The Australian hagiography stemmed partly from his being a near perfect example of the successfulness of the best of what was conceived of as the American type: bright, progressive and energetic. For the first time since the simple nobility of Lincoln, an American type captured the Australian journalistic imagination and was widely and genuinely admired.

'To Australians, the personality of the President is only less in importance than the personality of our king', wrote the Melbourne Herald. Roosevelt had refocused interest in the Presidency as the elections of 1904 and 1908 illustrated. The Democrats' choice of Chief Justice Parker instead of W.R. Hearst, as their presidential nominee in
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1 Age, 9 Jan., 21 Apr., 2 May 1903.
2 See editorials, Age, 14 July 1904, 30 Sept. 1905, 10 Feb., 6 Nov. 1906.
3 Age, 10 Jan., 9 Feb. 1907.
4 E.g. Editorials in, Newcastle Morning Herald, 26 Nov. 1907; Argus, 10 Nov. 1904; Age, 13 Apr. 1907.
1904 was taken as further proof of the good sense of the American public in the election of its leaders. Roosevelt's own condemnation of Hearst as a 'self-seeking demagogue' reinforced that sense of values. By 1908, even William Jennings Bryan had become acceptable as a candidate. Roosevelt's choice of W.H. Taft in 1908 was approved of, not for his dashing and crusading qualities, but because of his competence and the promise of continuance of Roosevelt's moral attitude toward Trusts and other malefactors. To the *Age*, Taft would redeem the democracy 'from the aspersions of timid, weak critics'. That paper later recorded:

*...talking to the more intelligent of our present Fleet visitors we gather that the rascality which comes to the surface now and then in the American courts and in American politics finds no support in the masses of the people of the great Republic.*

The several powerful elements making for Anglo-Saxon solidarity in the period up to 1901, continued in the period 1902-08. Friendly feeling between the two people was so obvious that the *Age* remarked hopefully, 'probably in the course of the present century...similar influences of a reciprocal character may be operative between Great Britain and Australia'. George Harvey, editor of the *North American Review* and *Harper's*, writing in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1904, confirmed the impression of the period under discussion as one of increasing amity. Maurice Jow's regular American letters to the *National Review* were well-informed epistles read closely by the *Age*’s editors in Australia, confirming this view. Largely through this source, Australians throughout 1904-05 were made aware of a change of attitude in America that was increasingly anti-Russian and pro-Japanese. 'The future of America lies in the Pacific', wrote the *Age*, presuming that she would naturally wish to combat Russian movements into that Ocean.  

Talk of formal alliance was not only prompted by immediate diplomatic events, but also by such supportive works as John Dos Passos's *The Anglo-Saxon Century* and the *Unification of the English-Speaking People* favorably reviewed in Australia toward the end of 1904. In early 1905, the Honourable George Peel's *The Friends of England* performed much the same function of providing a background intellectual rationale.
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1 *Age*, 7 Nov. 1904, 3 Mar. 1907, 22 June, 1, 4 Sept., 4, 5 Nov., 12 Dec. 1908; *Argus*, 11 July 1904.

2 *Age*, 28 June 1902, 7, 14, 28 May, 4 June, 8 Oct. 1904.

Whitelaw Reid, the famous journalist who took up the post of American ambassador to London in 1905, continued the growing feelings of solidarity so well served by John Hay his predecessor, as did Mortimer Durand (1904) and James Bryce (1907) - British ambassadors to Washington. Upon the occasion of the latter appointment, the Herald wrote,

> British we are to the backbone and spinal marrow, but first and most precious to us in our relations with foreign powers is the friendship - capable of being developed into such a working understanding that the "Yellow Peril" would cease to give us such anxiety - with the United States.

At the time of Whitelaw Reid's appointment, the Newcastle Morning Herald claimed with satisfaction that Anglo-Saxon amity had never been so high. 2

The ex-New South Wales premier George Reid, who had visited America a decade before, 3 wrote in the Argus in 1908 of this affectionate mutual regard. 4 Any editorial suggesting an alliance with a third power, was usually prefixed 'Anglo-American-....' Proposed alliances were now considered as being contracted between equal partners. 5

From 1902, Australian commentators usually referred to the United States as either having the status of a first-rank power or actually being the leading nation of the world in terms of population, wealth and political power. 6 This view had been best represented by W.T. Stead's The Americanisation of the World, or the Trend of the Twentieth Century (1902). 7

The renewed German attack on the principle of the Monroe Doctrine in Venezuela in 1902 stimulated Australian editorial discussion defending the traditional American policy of 'Hands off'. Not only was this

---

1 Herald, 8 Feb. 1907.

2 Newcastle Morning Herald, 29 Apr. 1905.


4 Argus, 23 May 1908.


6 Argus, 1 Jan. 1902; Newcastle Morning Herald, op.cit.

7 Stead's book is a remarkable prophecy concerning the growth of American influence. It believed that the Empire of Great Britain had no choice but to push energetically for some form of political and commercial union with America, whilst Britain retained the capacity to do so.
because Britain had been forced to recognize its operation in the same country years earlier, but also because it suited Australian self-interest to do so. As the *Age* put it in 1902:

> At some future date, when the people of the Australian Commonwealth possess a strong ministry to represent their interests from an international stand-point, possibly they may hope to be placed upon the same footing as their fellow British colonists of the Western Hemisphere by the enunciation of the rule that further acquisitions in their immediate vicinity will not be favourably regarded by the British government.¹

Others agreed; one of the best known being A.R. Colquhoun, the travelling correspondent, in his book, *The Mastery of the Pacific* (1902).²

Commenting at Lismore on the statements of Ewing, the Commonwealth Minister for Defence (13 January 1908), the *Herald* made the remarkable proposition,

> ...that if, in perfect harmony with our position as a British state and not for an instant consenting to ever modify the principle of British Imperialism, we Australians could enter into some working arrangement with the United States by which the Monroe Doctrine could be applied to us, the best assurance of our safety that the earth holds today would have been provided.³

Ewing had clearly intimated that an American alliance would be welcomed in order to keep Australia white. Roosevelt's own reaffirmation and extension of the Monroe doctrine ('The Roosevelt Corollary' of 1904) doubtless encouraged this attitude.⁴

American rebuffs to Germany in Venezuela, the Caribbean and the Philippines were pleasing to an Australia becoming increasingly fearful of German designs in her own area. On 11 September 1906, the *Age* wrote:

> '...Germany in her secret soul entertains the ambition of founding a German empire on the ruins of the British in Australia'. On 10 November of that year, Ambrose Pratt published in the *Age*, a serial considered

¹ *Age*, 27 Nov., 22 Dec. 1902.

² *Age*, 7, 9 Mar. 1903.

³ *Herald*. See also, 2, 6, 7, 27 Jan., 19 Feb. 1903.

strategically impeccable by the military experts, which forecast in fictional terms, a projected future German invasion of Australia to take place in 1914. This resurgent Teuton-phobia reflected the prevailing nervousness of British opinion with regard to invasion scares. It tended to further enhance the efficacy of an Anglo-American alliance in Australian eyes. ¹

Roosevelt's political machinations regarding Panama were observed with guarded approval by 'realistic' Australian observers aware of the obstructiveness of the American Senate in foreign affairs and the troublesome lack of cooperativeness of small Latin-American states. The vastness of the design and the interests at stake were too great for faltering, as they involved nothing less than an American 'paramountcy of the Pacific' in the opinion of the Ballarat Courier. With the guarantee of Panama's territorial integrity, comment became overwhelmingly approving. The shortened sea-distances from Australia to London and New York and the potentialities of the markets to be opened to Australian primary produce, excited enthusiasm. An almost equal interest centred on the awesomeness of the engineering feat and the valuable advances in tropical medicine accompanying the canal's construction.²

Not only did Australian newspapers express pleasure at Roosevelt's final rebuff of Kruger's interventionist envoys Wessels and Wolmarans, but also at the fact that the peace, finally negotiated with the Boers (1902) was recognized by papers such as the New York Tribune as being extremely generous.³

During this period few fears were expressed for the political future of Canada. The easier relationship now existing between the two countries was reflected in the peaceful invasion by 100,000 United States' settlers into the cheap lands of Canada's three prairie provinces in 1904-05, especially around Calgary and Edmonton. Far from creating friction, the movement was encouraged by Clifford Sifton, Minister for the Interior, for the increments of population, ideas, capital, ambition

¹ See also, Age, 7, 10 Jan. 1903; Argus, 30 Dec. 1902, 29 Jan. 1903; Herald, 11 Feb. 1908.

² Ballarat Courier, 21 Dec. 1907; Newcastle Morning Herald, 23 Nov. 1903, 26 Feb. 1904, 18 Feb. 1908; Argus, 16 May 1904, 23 June 1906; Age, 17 Nov. 1903, 4 July 1908.

³ Age, 8 Mar., 9 Aug. 1902.
and machinery accruing to what had been waste areas. Some Australian observers believed that Canada enjoyed the protection of the Monroe Doctrine as a guarantee of their security and there was a vague desire by some to encourage for Australia a similar form of protection.¹

One indication of Australia's new desire to attract the favourable attention of the United States was the Age's repudiation in early 1907, of open Victorian sympathy for the Confederate cruiser Shenandoah. The incident which had occurred over four decades before, was now described as a 'shameful' episode, one best forgotten.²

At all levels, Mahan's ideas on seapower informed the Australian debate on British Imperial naval deployment. On the other hand, Mahan's great disciple, Roosevelt, was obviously aiming for a commanding influence in the Pacific by the use of seapower. In 1903, the Herald, commenting upon America's fleet build-up, regarded it 'not only with unconcern, but indeed with gratification'. It was noted in 1905 that the United States had increased its navy in the decade 1894-1904, by 185 per cent. This was twice the British increase and 40 per cent higher than the German figure. Alfred Deakin, Australian correspondent to the Morning Post, who as Prime Minister kept his journalistic identity secret, was recommending in that paper, a role for Australia in such naval developments.³

By 1902, Australian statesmen and the press who supported the White Australia Policy, were becoming paranoid regarding the East in general and Japan in particular. Trade figures with the latter might burgeon, but good relations were not expected to. Japanese sensitivity toward the exclusionist immigration policy was recognized, but the supposed general desire of that country to wish to flood Australia with cheap goods or manpower added to a fear and an aversion among many editors, in the opening years of the new century.⁴

¹ Age, 9 Dec. 1905; Herald, 3 June 1908. From an article in St. James Budget. For the general phenomenon see Edgar McInnis, Canada, A Political and Social History (New York, 1954 edn), pp.374-5.
² Age, 23 Feb. 1907.
³ Herald, 15 Jan., 14 May 1903; Age, 9 July 1904, 16 June 1905. The Jervois' blue-water doctrines, and others, were discussed in this context.
As one of the few independent States of Asia, Japan caused serious and genuine concern to editors after 1900. Though the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902 had relieved some of the more conservative newspapers, the Bulletin was one organ which reacted violently at its existence. The weekly believed that Australia had been betrayed as an ally and her immigration policy endangered. The Barrier Miner and the Age were slightly more optimistic, but many editors revealed concern.

This concern became more serious in 1905. Though Japanese courage, chivalry and military prowess was admired during the Russo-Japanese war, an unease concerning the future ambitions of the country began to find voice.

Before the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), Australian editorialists were openly pleased that America had both frustrated Japanese territorial ambitions southward by occupying the Philippines and encouraged Japanese settlement in Manchuria northwards as a foil to Russia. These actions distracted Japan from casting covetous eyes on Australia, it was believed.

Following Japan's decisive win over Russia in that war and the American-sponsored peace that concluded it, the tone of the reactions became more shrill. Australia appeared more vulnerable; the British fleet less protective and American strength more attractive in the light of this development. Only the 'Open Door' policy in China remained as an effective Anglo-American check on predatory powers, it seemed. However, the Root-Takahira agreement at the end of 1908 did much to assuage Australian fears of Japanese expansionism. As the Newcastle Morning Herald put it: 'President Roosevelt in the last days of his rule has succeeded in lifting the United States to the forefront in the
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1 Argus, 14 Feb. 1902; Courier, 13 Feb. 1902.
3 Barrier Miner, 14 Feb. 1902.
4 Age, 17 Feb. 1902.
5 See editorials, Age, 17 June 1905; Launceston Examiner, 12 June 1905; Argus, 22 June 1905. J. Shepherd suggests that fear of Japan helped lead to compulsory military training in 1909 and a separate Australian navy in 1910, (op.cit.).
6 Age, 14 June, 29 Oct. 1904; Newcastle Morning Herald, 14 Nov. 1904; Argus, 11 Mar. 1904.
interests of peace and freedom'. The agreement was a fitting end to the sudden and intense trouble between the two countries (1906-07) which developed regarding the admission of Japanese into Californian schools. American relations with Japan in the period 1902-08 enhanced the impression that America not only had difficulties with Japan similar to Australia's, but was moving with the most forceful energy in the area to correct them.¹

News of the invitation sent by Deakin to Roosevelt, extended to the sixteen warships of the Great White Fleet to call at three Australian ports during the Pacific leg of their world cruise (1908), was received with almost universal approbation. As the Herald put it regarding the American presence: 'The late Mr Seddon used to dread that policy; we welcome it, as an important factor in the preservation of the balance of power and consequently of the world's peace'. And a little later: 'They are the ships of a people who can speak our language, who think our thoughts and whose ideas on all that relates to the higher civilization [...] especially the maintenance of the dominance of the white races in the Pacific] run much in the same grooves as our own'. The Age added:

There is no country in the world outside the Empire with which the Commonwealth is more deeply interested in maintaining cordial relations than America for reasons both of sentiment and policy...the national exigency that despatched the great battle squadron...is not one whit more an American than an Australian problem.

As the Argus put it, 'our joy is that kinship rises instinctively when we contemplate the emergence of the United States as a World Power'.²


Melbourne Punch, 10 September 1908.
Dismay had been periodically registered at the Anglo-Japanese alliance which seemed to allow Japan an unwelcome influence in the Pacific. The result had been 'to place our rich, sparsely settled and as yet undefended country more or less at the mercy of a coloured race whom our "White Australia" ideal has bitterly offended'. America, by establishing a naval base at the Philippines could help act as a white buffer against Japan and be Australia's nearest foreign neighbour. The fleet's significance was dramatised even further. The visit, expected the Ballarat Courier, would lay 'the foundation of a friendship which may last for years and profoundly affect the future history of one or both', of either Australia or the United States. As the Herald put it:

If by the adverse fortune of war, the protection of the British navy should ever be insufficient for us, to whom should we turn with faith and confidence if not the United States?

With the focus of world attention briefly on Australia during the visit, many editors looked forward to some dispersal of international ignorance regarding the country. This would be assisted, it was thought, by the accompanying presence of many American correspondents, who would disseminate throughout America and the world, many impressions of Australia. Australia's press public were therefore anxious to impress America and the world in a favourable manner.

Some Australian egos were undoubtedly encouraged by the words of Donald Mackinnon at the closing meeting of the Australian branch of the Imperial Federation League, 20 July 1908. 'At the end of the twentieth century', he said, 'I think it most likely that America and Australia will have divided the Pacific between them'. At the same meeting, Dr Curty Salmon, predicted that the United States would assume that dominance long before the century ended. 'Although this may not coincide with purely British desires, it will at any rate, help on Anglo-Saxon sentiment', he said. 'Many present difficulties would be solved and future possible
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3 Newcastle Morning Herald, 9 May, 18, 20 Aug. 1908; Argus, 2 Sept. 1908; Age, 25 Apr. 1908.
complications avoided'. Thus with no diminution of loyalty to Britain, some Australians saw in the people of the United States 'our most sincere, our most reliable, our quite natural allies in all that makes for the welfare of what is in most respects a common people'. The Americans were 'gallant men who stand not only for might, but the friendship of a great, spirited and exalted nation'.

On the arrival of Admiral Sperry and the fleet in Auckland (10 August 1908) the Herald commented:

there was a sentiment, somewhat strong a few years ago, that the growth of American power in the Pacific might be a challenge, if not a menace to our own flag. That sentiment has either died away or is rapidly becoming extinct. If a vestige of it still exists, we doubt whether it will survive the enthusiasm aroused by the visit of our distinguished neighbours.

It would also help disperse ignorance in Australia:

What a tremendous power the United States has become is, we are disposed to think, but unsufficiently realised either in the old country or this. So rarely do Britons, or for that matter Australians, stop, amidst the hurry and bustle of their business or pleasure to reflect upon the growth of nations around them, or upon what that growth may portend to the world's balance of power.

For that reason, the Age believed America had paid Australia a unique compliment by the visit. 'We desire a better acquaintance with Americans', it wrote.

We have looked on at the growth of the western republic with the interest that must attach to every work of marvellous human expansion. The Americans are a people who stand in the forefront of the world's progress. They have dealt with problems that reach to the heart of humanity...they are worthy of our closest study. We have more to learn from America, in what to imitate and what to avoid than from any other nation.

America's battleships, far from being a menace, stood 'for equity, for order, for peace, for a greater sense of security'.

Admiral Sperry himself hinted at some of the significances of the

1 Herald, 21 July, 7 Aug. 1908.
2 Herald, 11, 20 Aug. 1908. See also, Age, 17 Aug. 1908.
3 Age, 21 Aug. 1908. For Rear Admiral Sperry who commanded the fleet (in lieu of Admiral Evans) and who was a delegate at the second Hague Conference, see Who Was Who In America, Vol.1, 1897-1942 (Chicago, 1968), p.1163.
visit during the fleet's magnificent Sydney reception, attended by hundreds of thousands of Australians: 'Such a demonstration of kindly feeling must have more at the back of it than a mere curiosity and excitement over an unusual spectacle', he said. Sydney's reception was only outdone by Melbourne's. These civic exertions had their effect. Sperry for one, proclaimed the need to readjust his ideas on Australia, upon which the Herald observed, 'It is difficult to get Australians to understand what an exceedingly small place they occupy in the minds of the people of other nations'. As for Americans, the Bendigo Independent commented, 'They are our older brothers in colonization, most excellent wide-awake and ready-handed brothers, but not perfect by a long way'.

'Never in our experience have we received a heartier, truer welcome', said Sperry. 'The whole citizenship of Australia is profoundly impressed', wrote the Herald. 'If it commits a fault it is in being overanxious to demonstrate how exceedingly rejoiced it is to welcome the American naval flag to these waters'. With considerable exaggeration the Age claimed,...

... the whole world is taking careful observation, because all men see that it is fraught with significance the extent of which cannot be at present measured... We Australians, growing into nationhood with our own responsibilities in the great work of national defence, would love to think of ourselves and the great American Republic as travelling through the centuries with ever-increasing cordiality and love for one another.

Deakin's cable to Roosevelt sent through the Governor-General Lord Northcote, to the British ambassador to Washington was delivered on 20 August and included:

...The people of the Commonwealth gratefully appreciate the generous response to their invitation by the President and citizens of the great republic and rejoice in the opportunity afforded by this demonstration of the might of the American power to express their sincere admiration of your sailors and their esteem and affection for the country whose glorious flag they hope to see always floating beside that of their motherland.

Roosevelt's reply, sent through the British ambassador's seaside summer residence at Massachusetts, included:

...I am especially grateful to learn of the cordiality
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1 Herald, 22, 27 Aug. 1908; Age, 25 Aug. 1908; Bendigo Independent, 26 Aug. 1908.
2 Herald, 28, 29 Aug. 1908; Age, 1908; Ballarat Courier, 29 Aug. 1908.
shown by the people of Australia and the splendid welcome accorded to the fleet. I desire further to give expression to the very high regard in which the American people hold Australia.

This mutual respect and understanding was evident in the speeches exchanged by Deakin and Sperry during the visit.¹

Flatteries continued in many forms throughout the time of the visit. Warmth for America was accompanied by some editorial expressions of bitterness and disappointment with Britain as the result of her neglect of Pacific affairs. 'Australians feel no sort of confidence in Imperial guidance in matters pertaining to Austral interests' wrote the Age at the end of August, 1908.² And at the beginning of September: 'We in Australia have more constantly turned our eyes to America for light and guidance than we have to the mother country'.³ The Age was not the only spokesman infected by overstatement during this period. Deakin claimed the visit had opened 'a new chapter in Australian history'.⁴

Among other reactions noted was that of the British press. The Standard, Daily News and Daily Chronicle emphasised the negative side of the ethnocentric factor in the visit - fear of Japan - as being chiefly responsible for the enthusiasm of the welcome, and took occasion to remind Australia that Japan was Britain's ally. In the Times and elsewhere, Jose and Deakin as Australia's press spokesmen, vigorously rejected this view and that of probable future reliance on American aid.⁵

Deakin's reputation as orator and national representative had been considerably enhanced by the visit. It was one of the few occasions when he could be seen in perspective as a leader of world stature. As Wade, the premier of New South Wales recognized, the fleet visit had provided Australia with almost its first opportunity to respond as a single nation on an international occasion. The press added that it also

¹ Most large dailies carried the texts of the telegrams during the end of August 1908.
² Age, 31 Aug. 1908.
³ Age, 2, 3, 5 Sept. 1908.
⁴ See comment in, Herald, 1 Sept. 1908; Ballarat Courier, 1, 3 Sept. 1908; Argus, 5 Sept. 1908.
SAFE!

AUSTRALIA.—"Those bad boys can't hurt me when I'm with Dad and Uncle Sam."

Melbourne Punch, 3 September 1908.
provided Australia with a truly Pacific perspective on foreign affairs. The fleet gave policy-makers more confidence in Australia's own sense of identity regarding its power aspirations in the Pacific, and its possible relations with other nations toward the achievement of those goals. The Australian press also noted the moderating effect that the fleet visit seemed to exercise on Japan in particular in quelling that country's belligerent attitude toward the United States. The presence of 15,000 Americans in Australia, provided a valuable opportunity to better understand the United States through the formation of impressions, the result of direct communication.1

The visit also resulted in a reassessment of the Imperial relation. The ground had been prepared by the press for a greater acceptance of America in Australia than had existed hitherto. Stimulation of discussion on a separate fleet for Australia and of a suggestion by Deakin in 1909 for a Monroe Doctrine in the Pacific for Australia, were other results.2 Perhaps the Argus best summed up the impressions left behind. A week after the fleet sailed, it remarked:

Many false ideas about America and the Americans will be corrected in Australia when the impressions of the past two or three weeks come to be more clearly defined. Older communities in Europe are apt to look upon the United States as a country still in the green stages of adolescence; we in Australia, with younger eyes, perhaps see more clearly, when we recognize in our visitors the strong character and steady purpose of a nation which has "arrived".

This admiration, mixed with a touch of hero-worship, led to some interesting reassessments. The boastfulness, violence, money-mania and corruption that had disfigured the image of America in many Australian stereotypes, were notably absent among sailors who gave a good impression as men 'clean and capable'. Their expressed sympathy for similar future Australian imperial aspirations for Australia in the Pacific, were appreciated. For the nation, they were a 'never to be forgotten seven days'.4

1 See editorials in, Sydney Morning Herald, 10, 11 Aug. 1908; West Australian, 21 Aug. 1908; South Australian Register, 5 Sept. 1908; Courier, 24 Aug. 1908; Advocate, 2 Sept. 1908.

2 See N. Meaney, 'A Proposition...', op.cit.

3 Argus, 7 Sept. 1908.

It is doubtful whether any preceding event in Australian history had evoked such widespread enthusiasm as did the visit of the Great White Fleet in 1908. In the period 1889-1908, only the coronations, jubilees and deaths of monarchs, or the great events of Empire such as Mafeking Night, were comparable. The visit was not only a great festive occasion of itself; it served to submerge much of the ambivalence toward America that had been operating up to that date. A broad modification of Australian attitudes toward America (at different levels) had been in process for several years: the fleet visit in 1908 was the culmination of that development.

\footnote{J.A. La Nauze places the fleet visit in its Imperial perspective. His assessment of Deakin's motives and the reception of his suggestions at the Colonial Office is in sobering contrast to the reception of the press. See Alfred Deakin, op.cit., pp.489-91. R. Megaw in her work, records some adverse comment from the radical press, which referred to Uncle Sam's 'blood ships', but one must search hard for these views. They were certainly peripheral expressions of press opinion e.g. \textit{Bulletin}, 16, 30 July, 20 Aug., 10 Sept. 1908; \textit{Brisbane Worker}, 20 Aug. 1908.}
CONCLUSION
CONCLUSION

In summary, after prefacing with an outline of major elements in the Australian press scene, 1889-1908, this dissertation has opened with a brief exploration of general press attitudes concerning social, economic and political events in the 'Great Republic' for the years of Harrison's and Cleveland's administrations, 1889-1895.

Colonial press attitudes were ambivalent at this time due to the nature of the American experience toward the end of the 'Gilded Age'. Two ideas clearly dominated most Australian editorial attitudes in the metropolitan and provincial presses: ethnocentrism and progressivism. Americans, it was most generally held, were admirable because they were kin, professed high ideals and had pioneered paradigms for liberal development in many fields. But the bulk of the Australian press, including labor, catholic and satiric journals, also found them reprehensible for their considerable departure from these earlier social and political scruples and for a consequent failure to pursue progressive and radical domestic goals with sufficient vigour. Nonetheless, no serious division disturbed the relatively friendly relations between the two countries.

A significant landmark in press perceptions of the American nation appeared during the Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute and the Anglo-American crisis which it produced at the end of 1895 and at the beginning of 1896. During that period, an intense focus was brought to bear on American affairs by the presses of the Australian colonies, especially on the new developments of the Monroe Doctrine. Australian readers learnt much about their own Empire loyalties and aspirations during this period - one which coincided with a crisis in the Transvaal brought about by the Jameson raid.

One momentous result of that month of international disturbance was Britain's re-ordering of her foreign-policy priorities toward abandonment of 'splendid isolation'. From 1896 to 1899, Australian editors energetically promoted prospects for arbitration of future such disputes. What most Australian editors in fact hoped for was a general agreement leading to a racial alliance of which Australia could be a part - one that would ensure all Anglo-Saxons' futures in an increasingly hostile world.
For the three years 1895 to 1898, events unfolding overseas centered on Cuba and moved the United States toward a conflict with Spain. Australian editors conducted a long debate on the issues involved which led them toward a not unequivocal backing of the American position as champions of humanity during the Spanish-American War of 1898.

Australia, emerging as a federated nation in 1901 with a need for security, and espousing imperial ambitions of its own, largely endorsed the 'White Man's Burden' concept of Empire popular after 1899, and looked with equanimity and even some encouragement upon America's expansion into areas within the Caribbean, the Orient and the Pacific during 1899-1901.

Most of these events occurring during 1895 to 1901 were taken ambiguously to some extent by the various interest groups within the Australian colonial press. A final brief comparison of Australian press perceptions of American society as a whole, covers the Roosevelt era (1902-08) - a period which ends with the visit of the 'Great White Fleet' to Australia. It examines America in its new role as 'World Power'.

Press attitudes and reactions for this period were appreciably different from those of the earlier period 1889 to 1895. A tone of greater enthusiasm for United States' actions pervaded the decade following federation. More enlightened and energetic progressive U.S. leadership at home and the apparent pursuit of similar ethnocentric goals abroad - especially those concerned with Japan - appeared to effect this transformation. But the key period during which events shaped 'new' press attitudes resulting in these different reactions was during the years 1895 to 1901, and it is on those years that this thesis has concentrated most of its attention.

We may now examine this summary more closely.

Australians had a press of considerable size and status by world standards in the period 1889-1908. It was supported at great expense by the colonial and later, the state and federal governments through the monies expended on railways, telegraphs, subsidised mails and other communications. It was influenced in the main by conservative British journalistic models in matters of news presentation and avoided most of the worst aspects of the 'new journalism' coming into vogue overseas. The considerable number of American publications received in Australia exerted an increasing impact in form and content toward the end of the period.
Metropolitan dailies were primarily of a liberal-conservative nature and enjoyed huge circulations in the capitals where over one third of the populace was concentrated. The much more diffuse country press had some impressive dailies in cities of between 10,000 and 70,000 inhabitants. Provincial newspapers often followed their metropolitan peers in orientation. However, often the more conservative journals originated in areas primarily rural, while more liberal-radical newspapers were often centred in chiefly mining areas. Weeklies usually followed their parent daily in editorial attitude. But satirical journals and the presses of labor and catholic interests as well as Irish-protestant and freethinking papers modified the occasional unanimity of the Protestant-dominated either Free Trade or Protectionist liberal-conservative metropolitan and provincial presses with perceptions of the United States that were significantly different. Though it is difficult to detect either consistent sectional or colonial differences in the press, except superficially, detailed notes on publications mentioned in the dissertation are contained in an Appendix at the back of this work.

Correspondents and travellers added their lot to the aggregate store of impressions being published concerning America.

Statistics using the Age as a sample, showed that up to 43 editorials on the United States could appear in an exceptional year, while the average number of editorials per year (19) after 1898 - the year most commonly recognized as marking America's emergence as a world power - revealed a perceptible increase on the average before that year (14). The percentage of editorials devoted to overseas matters could occupy as much as 15 per cent of editorials in any one year and of those editorials, as much as 72.5 per cent of the foreign editorial space could be devoted to comment on America.

Editorialists claimed for themselves a large role as opinion-leaders and the overall status of 'the press' appeared to rise during the years 1889 to 1908. As ever, 'the press' claimed to both create and reflect public opinion toward foreign affairs in general and the United States in particular and its claim appeared to carry some substance in Australia at least, especially among the liberal-conservative elements around the centre of the political spectrum.

Two characteristics which predominated the intellectual approaches of proprietors and editors at this time were 'progressive' and 'ethnocentric' attitudes toward domestic and foreign
affairs: the two interacting upon each other. As 'progressives' (the term is defined at length in Chapter One), Australian editors found that they could endorse American expansion for humanitarian reasons, while criticizing iniquities existing on the domestic scene in the United States. As 'ethnocentrics' (the term is defined at length in Chapter Five) Australian newspapermen found that they could criticize America for anglophobia and for failing to co-operate with supposed broad Anglo-Saxon power aspirations. Often simultaneously, they praised the United States for a brotherly attitude when that country's actions coincided with notions of her responsibility and when they put racially or nationally alien peoples 'in their place'. These mutually intertwined attitudes toward matters domestic and foreign were the bases for the alternate and swiftly-changing enthusiasm and disgust which characterized the views of Australian editors toward the American experience during the years 1895 to 1901 especially.

At the opening of the 1890's, the liberal-conservatives (or major element of the Australian colonial press), stressed the kinship of race, sentiment, language, institutions and intercommunications with the Americans and projected an image of the United States as an ideal of freedom, liberty, material prosperity and the absence of imperialism among the countries of the world. During America's turbulent 1890's - referred to by Richard Hofstadter as experiencing a 'psychic crisis' (see Chapter Three) - the U.S. departed considerably from these traditional admirable ways. As it did so, the country generated much press criticism of its own. Australian colonial editors, mindful of the powerful influence American precedents were setting in aspects of social, economic and political affairs, accentuated these criticisms to point the lesson that newer progressive societies such as Australia's should act promptly in order to prevent similar evils from taking root in their own newly-emerging nation.

For the Australian colonies, as for any group attempting by means of its press to assess the image of another country, the procedure involved the operation of a 'two-way mirror'. In order to understand the kindred American society, the progressive Australian commentator had to clarify and reveal, consciously or not, the standards, values and aspirations of

1G. Serle, From Deserts The Prophets Come (Melbourne, 1973) p.60.
his own society.

Much of the anti-American sentiment from 1889 to 1895 pertained to the frigidity, acquisitiveness, ruthlessness, parochialism or boastfulness of supposed American 'national types'. Racial difficulties, unrestricted immigration, lawlessness in cities and industry; poverty and a depression in the countryside; discriminatory tariffs, the growth of trusts and currency confusion in America were also criticized. Along with Japan, Germany and Russia (China having disappeared by 1895 as a military menace) America was mildly criticised for its intrusion in Samoan and Hawaiian affairs which appeared to be in contradiction to its Monroe Doctrine. Coercion of Canada and South American states and differences over the payment of arbitration awards were periodically resented. At the same time American models were being adapted in all manner of inventions and products; trade union organization was inspired by the U.S., and American precedents were being used in Australian federation making. Trade and cultural contacts appeared to be strengthening aided by enthusiasts such as the American Consul in Sydney, Colonel Bell, who was generally held in high regard and who worked at improving his country's image.

Australian press attitudes and reactions therefore, were generally ambiguous toward the 'Great Republic'. Though approving at the opening of the 1890's a change of tone and emphasis worked to produce in Australian press attitudes what might be called a 'love-hate' relationship toward America by the end of 1895.

But few Australian editors expected that a full-scale crisis was impending: one to test thoroughly the true nature of their feeling toward the United States.

Barbara Tuchman succinctly described the broad significance of the crisis when she wrote: ' [Cleveland's] emphatic assertion of the Monroe Doctrine over Venezuela, in defiance of Britain, marked the beginning of a new period in American life as vividly as if a signal flag had been run to the top of the American flagpole'. In its suddenness and intensity, the dispute over the border between two countries in South America came as an unwelcome shock to Australian editors of all shades of opinion.

---

It had brought to the brink of war the two countries most admired by the Colonial presses. Due to the quickly re-animated warmth of the Imperial connection at that time, Australia's newspaper support was almost all on the side of Britain in the dispute. A deep probing of America's social, economic and political motives produced however, a better understanding of that country than ever before and an appreciation of the new direction in foreign policy in which the United States appeared to be heading.

Throughout the crisis, the Monroe Doctrine was viewed in its old 'Hands Off!' anti-imperialist sense by most of the press. It was also held to be the nexus of a complex of economic, political and emotional motives which had impelled America's extraordinary diplomatic action. As a vague, but successful, international concept the doctrine had been envied by Australian editors for a generation and especially so after the New Guinea annexation of 1884. Attitudes to the doctrine were by no means 'ignorant' as Neville Meaney suggests. In both its traditional defensive sense and with its newer offensive overtones (which came to be known as the 'Olney Corollary') the doctrine came into increasing prominence after 1895. In 1909 (with the addition of the 'Roosevelt Corollary') it was a source of inspiration to Deakin following the visit of the American fleet, and to other statesmen and journalists attempting to lay the foundations of an Australian foreign policy. Following World War I, it is clear that the acquisition of Pacific mandates by Australia did much to achieve that sense of security felt to be the purpose of the original doctrine.

Toward the boundary dispute, Australian press attitudes proved to be generally deeply interested and probing, though not always objective toward which side was 'in the right'. Editorials questioned America's motives closely and were not certain that Cleveland's actions had been undertaken for domestic gain in order to court the Irish-American vote; to exert increased influence over the projected Nicaraguan Canal by

3 J.A. La Nauze, Alfred Deakin (Vol. II) (Melbourne, 1965) Ch.23.
rebuffing British interests in the area; to divert attention from the fiscal crisis at home or for commercial gain abroad; or to relieve the pent-up anglophobia and growing jingoism in the country. It is certain that these colonial press analyses are on the whole sophisticated enough to present a new dimension to any future assessment of this very important crisis to be undertaken by historians.

Australian press reactions toward the Anglo-American crisis, both general and specific, were more intense and individual. If the event represented a significant stage in the realms of Australia's press recognition of America as an emerging world power, then it also did much to clarify the Australian colonies' perception of their own identity and status both real and potential, on the international level. Editors had much to say concerning the Jameson raid and the Kaiser's telegram as countervailing forces and the contrasting ways in which Salisbury and Cleveland had handled the situation. Editorials revealed the nature of Australian-Irish loyalist and religious reactions as well as attitudes toward Canada. As Mark Twain who was visiting the colonies noted, they illustrated well the degree of Australian newspaper interest in Imperial and other overseas events in general and the growing interest in American foreign developments in particular.¹

There can be no doubt that the affair had made a profound impact upon the two disputants, England and America. But the repercussions had also strongly affected Britain's colonies - in South Africa, Canada and Australia especially - causing them considerable agitation and anxiety concerning their long-term future and security.

Not one of the colonies welcomed the prospect of an Anglo-American war. After the Kaiser's telegram and Cleveland's Commission had acted to deflect and dissipate animosities, the Australian press in particular took it upon itself to urge the Home Government that far from exacerbating Britain's isolation by continued hostility, Britons must now convince Americans, as a matter of priority, that it was essential for English-speaking peoples to remain friends.

The possibility of a closer Anglo-American military and naval alliance had occupied a part of Australian editorial thinking before the Guiana-Venezuela dispute. During 1896 these ideas were re-examined to

¹Mark Twain, Following The Equator (Connecticut, 1897) pp.167-8.
see what, if anything, of the desire for an Anglo-American understanding remained. The first step in coming to terms seemed to lay in an appreciation of the existence of mutual differences. Time and a thoughtful attitude would combine to assist in an actual waning of antipathy, it was hoped.

Specific arbitration of the boundary at first forced by Americans upon the British, was resented. Later, Cleveland's Commission was welcomed as a means of easing the immediate tension and suggesting a broader basis for the solution of any such future disputes by means of general arbitration. Though editorial views were generally realistic and sober, proposals of a general nature always evoked a more positive response than those for specific arbitration. Enthusiasm for the former development rested largely on the pervasive ethnocentrism of the times which envisaged the possibility of a broader international federation of 'Anglo-Saxon' powers, beyond the imminent local federation of the Australian colonies.

Editorial discussion on arbitration among the senior English-speaking powers progressed through five phases in the Australian press from 1896 to 1899. The first phase represented initial reactions to the machinery of arbitration being assembled and this was followed by at first cautious, and later openly optimistic phases of reaction concerning the seemingly successful operation of that machinery. Its surprising and complete breakdown brought about by the U.S. Senate in mid 1897, resulted in a period of bitter pessimism in the presses of the Australian colonies regarding the efficacy of arbitral systems of a general nature. In their final phase, reactions settled down to an acceptance of something less than perfect results and 'ended' in the period under discussion with a new burst of enthusiasm following the modest success of the more limited form of arbitration. The latter, which fixed the position of the boundary, while physically favouring Britain, was really a 'moral' victory for the U.S. in the recognition it gave to its status as a world power.

The Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute had shown the urgent need for and helped provide the means for a tangible focus of 'Anglo-Saxon' understanding. In doing so, it accelerated and developed an already existing underlying tendency. Though setbacks for a total detente were in store (as the Alaskan boundary dispute in particular was to illustrate), the basis had been laid for an understanding lasting until the present day. Certainly such advances of sentiment had been made in the four
years since 1895 as to justify Bradford Perkins' description of the phenomenon as 'The Great Rapprochement' and his reference to 1899 as 'the crescendo of Anglo-Saxonism'. Despite the tensions generated by the near election of the Popocrat candidate William Jennings Bryan in November 1896 and of the prohibitive (Dingley) tariff introduced in 1897 by the Republican victor of that election, William McKinley, Australian press opinion had shared willingly in the promotion of all phases of arbitration, out of idealism and self-interest.

Various themes such as Monroeism and continuing jingoism stressed during the Guiana-Venezuela boundary dispute and its arbitration aftermath reappeared during the press debate in Australia from 1895 to 1898 on the impending Spanish-American conflict over Cuba and the Philippines.

That both Spanish colonies were suffering great hardships was the outstanding fact that no paper denied. It was regarding the interpretation of that suffering and the commentary on what should be done about it that created most of the debate in the Australian press concerning the relative merits and demerits of Spanish stewardship and American intervention.

During the three years of press discussion on the unfolding events, Spain steadily lost the sympathies of Australian editors and readers. Charges of martial incompetence, colonial exploitation, out-right cruelty and all-pervading national degeneracy were brought against the country's administration. Those who defended Spain often did so out of sorrow for the decline of a once-great power. Others were hostile toward an increasingly pretentious America, whose break with traditional isolation was as resented as the jingoism of the 'Yellow Press' which accompanied it.

Yet it soon became clear that most of the Australian liberal-conservative metropolitan and provincial dailies would applaud the prospect of American intervention. Its humanitarian motive, its long-standing and legitimate economic and strategic interests together with the emotional impact of events such as the sinking of the Maine in Havana harbour and, in another sphere, the darkening international situation in China provided grounds for the bias in press opinion toward the U.S.

---

Though many editors feared that due to the situation in the East, a Spanish-American conflict would precipitate the long-predicted Armageddon of the nations, the forging of a defensive 'Anglo-Saxon Union' as the result of such a critical event was usually considered to be worth such a risk. When war was declared, Australian press opinion in the main gave its full support to the United States. In doing so, it believed it was backing an ethnically similar country practicing 'Progressivism by the Sword'.

Interest in the Spanish-American war of 1898 by both press and public in Australia was sincere and unaffected even to the point of wishing to fight in it. The metropolitan, protestant, liberal-conservative press was unanimously pro-American. Catholic press opinion in Melbourne was ambivalent and in Sydney was enthusiastically pro-U.S., with the exception of Cardinal Moran who doggedly defended the reputation of the Catholic power. Jewish press opinion backed America, while labor press attitudes firmly opposed what was considered to be naked American aggression.

Economic disturbance, but for increased insurance costs, redounded to the benefit of colonial producers who sold their wheat to Europe and their coal to America at higher prices. An unexpected bonus was the sale of foodstuffs to Commodore Dewey in Manila and to Americans in Hawaii. Colonial military experts drew lessons which they published in the dailies and weeklies on the performance of mines, guns and armour, harbour defences, scouting, invasion and investment tactics. Sea-power proved itself in the completeness of the victories at Manila Bay and Santiago de Cuba. These victories were rejoiced over by many editors as proving the courage of the race and the decadence of the Spanish system. Though the war excitement temporarily eclipsed the newsworthiness of referenda on Australian federation, the urgent need for federation, if for defence only, had been once again stressed by the war. Hopes for Anglo-Saxon union reached new heights, which radicals and satirists such as the Truth and the Bulletin continued to deride and which conservatives such as the Mercury believed overblown.

In general, American intrusion into the Pacific, especially in Hawaii and, at first to a lesser extent Samoa, was welcomed. It was certainly preferred to the further growth of Japanese or German influences in either area. Yet the difficulty of both attempting to free and at the same time to retain the Philippines led to a degree of ambiguity in
Australian press attitudes - one which matched the American press's own lack of attitudinal decisiveness. Sir George Turner aroused universal criticism with his premature individual appeal to the British Colonial Office for intervention in the Philippines. By the time of the Treaty of Paris most commentators believed that the U.S. victory had been won briskly and cheaply enough to label the war 'splendid'. It marked a turning point in Australian press perceptions of the U.S.

From 1899 to 1901 Australian press debate centred on the significance of the momentous events of 1898. Following the confusions of the Mataafa-Malietoa struggle in Samoa, the press, especially more conservative dailies, accepted grumblingly the contretemps enforced by German diplomacy during the Transvaal difficulties to enforce British withdrawal from Samoa. From 1899 there probably dates the Australian press's first real recognition of its reliance on the U.S. to represent Anglo-Saxon interests in the South West Pacific. Much metropolitan press opinion favoured the occupation of Cuba and Hawaii as long withheld and inevitable extensions of American power into areas remote from Australian colonial interests.

It was expected that the new isthmanian canal, increasingly under U.S. control, would secure these possessions - however temporarily - as prizes of war or as spheres of influence. The diplomacy that had denied Britain a share in the expensive canal venture was not long resented as the United States addressed itself to the mighty engineering task, which it was presumed, would bring such commercial benefits to the south-eastern Australian seaboard by way of swifter trade with the eastern U.S., Britain and Europe. John Hay's 'Open Door' proposal in China excited as little comment as the annexation of Hawaii. Both issues had been broached editorially many times before as possibilities and both were seen as the logical fruition of long-existing trends in American policy. America's action in the East would undoubtedly assist Australia commercially as being one of China's closest occidental traders. American cooperation with Britain at the time of Boxer Revolt was hailed as evidence of the type of political and economic action long predicted during the arbitration excitement. It was thought to augur well for the Anglo-Saxon future.

At first, attitudes toward difficulties in the Philippines, exacerbated by Aguinaldo's revolt, were sympathetic from the liberal-conservative metropolitan and provincial dailies. They were however,
the focus of intense opposition by the worker-socialist press and the Catholic press, the latter concerned to answer charges levelled by Protestants eager to make sectarian capital from the involvement of religious orders in the uprising.

Contained in the debate was the abstract phenomenon of the 'New Imperialism' and the policy of 'Liberal Imperialism' rising from it. Both issues involved Australian editors who had taken sides on the Boer War and who cautiously viewed their coming Commonwealth as a nascent Pacific power. 'Anti-Imperialism' in the abstract was also involved in editorial concerns as the corollary of these developments and ideas disseminated by W.T. Stead in the Review of Reviews were adopted by a variety of spokesmen. Rudyard Kipling's 'White Man's Burden' received wide publicity and for many editors resolved the dilemmas of power with its near-perfect statement of the duties and perils involved in the practice of Empire. It provided the rationale toward which progressive elements of the Colonial press had for long been groping and which helped them back the American position.

Though economic irritations concerning pretensions to world markets and the exclusion of British traders received its specific manifestation in the Sydney to San Francisco mail contract being dominated by America, a large number of other developments were taken as giving cheering evidence of growing amity. Among them, Colonel Bell represented Australia at his own expense at the Philadelphia Commercial Congress. Visiting U.S. politicians, businessmen and journalists such as Henry Demarest Lloyd flattered Australia's progressivism. Not only did Roosevelt write his congratulations, but American citizens contributed the largest foreign arch of any in the procession; the Constitution abounded with American precedent and the Brooklyn rode at anchor in Sydney harbour when the colonies were federated in 1901. Reid acting as N.S.W. premier had telegraphed Washington direct at the time of the Maine with colonial sympathy and Lord Hopetoun performed this service for the young Commonwealth on the sad occasion of President McKinley's assassination later in 1901. On the latter instance the press for once found it was unanimous in its fellow feeling. Periodic doubts that these emotions were not fully reciprocated were dulled in the fascination all elements of the press found in the person of the energetic new progressive president, Theodore Roosevelt.
By 1908 it seems clear that the fact of American power had not been accepted as wholly by the presses of other countries as by those in the Australian Commonwealth. Though a duality of attitudes continued to be expressed from 1902, the new status of the United States and the exertion of American power on the world scene had caused a fundamental reassessment that reflected in attitudes and reactions to all manner of events and developments involving the United States.

Within the Australian press from 1902 to 1908 there remained many aspects of American domestic and foreign policies that rankled. As at an earlier time (1889-1895) social and political phenomena provided a source of criticism. Economic concerns, especially the intrusion of U.S. trusts onto the Australian scene, provoked the worst anti-American outbursts in both press and parliament.

Yet the novelty, strength and attraction of the United States in the years 1902-08 appealed strongly to Australian editors on two general grounds. During that period, 'progressive' press attitudes approved of the resurgent impulses toward reform animating American domestic political, economic and social life. 'Ethnocentric' newspaper attitudes also approved of the firm direction in favour of peace in the Orient and the Pacific seemingly imposed by Roosevelt's 'Big Stick' diplomacy. Alarm over the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty and the prospect of annoying Japan with its exclusive 'White Australia' immigration policy occupied some editorial space in most Australian newspapers. Japan had been considered by most commentators a potential military threat since 1905 with its defeat of Russia (and by many for a decade before that). Though restrained by ties to Britain both real and sentimental as well as by a long tradition of criticism of the U.S., this fear of Japan and Germany interacted with notions of British weakness and neglect. It helped foster editorial concepts of Monroeism based on liberal-imperialist principles and relying to a certain extent on American support to secure Australia's future in the Pacific.

In the balance, approving press attitudes prevailed over traditional attitudes of disapproval in this period, especially in the realm of foreign affairs. They did so to such an extent, that by 1908 at the end of Theodore Roosevelt's period of office and during the visit to Australia of the 'Great White Fleet' sent around the world by him, enthusiasm in the Australian press for the United States reached an apogee not to be approached again until the days of World War Two.
Some conclusions can be drawn from this study by comparing what has gone before with a recent assessment of the period, basing its generalizations on the flimsy scholarship of the past. Bruce Grant, in 'The American Image in Australia', has written (1968):

...Australians were late to take the United States seriously as a political force....

...Australia's political interest remained glued to Britain. It was a substantial interest, including a full range of loyalty on Australia's part, and it prevented Australia from seeing the United States as a potential world power....

...It is largely since 1945 that Australians have begun to study American history and to read American newspapers and magazines for information and analysis rather than for entertainment....

...There is now in Australia much more understanding of the complexity and richness of American life; the substance behind the oratorical tribute to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness....

Most of those and other of his points are, in the light of this research, debatable to say the least. Much of his assessment regarding a 'two way mirror' operating in regards to criticism of America; of the difficulty in explaining the attraction-repulsion feelings between the two nations, and of the problem of linking 'Australian aspirations with American power' were as true for the period of this dissertation as they are today.1

Mrs Ruth Megaw's article, 'The American Image in Australia, 1900-23', also suffers from a lack of comprehensive press information concerning the period of the 1890's. Megaw's research is excellent and her work pioneering, but she underemphasises the due role of liberal-conservative press comment, which was just as abrasive toward certain American developments as was the Labor press, and at an early period.2

We may now make some new generalizations - ones hopefully more detailed and accurate - about 'The American Image in Australia', especially for the period 1889-1908. They are, in brief:

1. Australian editorial interest in the United States

---

1 Grant was a Fellow of Harvard University, 1957-8 and the University of Melbourne, 1965-7. He now works for the Age. See N. Harper (ed.), Pacific Orbit (Melbourne, 1968), pp.207-19.

increased dramatically during the period under consideration, hence impressions of America were fuller and better informed than had been held hitherto.

2. Though with a primarily British and Atlantic orientation, editorials showed increasing concern with the Orient and the Pacific. They placed the U.S.A. in both these contexts as a very important part of the 'world view' being built up by Australian editors.

3. With their emphasis on the Monroe Doctrine throughout the years 1889-1908, editorials cannot have failed to have had an influence on the formulation of foreign policy by statesmen such as Alfred Deakin in 1909.

4. Common underlying ethnocentric and progressive editorial attitudes help explain a certain unanimity of press attitudes toward America: primarily disapproving in 1895 and principally approving by 1901.

5. A change in press tone and emphasis from hostility (1889-1895) to friendliness (1902-08) is explained by a change in U.S. domestic and foreign policies from that of drift to one of interventionism on altruistic grounds. This two dimensional shift appealed to progressive instincts in the liberal-conservative press. As well, it appealed to the Liberal-Imperialism fashionable at the time by abandoning isolation in order to assume the 'White Man's Burden'. This ethnocentrism appeared to help effect the security long sought by the new nation in the south west Pacific, especially against Japan.

6. It became possible that the U.S., (now in the vanguard of a widely admired trend in public opinion as a 'World Power' just as over a century before it had been the attractive, responsible model of a 'Great Republic') was able to annex Hawaii, occupy Samoa,
intervene in China, repress Filipinos, send a fleet to visit Australia and begin building a Canal linking its possessions in the Pacific and the Caribbean with little or no hostility on the part of Australian editors. Indeed, American precedents much encouraged Australian national self-confidence in a variety of ways.

7. Yet the theme of editorial ambivalence toward the United States by the Australian press never entirely disappeared. There were few newspapers unfailingly friendly for the whole of the period 1889-1908. But only the extremes of Left and Right - the labor and some catholic, conservative and satiric journals, affected to remain consistently hostile. The greater number of liberal-conservative press elements, both metropolitan and provincial at the centre of the spectrum of opinion, held attitudes that were ambiguous to a greater or lesser extent.

8. In all, the 'American Image in Australia' as conceived of by the press, especially from 1895 to 1901, established itself during that period in such a way that attitudes have, until recently, changed very little toward the United States. The existence of an emotion approaching a 'love-hate relationship' was well known by Australian editors of all shades of opinion at the turn of the century and this ambiguity in attitudes - expressing alternative approval or disgust - is evident still.

Finally, a few brief conclusions regarding the Australian press as gathered during the course of this thesis:

1. Metropolitan dailies dominated colonial press opinion, especially the *Age*, *Argus*, *Sydney Morning Herald* and

---

1 E.g. William Buchanan and Hadley Cantril in *How Nations See Each Other* (Urbana, 1953) a scientific study in perceptions undertaken by UNESCO discovered that in the early 1950's Australians considered 'progressive' the best word to describe Americans and desired them above all other foreigners as neighbours.
Daily Telegraph in Melbourne and Sydney respectively. Their centrist views, being either Liberal-Conservative or Conservative-Liberal imparted a more 'progressive' tone to the 1890's - and that includes a heavily conservative element - than has been the case with historians who have wished to view the period almost solely through the eyes of the Bulletin or other limited elements of the radical labor press. Though often a paradoxical mix of attitudes, metropolitan dailies, especially the more substantial morning editions, were almost never 'radical' or 'reactionary' but subscribed to either older or newer varieties of Liberalism. These impressive newspapers - some with circulations rivalling anything in the Empire - were widely disseminated by rail throughout their colonies and their attitudes were noted ever further afield. Though British in tone and often echoing the European emphasis of their overseas news sources, they took their role as spokesmen for a distinctive 'Australian' outlook seriously and frequently challenged their sources' veracity and opinions. They usually desired identity with respectability.

2. Provincial dailies and tri-weeklies carried much weight in their local areas e.g. the goldfields or Wimmera of Victoria; the Hunter Valley or Riverina in N.S.W.; the northern coastal areas of Queensland or inland mining areas of Western Australia. They often had quite significant circulations. Editors were generally progressive in orientation and usually split along Free Trade or Protectionist lines, following either the Argus or Age in Victoria, Tasmania, Queensland and to a lesser extent in N.S.W., or the Advertiser or South Australian Register in South Australia. Though articulate and noteworthy in a number of instances, their editorial attitudes were often more derivative and less well informed (and frequently non-existent) the more remote the
Editorial individualism combined with the servicing of areas from rural to mining resulted in a wider spread of editorial perspectives than in metropolitan areas. Vicissitudes in the material fortunes of the area served, left occasional ravaging marks on the quality of many journals until the formation of Country Press Associations in the two senior colonies helped them better to survive.

3. With the exception of the iconoclastic, high-circulation *Truth*, weeklies were usually a pale reflection editorially of their parent metropolitan dailies.

4. The two major satiric journals, the *Melbourne Punch* and the *Sydney Bulletin*, usually found themselves to the right or left respectively of the editorial centre on most issues. They formed an off-beat and interesting counterpoint to each other, but often distorted overseas events and lost credibility through either over-solemnising or regarding too flippantly international developments.

5. The *Review of Reviews* dominated the monthlies and for a time enjoyed a circulation almost as high as its ideological opposite, the *Bulletin*. Reflecting the individualism of its editor-in-chief (Stead) it presented an often confusing combination of innovation and tradition: both liberal and anti-imperialism; both racial hegemony and international harmony. Yet in its provision of a wide variety of alternative viewpoints on issues, its role was invaluable. It fuelled progressive opinion everywhere.

6. The Catholic press was important for its Irishness and independence. In Sydney the old *Freeman's Journal* was felt to be so conservative (though protectionist) as to encourage a rival free trade spokesman, the *Catholic Press*, set up in 1895 along more 'liberal' lines. The *Melbourne Advocate* disagreed with both,
fiscally and editorially. With the vigorous Perth Record and the Launceston Monitor both presenting alternatives to their conservative press peers, these papers often found themselves out of alignment with the ideas of Catholicism's chief spokesman in Australia, Cardinal Moran. Protestant journals with the exception of the shrilly sectarian Protestant Banner usually left their comment to the metropolitan press which represented the Establishment of which they felt themselves a part. Jewish papers were often as cautious as the Freethinker press was adventurous yet were no less liberal than the latter in their comment.

7. Labor newspapers presented a distinctly radical-socialist left wing approach, but their comment on overseas affairs was either disappointingly meagre or naively simplistic. Small circulation papers such as the Brisbane Worker and the Tocsin were of irregular editorial quality.

8. Differences between the metropolitan and provincial presses of the various colonies (later states) is perhaps not as striking as their likenesses despite a very wide variety of different proprietors and the virtual absence of press 'chains'. In N.S.W., the press tended to be more consistently Free Trade, but no less liberal than Victoria's. N.S.W. provincial papers often gave the impression of not being as dominated by Sydney, the colonial capital as was the case in the younger colonies: Adelaide and Melbourne in particular. In Victoria, the great fiscal split polarised the press of the whole colony in an orientation increasingly Protectionist and Syme-dominated. Intense, lively and progressive, the Victorian press led all others in energetic attitude-nising. Though Brisbane's press was monopolized

---

by Buzacott's Courier, geography dictated a more individualistic course to the presses of Queensland's far north than existed in any other provincial situation. It differed strikingly from the influence exerted by Adelaide's press in South Australia where the provincial press was comparatively weak. The South Australian Register as a Free Trade conservative-liberal gathered and disseminated cable information to a series of newspapers of similar orientation elsewhere: the Argus, Sydney Morning Herald, Mercury and Courier. This Reuters service was slightly more reliable than the alternative service run from the rival Protectionist, liberal-conservative paper, the Advertiser, which serviced the Age, Daily Telegraph and others. Hobart was forced to share its influence over the Tasmanian provincial press with the more liberal press of Launceston. F.J. Prichard, the editor of the Launceston Examiner was, after E. Rothman, the American correspondent to the Sydney Morning Herald, the most perceptive commentator on America on the Australian scene. Perth, too, was increasingly losing its hold over a provincial press moving the centre of gravity of the colony's life away from the coast toward the gold-mining centres of Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. The shift was also ideological with less conservatism and more radicalism in the progressive mix of attitudes held by the inland editors. All metropolitan and provincial newspapers lost something of their previous authority, following federation.

Far from ignoring the United States, the Colonial presses, especially the predominant progressive metropolitan and provincial editors, were engrossed in the American experience - especially the phenomenon of overseas expansion - and were determined that future actions of the new Australian Commonwealth should be guided by the successes and failures of American precedents.
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This Appendix describes very briefly the background of the publications mentioned in this thesis and puts them in their setting. Rather than present a disconnected body of unidentified notes, a running narrative, properly documented, has been prepared.

It includes background on the Metropolitan Press; the Country Press; Weekly Magazines; Satiric Weeklies; the Labor Press; the Religious Press; the Monthlies and very brief notes on the Commercial, Suburban, Foreign Language and Social Presses of Australia.

As the material included is essential background, but does not advance the argument of the thesis and is too bulky and unwieldy to include as footnotes, it has been incorporated into this Appendix and is referred to in the text where appropriate.

A. Metropolitan Press: Dailies

Between 1891 and 1901 on the average, 32 per cent of the population of Australia lived in the capital cities of the various colonies. During that decade, the percentage of the population of New South Wales living in Sydney rose from 34 per cent to 36 per cent. At the same time the proportion in Melbourne dropped from 43 per cent to 41 per cent. In Adelaide it rose from 42 per cent to 45 per cent, while in Brisbane it remained constant at 24 per cent. In Western Australia the percentage of the colony's population living in Perth rose 3 per cent from 17 per cent to 20 per cent, while in Hobart the percentage of Tasmania's population fell 3 per cent from 23 per cent to 20 per cent. This concentration of population explains the importance of the great metropolitan dailies. They could reach more people more quickly than any other publication. ¹

If, as W.T. Stead put it at the time of Federation, 'Australian journalism has always been eminently respectable', then no daily in Australia was more respectable or venerable than the great city daily of New South Wales, the *Sydney Morning Herald*.\(^1\) Founded in 1831, in its continuity of proprietary - the Fairfax family had been associated with it since 1840 - it was comparable with the New York *Herald* or the London *Times*.\(^2\) It was compared particularly with the latter paper in this period for its status and prestige compared with other Australian publications, its accuracy and its dullness. John Norton assailed it for its neutrality on major issues; its 'Masterly Mediocrity' as he called it.\(^3\) In 1889 James O. Fairfax, Mr 'J.O.' as his staff knew him, and his father, Sir James Fairfax (knighted 1898), were chief proprietors of the paper.\(^4\) Samuel Cook had been general manager since 1888 and William Curnow editor since the retirement of the Hon. Andrew Garran in 1885.\(^5\) In 1903 on the death of Curnow, T.W. Heney became editor, though Henry Gullett had been an important associate editor from June 1890 to February 1899 when he had retired. In 1907 Cook resigned as general manager and was replaced by W.G. Conley. Until 1905, P. Proctor was financial editor, when he was replaced by F.M. Gellatly. In 1904 C.B. Fairfax, who had been admitted to the firm in 1888, retired. The coming man in 1903 was associate editor Charles Brunsden Fletcher, himself destined to become one of the newspaper's great editors. Though pro-free trade, it considered itself above narrow party loyalty. In 1893 it was the richest of all Australian dailies and made £80,000 profit per annum.\(^6\)

In 1890, the paper had 25 on its parliamentary and general reporting staff and 90 compositors including superintendents in its typographical departments. Even then it had machines that could print, fold and inset

---

\(^1\) *Review of Reviews*, 20 Feb. 1901, p.191.

\(^2\) *Review of Reviews*, 20 Aug. 1892, pp.32-3.


\(^5\) Garran was an MLC in the Reid Govt. 1895-98. He had formerly edited the *Register* and was Sydney correspondent to the *Times*; d.1901.

papers at 18,000 to 24,000 per hour, though circulation was around the 60,000 mark at this time and closer to 85,000 by 1908. In 1895 Mattersley type-setting machines were installed and in 1901 monolines. In 1903 linotype machines were installed and in August 1908 process blocks were first used in the Herald. These mechanical aids placed the Herald in the front line of Australia's mass produced newspapers and those who wished to match her followed closely in these technological footsteps. On 26 June 1893 the Herald's price dropped to a penny and a wider reading audience than had been claimed hitherto, was appealed to, though the newspaper always remained somewhat elitist in readership and aloof to changes in journalistic style. Among the outstanding men working for the paper in this period were Farmer Whyte, Mungo MacCallum, Frank C. Donohue and the future war historian C.E.W. Bean.

Its chief rival among the great dailies in New South Wales was the Sydney Daily Telegraph. Begun in 1879, it had a growth rate that has been unparalleled, achieved largely by astute business management. Watkin Wynne had been general manager since 1883 and was to remain in the position throughout the period, ably assisted by J.L. Brient and F.W. Ward as editors. These three were considered among the brightest, most energetic and progressive newspapermen in Australia. Doctor Frederick Ward, a New Zealander, and a particular favourite of H.M. Green's, twice edited the paper - 1885-90; 1903-13. As Green puts it, 'it was under his guidance that the Telegraph reached its height' as one of the top four newspapers in Australia, despite its anti-Federationist stand. An able leader writer in the gap 1890-1903 (briefly editor) was the former brewer and long experienced journalist and poet, John Farrell - a Henry George Socialist. Irish and optimistic, he rendered sterling service under pseudonyms 'Niemand' and 'Outis' and contributed despatches to the New York Standard. J.R. Carey and Robert Sands were chief proprietors in the important early stages of the paper.

1 Mayer, The Press In Australia, p.11; Adams, The Australians, p.49.

2 Green, A History of Australian Literature, p.840; telephone conversation with Mrs Green, August 1972.

After 1883, by one estimate the paper had 'one of the best reporting staffs ever formed in any newspaper office in Australia'.¹ Though only somewhat less conservative than the Sydney Morning Herald in context and equally enthusiastic about Free Trade, it was the first major paper to respond to what K. Inglis has called the 'Law of Increasing Brightness' in its presentation, though a much-muted version of the London Daily Mail.² Editorials were sub-headed; articles were concise; illustrations attractive. Sub-editor Robert Nall helped achieve this and was ably assisted by Thomas Courtney, Robert Nash, J.H. Taperell, Thomas Roydhouse, John Sandes and Henry Gullett, who was editor from August 1901 to February 1903. By 1901 the paper's circulation exceeded the Sydney Morning Herald's and stood at 70,000. The paper considered itself an 'advanced liberal' - 'democratic' or 'radical' by English standards. In composing facilities and modern machinery, it, like the Sydney Morning Herald, claimed to rival any newspaper in the world. In page size, price and content this claim held good. Birient cabled the London Times each night, as its Australasian correspondent. With the Argus, it shared an energetic cable service from London based on Dalziel's rather than Reuter's news-collecting agency, though the latter almost completely dominated the Australian scene. The paper appeared to wield as much influence in domestic matters as the Sydney Morning Herald did regarding foreign affairs.

Boasting a circulation double that of any other Sydney paper was the Evening News, owned by the Bennett family since 1875. The sons of Samuel Bennett (the paper's founder), Frank and Christopher, were in control of the paper after 1895. In 1899 John Norton challenged among other things, the claim of the paper to a circulation of around 120,000 and it appears that the challenge holds good.³ Whatever the circulation - and it was probably only slightly in excess of the Sydney Morning Herald's and the Daily Telegraph's - the paper, based on a policy of 'conservative but businesslike commonsense', was the most successful evening paper in Australia and committed to its advertisers, though it claimed to cater for the tastes of more ordinary people.⁴ With the Telegraph it can be

¹ Review of Reviews, Oct. 1892, p.73. All such assessments must be viewed cautiously however, due to the difficulty of making accurate comparisons.
² K. Inglis, Australian Civilization, p.152.
⁴ Green, op.cit., p.343; The Evening News, 1867-1926 (Sydney, 1926), p.118. The paper 'died' in 1931.
considered liberal-conservative, though more committed to federation than
the latter, it was similarly pro-free-trade, pro-Empire, pro a 'White
Australia' and like the penny Telegraph intermittently revealed its
'democratic' sympathy for the Labor cause for as long as the movement
remained orderly.

After Bennett senior's death, the paper's general quality slipped,
though it could claim some impressive journalists in its ranks from time
to time. These included Hogue, Archibald, Argells, Bailey, Withers and
Peters as journalists and Walter J. Jefferey, John Haynes, G.B. Stronach,
James Elliott, J.M. Perrier and C. Dekker as editors and sub-editors.
But altogether in matter, tone and format its impact was less than that
of the great morning journals.

Rivalling the Evening News was another daily evening newspaper
offering eight pages for a penny - the Australian Star. It aimed more
at the working classes and was intensely protectionist. John Norton
savaged it for advocating only protectionism for capital and free trade
for labour, thus failing to promote the welfare of either.¹ The life of
the newspaper (1887-1910) was dogged by 'bad administration, staff, paper
and ink'.² Its editorials were shrill, cranky and inconsistent, but for
their lip-service to principles of protection. It was absorbed by the
Sydney Sun (1910) edited by the able Montague Grover.³ Nonetheless its
radical tone assured it of a circulation which probably approached
50,000 at its best. John Milton Sanders printed and published it for a
board of directors claiming to represent the National Protectionist Party,
though it was regularly disowned by such staunch protectionists as E.W.
O'Sullivan, the Member for Queanbeyan. Catholics and Protectionists alike
attacked it for distorting their positions. By 1908 it had lost its
constituency.

The dailies of Melbourne were dominated by two morning papers, but
only one evening journal in this period. One of the most important
newspapers in Australian history flourished at this time. The Argus had
been called by Howitt 'the Times of the colony'. Westgarth thought it

¹Truth, 2 Apr. 1899; Norton put the circulation at 36,000.
²Green, op.cit., p.640.
³See his 'Held Over; Reminiscences of a Newspaper Man', Lone Hand, July-
Nov. 1914.
'the Times of the south'. 1 In 1892 one writer thought it too big and powerful for its constituency. Certainly, no other million of Her Majesty's subjects anywhere have planted amongst them a journal so ample in its range of news, so authoritative in its criticism of affairs and so high in its literary standards as the Argus.

Its Tory-elitist and free trade proclivities gave it an outlook similar to that of the Sydney Morning Herald. However, it was generally considered more activist and committed than that journal, especially on the fiscal and federal questions. It always harboured some sympathy for Imperial federation and was the most conspicuously 'loyal' of the dailies. Throughout this period, the son of Lauchlan Charles MacKinnon was proprietor of a newspaper dating from 1846. 'Progress tempered by prudence' was its policy. Its progressivism was best exemplified in its 'unlock the lands' crusade. Its prudence was more represented by its bias toward the stable and settled interest of the colony. As a political force it claimed creation of the Service-Berry coalition government, the retention of the Legislative Council, an annual parliament, a non-political public service and one man, one vote.

F.W. Haddon edited the paper 1867-98. Edward Sheldon Cunningham was assistant to David Watterston until 1906 when he became editor himself. Cunningham had accompanied Deakin to America to report on irrigation and had attended an Imperial Conference (1887) and the Diamond Jubilee (1897). He was ably assisted by John Sandes, D. Symmonds and E.T. Fricker, the former being chiefly responsible for the popular 'Passing Show' by 'Oriel'. D. Macdonald, D.H. Maling, G. Dunderdale, H. Willoughby, J. Smith, C. Smith, T.C. Brennan, H. Maddison, J. Davidson, Campbell Jones, R. and G. Innes as well as Gilchrist, Corlett, Salter and the McCoys gave the paper much of its quality throughout this period. 3 The paper's Saturday edition in 1892 ran to 16 pages and 128 columns and was part magazine. With the Sydney Morning Herald it boasted numerous distinguished correspondents in

1 Green, op.cit., p.331. Like the Sydney Morning Herald it had in gold rush times a circulation of 20,000: equal to that of the Times.

2 Review of Reviews, Sept. 1892, p.49.

3 M. Grover, Lone Hand, 1 Sept. 1914, p.266, maintains that from 1906 the paper was better in quality than the Age. We must note however, that this was during the period in which Grover himself belonged to the paper.
many capital cities overseas, was catholic in the articles and letters which it published and was proud of the home-grown Australian journalistic talent it encouraged. T.S. Townend and C. Short were in charge of a cable service renowned for its reliability and initiative - it having scooped even the local papers in its coverage of the Deeming murders in Britain. In April 1893, just before the Sydney Morning Herald, its price dropped from 2d to ld an issue, the better to allow it to compete with the Age. Beside appealing to the 'cultured' well-to-do, it now attempted to broaden its appeal, but found it difficult to abandon its lofty tone. Consequently, its circulation was probably only half that of the Age in 1900, i.e. 60,000, though its influence was on the increase by 1908 when its circulation was probably closer to 75,000.1

A contents analysis from Greater Britain indicating the number of columns of printed matter in one week was presented in comparative form in 1892:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>London Times</th>
<th>New York Herald</th>
<th>Melbourne Argus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Editorials</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15 1/4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Original Writing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Reports</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign News</td>
<td>27 3/4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to the Editor</td>
<td>3 1/4</td>
<td>3 1/4</td>
<td>7 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Shipping</td>
<td>52 3/4</td>
<td>53 1/2</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Athletics</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General News</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local News</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heavy accent on local news should not distract from the fact that in foreign news - as with other leading Australian dailies - the Argus was on a par with the 'best' papers of London and New York. Anthony Trollope's observation that the Argus and its weekly the Australasian, were worthy of

1 It ultimately passed the Age's seemingly unbeatable lead after World War One, following a decline of interest in protection as an issue and a battle for agency outlets in Victoria. See Review of Reviews, Apr. 1893, p.77; Argus, 2 June 1896.
2 Review of Reviews, Sept. 1892, p.54.
being placed alongside the best British newspapers remained as true in 1896 and 1906 as when it was uttered in 1886.¹

The Age had at its height much more power than the Argus or the Herald; it is doubtful whether any newspaper, except perhaps the London Times under Delane & the New York Tribune under Greeley, ever exercised greater authority within its own community.²

As Green, Australia's literary historian implies, the Age was the single most important morning daily in Australia during this period. It was often charged with being Radical-Protectionist and as such was the perfect foil to the Argus. Politically, it carried through the steely reputation of David Syme (who with his brother Ebenezer ran the paper from 1856) much more impact, especially in the shaping of Liberal-Protectionist ministries in Victoria than did opinion leaders elsewhere in Australia. Syme's influence and reputation in Victorian politics and Australian journalism was so all-pervasive, that in 1908, when he died, it seemed the end of an era.³

The circulation of the Age was the stuff of journalistic legend. Because this was its leading feature, the newspaper did much to highlight it. Up until 1860, it had a struggling circulation of from 2,000 to 4,000 copies. On the death of Ebenezer, David his brother took charge and by the end of 1869, the paper had grown from a circulation of 5,000 at 2d to 15,000 at 1d. By the end of 1873, its circulation was 20,000 - higher than any other journal. By 1879 it was 38,000 and equal to nearly three times the combined circulation of the other two Melbourne morning newspapers. In 1883 it was 52,500 and the 16 page Saturday issue was 'the largest penny paper in the British Empire'. In 1886 it was 58,000; in 1888 76,000; 1889 81,149. By 1890 it was approaching the 100,000 per day mark. On occasion the Saturday issue totalled 24 pages, which made it 'the largest penny daily paper in the world' in its day. At the time of Syme's death in 1908, the figure had reached 130,000 copies sold daily.⁴

² Green, op.cit., p.331.
³ See Lone Hand, June 1907, pp.116-20; Ambrose Pratt, David Syme (Melbourne, 1908).
⁴ Figures obtained from Age office, Melbourne. Ref. to 'Centenary Supplement', 16 Oct. 1954. The figures level off after this. Even by 1960 its circulation was only 166,746; see also Age, 5 Nov. 1889, 18 Dec. 1897, 5 Jan. 1898, 1 July 1908.
Such a paper was obviously in tune with the times. It had first gained miner and worker sympathy during the goldrushes and it moved on from there to broaden its constituency by building a democratic, progressive, radical and nationalist image. It was on the left of the liberal-conservative spectrum; but conservative nonetheless — strongly supporting Britain in the Boer War; a subscriber to a white Australia and in general an advocate of evolutionary change. Behind this was David Syme's clear vision and energy which promoted protectionism as the key to national development. He was furiously active in helping bring about federation, land reform and land tax, Upper House reform, electoral reform, payment of members, compulsory education and other legislation. Syme's fight against inefficiency in railway management led to the famous action against Richard Speight (1894) which cost the paper £50,000; was said to have saved the taxpayers £41 million in useless track and further established the paper's reputation as a guardian of the public interest. Syme overcame such annoyances as advertising boycotts and so flourished.¹

The paper was also well served by a talented staff. Arthur Lloyd Windsor was editor, 1872-1900, when Gottlieb Frederik Henry Schuler took over until 1926. Syme kept a keen eye on all editorial activities himself. Benjamin Hoare wrote many of the editorials at this time as did D'Arenberg and A. Deakin. J.S. Stephens, G. Sutherland, A. Pratt, J. Thomas ('Vagabond'),² P. Nicholson, F. Fox, B. Burt, A. Lambie, J.A. Dow, J. Melvin, P. Gullett, B. Sweet, F. Admans, J. Woods, R. Kleiser, C. Bright, A.B. Robinson, A. Bell, T. Bird and J. Harrison formed one of the best staffs in Australia.³

By 1892, the paper was considered 'a marvel of mechanical science and organization'. Copy was received at 6 p.m. through to 2.34 a.m. After that time and in the ensuing 52 minutes, the print was set up; proofs pulled and revised; forms made up; matrix moulded; stereo plates cast and sent to the machine room, then put on the machine and the paper printed and packed to be sent on the 3.26 a.m. train. The composing room employed 110 hands using 15 cwt. of type per issue. A 16 page, 128 column

¹ Review of Reviews, No. 1892, p.100; Green, op.cit., p.341.
² Both names were pseudonyms. His real name was Stanley James.
³ Grover, op.cit., ibid. See also manuscripts in Age office for editorialists, 1896-1902.
paper had 35,000 lines; 1,810,000 letters, used 59 1/2 reels of paper each 3 1/3 miles long (or 198 miles of paper). Produced on Hoe's supplement presses at 24,000 copies an hour and using five presses, the whole Saturday issue could be completely despatched 2 1/2 hours after receiving manuscript. Following 1892, these details of production are even more impressive.¹

In the presence of these giants any other newspaper was sure to appear an anti-climax. Ironically, the paper destined to surpass both other Melbourne dailies in the size of its organization, was still struggling upwards in this period. The Herald, a daily evening newspaper on a much more modest scale than the other two, carried on following the 1891 depression which killed its sister morning daily. The Melbourne Daily Telegraph had been great in its time, but due to its sanctimonious flavour, came to be known as the 'Goody Goody Paper of the Great Boom'.²

The Reverend Dr Fitchett, Howard Willoughby, Harry Short, Joe Melvin and S. Lynch as editors, gave it its 'wowser' reputation. Marcus Clarke had written for it; J.M. Balfour and Sir Matthew Davies were its directors and James McKinley the manager. On 30 April 1892 it collapsed. But the Herald, managed by Sam Winter³ and edited by William Thomas (Lieutenant Colonel) Reay survived.⁴

In November 1894 it took over its chief rival since April 1889, the Evening Standard— a paper of similar liberal principles not devoted to any party. At the time, the Herald's circulation was in excess of 60,000 which made it Melbourne's second largest newspaper. In 1902, the Herald and Weekly Times Company was formed with the Hon. Theodore Fink as chairman of directors. Though pro-federation, the paper's whole approach to issues both overseas and domestic was much more lightweight than the Argus or the Age. However, in general tone, it was superior to either Sydney's Evening News or Australian Star. It aimed at a lower and middle-class readership returning home from their day's work and employed some of the techniques of the 'New Journalism' to brighten its

³ J.F. Archibald who worked for the Herald, called the kindly S.V. Winter, a 'champion objurgator' in his reminiscences in Lone Hand, June 1907, p.163.
⁴ James Edward Davidson followed Reay as editor.
'Perhaps the story of no other journal in "Great Britain" includes more of the history of its own particular colony than that of the Brisbane Courier', a writer observed in 1893. By the time Charles Hardie Buzacott, one of the oldest and best known journalists in the country ceased editing it in 1894 (he had become managing director from 1880 and was to remain so until 1906) it looked back on a history closely associated with the early foundations of Moreton Bay, dating from 1846. From the time of Buzacott's association with the paper, it grew rapidly. Within two years it had doubled its size and dropped its price from 3d to 2d, then 1d. It twice moved to new premises. In 1883 it bought out an evening paper, the Daily Observer which aimed more at working readers, for £1,010 in the name of the Brisbane Newspaper Co. Its shift in 1887 was to a building of eight floors with 80,000 feet of floor space - an ambitious step for a newspaper serving something in excess of 100,000 inhabitants in the city and suburbs. The paper's circulation in this period would have been around 40,000 at best. Distances and an indifference to the interests of Queensland's north limited its growth. Though it corresponded with and serviced the whole of Queensland, the north coast kanaka employers never forgave it for its humanitarian stand in the mid-eighties against coloured labour and the blow this dealt to the sugar industry. However, interest by the Courier in the northern political, rail and mail development abided.  

As a self-confessed 'moderate liberal' and anti-labor, its conservative-liberal image was between that of the Melbourne Argus and the West Australian. Though the Courier and the Evening Observer were much alike in policy, the individuality of Kinaird Rose, editor from 1888-91 and F.W. Ward, Courier editor 1895-98, and Charles Brunadon Fletcher, who wrote for both papers and was Courier editor 1898-1903, produced differences. Fletcher's editorials on overseas events were occasionally praised by Lord Lamington as being superior to those in the London Times.

---

1. I.e. news on front page; sensational stories; pictures; short editorials; arresting headlines designed for the 'average reader' who read in haste on his way home from work. See Green, op.cit., pp.830-1.


Both editors, subsequently joined the greater free trade papers in Sydney as editors though Ward returned in 1917 to edit the Telegraph, Brisbane's second evening paper, a working-class paper managed by F.H. Brentnall. Succeeding Fletcher in the chair were E.J.T. Barton and J.J. Knight - the latter having been the Observer's editor since 1898 (after R. Spencer Browne). Both were ably assisted by J. Milne. In 1903 Buzacott founded and largely edited to 1908 a second morning daily, the Daily Mail destined to be incorporated in the Courier. Now the two morning and two evening dailies all came under the Brisbane Newspaper Co. whose chairman of directors since 1894 had been Ernest James Stevens - like Buzacott, who owned a third of the Company's shares, an active participant in Queensland politics.

Adelaide similarly boasted two morning and two evening dailies in this period. Oldest and most conservative among these - it yielded only five years to the Sydney Morning Herald in date of foundation (1836) - was the South Australian Register. In this respect, its foundation pre-dated that of some leading London journals - the Daily News, Daily Telegraph and the Daily Chronicle. Its first issue had been printed in London, before the foundation of the colony, and its presses travelled by ship accompanying the first settlers in South Australia. In 1868 it began the Evening Journal and both dailies continued throughout the period under consideration.\(^1\)

In 1877, John Harvey Finlayson and Robert Kyffin Thomas (grandson of Robert Thomas the founder) were admitted to the owning syndicate as partners and the paper continued its steady growth. In 1892 the price dropped to a penny and the paper led the older dailies - the Argus, Sydney Morning Herald, Courier and Mercury - all papers with which it interchanged telegrams and cables - in adopting a popular rate of subscription. Though Adelaide papers utterly dominated those outside the city area and monopolized news-gathering services, circulation in a city of 168,066 (1903) and surrounds, would have likely been only 65,000. In 1892 however, the newest Hoe machine, the gas-operated 'Knickerbocker', was imported to produce the new penny paper.\(^2\)

After 1890, when Charles Day retired, R.K. Thomas became the director of the commercial and mechanical departments and the latter remaining


\(^2\) *South Australian Register*, 11 Mar. 1901.
partner of H. Finlayson was left as editor and literary manager. With William John Sowden, Finlayson was responsible for some of the longest and most ponderous editorials on the whole Australian press scene. Finlayson had attended the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition on a trip around the world and was most knowledgeable, but the 'heaviness' of his style and his desire for respectability and authority gave the paper a woodenness that exceeded in tone even the Times' elitism and free trade conservatism. Thus the enormous lead that the Register had given to liberal impulses in the early colony was somewhat reduced by its style in this period.1 This allowed its rival paper the Advertiser to appear the more lively and progressive of the two journals as it overhauled the older paper in circulation and influence during this period.2

'Journalism is for him what song was to Tennyson', wrote an observer of J. (later Sir) Langdon Bonython - proprietor, manager and editor of the Adelaide Advertiser, at the end of 1892.3 From 1886, following J.H. Barrow (1859-74), W.E. Marcus (1874-86), the Reverend Dr Jefferis and Jefferson Dickman Stow, Bonython took up the editorship and retained it until 1914. With machine-like efficiency he helped produce that paper and its evening daily, the Express,4 which was heir to the claim of first penny paper in Australia, having bought the Daily Telegraph in 1867. A born organizer, Bonython coaxed the best from F.T. Robertson, T.P. Hill, R.S. Smythe, Ebenezer Ward, George Stevenson, E.W. Webb, C.R. Wilton and M. Mayrick his sub-editors. Bonython remained sole proprietor until 1929.

As with Syme's Melbourne Age, Bonython built up much power for himself and his paper by an aggressive policy of protectionism. The paper projected a liberal-conservative image on a nationalistic platform of support for local industry and encouragement of native products, though when founded in 1858 only 15 months before self-government in South Australia, it disavowed any party affiliation. Nonetheless, five of its staff members were to become Ministers in the government and of Bonython...

---

1 Staff had included journalists Dr Garran, J.H. Barrow, F.M. Cutlack, W. Marcus, W.R. Lawson and Sir Richard Harrison and editors G. Stevenson, J. Allen, J. Stevens and J.H. Clark.

2 The South Australian Register and the Adelaide Advertiser emphasise the differences occurring at this time between the older style of liberalism and the newer.


4 See Bulletin, 4 May, 1905, p.21.
it was said 'he has occasionally been a veritable Warwick in the...history of South Australian Administrations'. However, with a state population in 1908 of less than half a million, it was difficult to exceed a circulation of 75,000. As an indication of tendencies, it absorbed the Register in 1931. Bonython's slight pro-bimetallic and imperial federationist tendencies probably reflected the sentiments of his constituency, with which he was very much in touch.

Personal journalism was equally evident in Tasmania, where Hobart and Launceston shared the market for metropolitan dailies. Both cities had a population of approximately 30,000 in this period though Hobart had the status of colonial, later stage, capital. The Hobart Mercury, a morning daily, was in the hands of the Davies family since beginning in 1854. It had absorbed a formidable number of rival journals and in 1883 founded an evening journal, the Tasmanian News, discontinued in 1911. John Davies ran the paper with 'abundant energy if not always equally abundant politeness' until 1872 when the paper was conducted along similar lines by his sons John George and Charles Ellis Davies. Under the proprietorship of the latter the journal flourished; reduced its price to 1d in the early 1890s and employed 130 people by 1893. Both sons ultimately followed their father into politics and were energetic and public minded. Though Henry Richard Nicholls, a famous former editor of the Ballarat Star, had been editor since 1883 and was to remain so throughout the period, the hand of Davies was evident in the attitude of most leaders. Nicholls became one of the oldest working journalists in Australasia and was Tasmanian correspondent to the Argus and Australasian to which the paper bore some resemblance in its Tory elitism and free trade, pro-Empire, pro-federation and gold-standard policies and generally lofty (though more excitable) tone. It was probably the most conservative of Australia's metropolitan dailies.

More popular with working class men and of equal, if not better quality, were the competing Launceston evening dailies - the Launceston Examiner and the Daily Telegraph. The Launceston Examiner was the oldest journal in Tasmania and one of the oldest in Australia, having been founded in 1842. James Bonwick recounts its early struggles against the transportation of convicts to the colony which earned it a reputation for

---

1 Ibid.

vigorously that period (from 1893) carried on the clear-headed traditions of Ronald Smith and William Horne its former editors and often brought the paper to the attention of those on the mainland with his perceptive comments. From 1900 the paper was in the hands of the Rolph family and continued to express its independent liberalism and a conservatism based on the caution of experience.  

The most recent of the Tasmanian dailies was the most successful in this period. The Daily Telegraph founded in 1881, became a daily in 1883 and at 1d out-priced all Tasmanian competitors. James Brickhill its sole proprietor, edited the paper following the death of George Nixon Steward (1887). Then John Dorrian and T.H. Prichard briefly filled the post. From 1888 to 1895 William James McWilliams was editor with G.W. Batty as sub-editor. He was followed by R.G. McWilliams, then John Gunning with J.L. Melrose as sub-editor, filled the post until well after 1908, with William Alexander Whitaker as principal proprietor throughout the period being considered.  

In 1897, the paper had 90 employees. Beside the proprietor and two editors, there were six reporters, two readers, advertising manager, writer and clerk, an accountant, ledger keeper, agency clerk, two office clerks, two collectors, the publisher, a sub-collector, an overseer and sub-overseer of the compositing department, 19 compositors, 24 apprentices, a litho artist, an overseer of the machine department, an overseer of the jobbing department, an overseer of the type foundry, five machinists, ten messengers and a packer. Such a numerous staff was possibly typical of even a small daily with a circulation of probably no more than 35,000 throughout most of this period. By 1898 the paper claimed 'an agency sale of double that of any other Tasmanian newspaper'. This being the case, one might compute the Launceston Examiner's and Hobart Mercury's circulation as less than 25,000 (throughout the whole island of 172,000 in 1901) though this is guesswork. Certainly the Mercury's circulation had not reached 50,000 even by 1960. Following the Age and Advertiser, the

---


2 Review of Reviews, op.cit., p.208.


4 Daily Telegraph (Launceston), 22 June 1897. Diamond Jubilee supplement.
Daily Telegraph was a vigorous advocate of protectionism and this mainly distinguished it from its rivals. True to the mould of the former two, it claimed to be more liberal and appeal to both middle and lower middle classes without a lowering of tone. Nonetheless, it urged caution during the period of 'boom' financing in the 1880's and took up the position of equal state representation in the Senate or no federation, and though militantly democratic, in many ways it conformed to the liberal-conservatism of its mainland peers.

By 1890 Western Australia had barely achieved full colonial status. On 15 August of that year Queen Victoria passed a Bill enabling West Australia to have a constitution providing for a governor, an elective legislative assembly and a legislative council to become elective when the population reached 60,000 - which it did in 1893. Gold discoveries in 1888 at Yilgarn, 1891 at Murchison, 1892 at Coolgardie and 1893 at Kalgoorlie began a rush which, combined with rail links from Perth to Albany (1889) and later to Geraldton and Kalgoorlie begun during the energetic premiership of John Forrest (1890-1901), opened the country. By 1901 the population tripled to reach 180,000 and had added close to another 100,000 by 1908. Until 1901, Forrest led an ultra-conservative government dominated by the primary producing interests and by no means interested in federation. Very late did Western Australian join the federal movement and then entered on conditions.

The West Australian, Perth's most important journal, typified these attitudes. This morning paper, a daily since 1885 was begun 5 January 1833, only four years after the foundation of the colony and was almost the age of Australia's oldest daily in the east, the Sydney Morning Herald. During the period under consideration, the paper was edited by its famous

1 See F. Crowley, Australia's Western Third (London, 1960) and J.S. Battye, History of Western Australia (Oxford, 1924).
proprietor the Honourable Sir John Winthrop Hackett, who was ably assisted by Alfred Langler after 1895 (associate editor, 1902). Though Hackett supported Forrest, he was more pro-federation than the premier and was a delegate to the Federal Conventions of 1891 and 1897-98, where he argued his colony's case. Probably no other editor was more public-spirited. His gift of the paper to the University upon his death in 1926 enabled that institution to become the only university in the whole British Empire not to charge fees. Support for public works and facilities was ceaseless, so that a liberal-progressive tone was achieved while retaining a proper free trade, pro-Empire, xenophobic and otherwise loftily conservative stance. At one high point in the 1890's an issue sold 60,000 copies throughout the colony, though circulation was probably usually closer to no more than 45,000 (colony-wide) at best. In foreign affairs the paper was almost religiously Times oriented. In later days, perhaps to compensate for its isolation, it achieved a higher foreign news-coverage than any other Australian daily.¹

Despite Perth's small population of 46,000 (1903), a rival appeared in the shape of the Perth Morning Herald on the first day of 1896. By 1901 it had incorporated Perth's third important daily, the Stirling Brothers' Inquirer and Commercial News. Both failed at the beginning of 1909. The venture, also floated by the Stirlings as a co-operative, failed for being too like its more venerable rival. J.L. Nanson, a leading local politician, had control in 1904-5. Mismanagement after 1905 by its new proprietor, Dr Gibney, Archbishop of Perth, saw its end. In Sydney's terms it attempted to play the role of Daily Telegraph to the West Australian's Sydney Morning Herald. It appealed to the same farmer-miner constituency, but with a heavily Conservative, even more Tory tone than its well-established rival. A large broadsheet, eight pages for 1d was produced on the latest machinery, but probably never achieved 30,000 copies circulation. At its opening it boasted having the 'cream of reporters from the English journals'. Nonetheless, its English-oriented mental horizon did not go far past the Pall Mall Gazette and Westminster Budget. A. Lovekin and S.B. Stronach as editor and sub-editor, probably conceived of themselves as liberals in Western Australian terms, but were far to the right of the conservative-liberal spectrum in Australian terms.

¹H. Mayer, op.cit., p.214.
The paper was as much parochial as the older journal. It was said to have failed finally, for having provided an inadequate sporting coverage. The Sunday Times of Perth, founded by F.C.B. Vosper in 1900 and only recently deceased, also had considerable influence in Western Australia to 1908.

What can be said of these daily broadsheets in summary? Inevitably, the morning journals, being able to offer not only all the previous day's local and Australian news, but also the news from overseas, were in an advantageous position. The evening dailies carried less weight in both spheres. The period was dominated by the two Melbourne journals - the Age and the Argus and the two Sydney Journals, the Sydney Morning Herald and the Daily Telegraph, though not necessarily in that order. Most other journals found it hard to ignore either these four or their own capital city dailies. There is much evidence of inter-state influence as well. For example, the Melbourne papers can be found often referred to in South Australia, Tasmania and Queensland. Within each state their capital city dailies were widely distributed. Remembering their duality, one simple ranking on a spectrum of 14 key dailies in Australia might be (reading from top left to bottom right):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBERAL-Conservative</th>
<th>CONSERVATIVE-Liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Argus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertiser</td>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph (Sydney)</td>
<td>South Australian Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Telegraph (Launceston)</td>
<td>Brisbane Evening Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston Examiner</td>
<td>Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Star</td>
<td>Perth Morning Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald</td>
<td>West Australian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening News</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this period, the terms 'liberal' and 'conservative' cannot be briefly or closely defined without some oversimplification. They refer in the main to internal relative differences, one paper from the other. All metropolitan papers contained some aspect of political, social or economic conservatism, just as all metropolitan papers were to some degree politically, socially or economically liberal. Despite 'grey' areas of little differentiation, as between the Argus and the Evening News, it is clear for example, that the Age is generally more liberal than the Mercury; the West Australian is in general more conservative than the Advertiser in most social, economic and political attitudes and reactions. The work of historians and political scientists such as J.A. La Nauze, Peter Loveday and others move toward defining 'liberal' and 'conservative' for the period, without confining the label to political affiliation. See the discussion on liberalism in transition in Chapter One.
B. Country Press

If the capital city dailies serviced a total population of almost one and a half million people in 1904 or 37.5 per cent of the total population of four million, then the country (or provincial) newspapers serviced the remaining 62.5 per cent. The 1901 census revealed that 25.5 per cent of the population was engaged in agriculture, fishing and forestry and 7.4 per cent in mining. This may mean that much of the population may not have been in contact with any other than the local or area newspaper production. Certainly their attention would have been focussed by that paper which they considered most served their own interests. The country press of each colony is important because of its local status and loyalties, its readership - especially the large town dailies that commented on foreign events - and the pool of journalistic talent it trained before often losing its best to the cities.

A writer in 1907 assured his readers that the history of the country press

teems with incidents, adventures, trials, tribulations, adversities, successes, triumphs and achievements...brave ambitions, pleasant surprises, Quixotic enthusiasm, daring exploits and improbable heroisms. It compasses much of the pathos, joy and power of Australian life.... The printing press...gave to rude, crude, outlandish township and mining camp the most desired and most distinctive mark of modern civilization.¹

The fruits of that pioneering effort were evident in the New South Wales of 1904. In that year, ten dailies - six morning and four evening newspapers - were published, as well as seven tri-weeklies, 83 bi-weeklies, 110 weeklies and three monthlies, totalling 213 newspapers.² By 1907, the number was 230.³

Of the dailies, the Newcastle Morning Herald founded in 1858 and serving in a morning edition, the general and coal-mining interests of a population of 70,000 (1904), was the most important. Through encouragement of a historian of British provincial journalism, G.A.

¹ Review of Reviews, 1 Nov. 1907, p.445.
² Numbers calculated from Reuter's Telegram Co. Lists of Australasian Newspapers (London, 1904). All population figures for provincial areas are based on the same source. They are undoubtedly inflated to refer to the city or town and its surrounding area.
³ Review of Reviews, op.cit., ibid.
Cranfield, the Herald has been among the few newspapers to be treated by a historian. Generally in the liberal-conservative framework outlined, papers serving mining interests are biased to the left, while those serving rural interests (agricultural and pastoral) are biased to the right of the frame and can be called conservative-liberal. The Newcastle Morning Herald, true to this generalization was both more liberal and protectionist than other New South Wales organs due to its situation at port of the richest coal-field in the southern hemisphere, the Hunter Valley.

Another of Cranfield's students is in the process of writing the history of the Maitland Mercury founded in 1843 - the second oldest newspaper in New South Wales after the Sydney Morning Herald. Liberal and pro-labor, the daily differed from its coastal counterpart in the Hunter Valley by being free trade. This first of the country journals on the mainland founded by Richard Jones and Thomas W. Tucker, and situated in the heart of the coalfields, exerted an influence won by trust out of all proportion to the population of 16,000 which it served.

Other journals enjoyed impressive continuities. The Goulburn Herald, though not a daily, was founded in 1848, served a population of 22,000 in their pastoral and agricultural interests and survives still. The Evening Penny Post in the same town, also a tri-weekly on alternate days, was founded in 1870, ran during the period under consideration as a conservative-liberal and was incorporated into the older paper in 1927.

Bathurst, a town of similar population and interests (including mining) could better sustain two dailies. The Bathurst Daily Argus, a morning paper founded in 1858 and the National Advocate, an evening paper founded in 1889 saw no need to amalgamate until 1963. Grafton and

3The Newcastle Morning Herald is one of the few newspapers with an index.
5The Tasmanian of Launceston was older (1825).
Wollongong also had daily newspapers from the 1850's.\(^1\)

On a smaller scale, Albury's 8,000 inhabitants, engaged in pastoral and agricultural pursuits on the Sydney-Melbourne border and athwart road and rail connections were also well served by the *Border Morning Mail* from 1903; a daily which not until 1925 absorbed its evening rival the *Albury Daily News*. Until 1902, the old *Border Post* (founded 1856) had also been important.

Further west in the Riverina, serving a population of 12,000 engaged in similar pursuits were two alternate day tri-weeklies - the *Wagga Wagga Express*, founded in 1858 and the *Wagga Wagga Advertiser*. The former survived until World War II, the latter still survives.

Yass, in the heart of one of the richest wool-growing areas in the world served the pastoral interests of a small population of 4,000 with two long surviving bi-weeklies. The *Yass Courier*, founded in 1854 and the *Yass Evening Tribune* founded 1879 did not merge until the eve of the great depression (1929). In a roughly similar environment, the *Braidwood Despatch* continued from 1855 to the present day.

Among the other important newspapers in this period was the *Barrier Miner* of Broken Hill, a daily broadsheet whose editor after 1902, Samuel Henry Prior, wrote for a community of 28,000 silver, lead and zinc miners. The Barrier District Council of the A.L.F. founded the *Barrier Truth* in 1895. Issued weekly, it became a daily in 1908. It had several editors: Charles Maley, 1895-89, George Black, 10 September-30 December 1898, until Maley resumed editing 1899-1902. J.W. Kilner succeeded him in 1902-3, then Tom Lander 1903-4; Robert Ross 1905-6 and Will A. Jones after 1907. The *Riverina Herald*, which had so impressed C.W. Dilke during his visit at the end of the 1860's was still an evening daily in the heart of the wool area of Moama-Echuca though it served a population of only 4,000.\(^2\)

Orange, in western New South Wales, serving a pastoral, agricultural and mining population of 10,000 had two morning dailies in this period: the *Leader* and the *Western Advocate*. Significant journals were also produced at this time in Armidale (*Express and Chronicle*); Cooma (*Express and Monaro Mercury*); Dubbo (*Despatch and Liberal*); Forbes (*Gazette* and  

---

\(^1\) *Clarence and Richmond River Examiner* (Grafton, 1859) and the *Illawarra Mercury* (Wollongong, 1855).

\(^2\) *C.W. Dilke, Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries During 1866 & 1867* (London, 1869), p.34.
Several journalists on quite modest newspapers had achieved an
Australia-wide reputation for their efforts in forming first, a New
South Wales, then in co-operation with other states, a Commonwealth
Country Press Association (1906). Their members were prominent at the
Imperial Press Conference of 1909. These co-operatives protected the
country newspapers from the depredations of unscrupulous advertisers and
allowed for combined action toward businessmen and cablemen in their own
united interests.1 John Gale of the Queanbeyan Age and James Torpy,
associated with the press and politics of Orange, were considered the
'grand old men' of the movement. Also prominent were Thomas Temperley
of the Richmond River Times, J.C. Leslie of the Corowa Free Press and
T.M. Shakespear of the Forbes Gazette and Grafton Argus. The latter
successfully managed the New South Wales Press Co-operative Co. with
imagination and foresight throughout much of this period. Also
instrumental in the success of the venture were G.H. Varley of the
Clarence & Richmond Examiner, W.H. Midgley of the Moree Examiner,
Frederick Pinkstone of the Kiama Independent, Goulburn Herald and
Cootamundra Herald, J.L. Trefle of the Temora Independent, A. Colless of
the Nepean Times, J. Ryan of the Lithgow Mercury and A.J. Douse of the
Bathurst Argus.

The Victorian country press in 1904 had 212 newspapers—almost
exactly the same number as in New South Wales. These consisted of 14
dailies (nine morning and five evening), 19 tri-weeklies, 49 bi-weeklies,
128 weeklies and two monthlies. Computing the more important of these—
the dailies and tri-weeklies, the number comes to 33, almost exactly
twice the number of dailies and tri-weeklies in New South Wales. This
fact makes the Victorian country press by far the most significant in
Australia and due weighting has been given it in this thesis, where a
greater emphasis on Victorian provincial newspapers is to be found.

1 REVIEW OF REVIEWS, 1 OCT. 1906, PP.346-51.
The most important of this group was the Ballarat Courier. In 1898, its circulation was 82,000 - the largest of any paper in Victoria outside the metropolitan area and larger than that of many metropolitan dailies in the other colonies. One publication in 1894 called it the 'third most valuable paper in Victoria'. Robert Clark, with Bateman, had started the paper in 1867 and by 1889 was its sole proprietor. Clark, a Scot, had a career typical of many newspapermen in those turbulent pioneering times. At the age of 14 he had worked as a printer with the Glasgow Daily Mail; had later visited Gavan Duffy in Dublin when the latter was editor of the Freeman and worked in London for four years in the heart of the journalistic world. In 1854, he took ship for Australia, printed 1,500 copies a week of a shipboard journal and shared the voyage with Tom Bury, who as 'Tom Touchstone' was to enliven Clark's Ballarat paper some years later. In Melbourne, Clark worked 18 months for the Argus and then as a compositor for Henry Seekamp, the proprietor of the Ballarat Times who was horse-whipped by the fiery Lola Montez. In 1856 he was with the Ballarat Star, but wished to begin a journal of his own. From 1862-65 he began the Back Creek Register, then the North-West Chronicle, called later the Talbot Leader. For two years he was mayor of Talbot, then left to manage the Ballarat Sun, before founding the Courier.

From 1889 to 1902 Clark, although he did not again enter politics, wielded considerable power through his journal. He became the very model of the progressive editor interested in the local as well as the colonial scene and his ideas were carried on after 1902 by his sons. Protectionism and concern for local mining and fruit growing and federation filled editorials assisted in the writing by O.P. Law, Colonel Williams and T.W. Cotton. The conservative side of his liberalism was revealed in his imperialistic fostering of several patriotic funds; his donation of a soldier's statue, and his racism. Having begun with a circulation of 1,100, it was a high moment in the paper's history when on the 10 June 1901 at the newspaper's 34th anniversary the State Premier opened the new printing plant. It used Hoe machinery worth £15,000, capable of producing 24,000 copies an hour. As with the metropolitan dailies, this morning daily (serving 60,000 people) revealed a Liberal-Conservative

---

1 See Ballarat Courier, Jubilee Notes, 11 June 1917.

2 W.B. Kimberley, Ballarat and Vicinity (Ballarat, 1894), p.64.
duality, in this case leaning more to the left.¹

Such a paper naturally attracted a rival. The Ballarat Star, begun before the Courier in 1855, was the town's second morning daily. Its beginnings were inauspicious.² P.D. Wheeler described how 'its first number was printed and published in the middle of a hurricane and inundation, with the printers nearly up to their middle in water' in Bridge Street before the levels there were raised.³ The Star which sold at Is 6d a week was quickly surpassed in circulation at the end of the 1860's when the Courier chopped its price to 6d a week. As a business, the paper passed through troubled times until Martin and Grose stabilized it in 1871, running it in conjunction with the Creswick Advertiser.

Edward Grose proved a competent business manager during the 1890's and other than a free trade bias the paper successfully advocated many of the same liberal-conservative-progressive ideas as the Courier, championing democracy, labour, and civic improvements just as sincerely. In 1925, the paper that had recorded the Eureka Stockade, was absorbed by the Courier. Its circulation in this period, probably half that of its rival, perhaps reached 45,000 (considering state-wide distribution).

Bendigo, Ballarat's sister gold-rush town, claimed the first paper on any goldfield, the Bendigo Advertiser first published in 1853.⁴ A daily since 1856, its price in 1882 was ld. In 1893 it was using linotype and printing with a gas driven Wharfdale and had the largest circulation in northern Victoria - perhaps as high as 65,000 copies a day. The paper was firmly in the hands of the Mackay family and George Mackay, Bendigo's historian, was editor throughout the period under consideration.⁵ Angus Mackay and Robert Ross Haverfield had since 1855 established the paper as a vigorously progressive journal in general and a democratic

¹See Law-Crisp-Edmond debate on federating the Empire, Review of Reviews, 20 June 1905, pp.565-70.
²W.B. Withers, History of Ballarat (Ballarat, 1887), pp.63-6.
³The 'Welcome Nugget' was discovered virtually at the Star's doors when the paper was only three years old. See Memorial Edition, Ballarat Star, 23 Sept. 1905; Kimberley, op.cit., p.156.
miners' advocate in particular, using Edmund Harrison and J.B. Thompson as editors. The paper fostered several public men and trained many competent journalists such as Dr Quick, J.S. Stephens and J.H. Nish before losing them to the Melbourne press. Its free trade preference expressed its conservative side.

The _Bendigo Independent_, its protectionist rival since 1862, claimed to be the first penny newspaper in Victoria (1877). Since 1869 the paper had been in the hands of the Edwards family and throughout the period 1889-1908 was dominated by John Gregory Edwards. It became the organ of the Liberal party and grew in influence and circulation to rival, if not surpass, the _Bendigo Advertiser_ due to an efficient network of agency outlets. It saw itself as more to the left than its competitor and under its editor E.A. Banks, championed miners' causes.¹

Both these Bendigo journals, including a competing evening daily from 1894, the _Bendigo Evening Mail_ (soon to be dominated by proprietors William F. Wilkins and Robert Walker) considered themselves 'sane' Socialists and only mild Radicals.² The evening paper copied something of the format of the _Melbourne Herald_ with some moderate concessions to the 'New Journalism' such as news on the front page. The venture survived only until the eve of World War One, having made the mistake of so many others of being too much like its closest rivals. Serving the population of 50,000 engaged in mining and wine-making, with its own telegraph service, the paper, an advocate of free trade and 'advanced liberalism' was in constant trouble securing advertisers. The year 1895 had been a crisis period following the resignation of H.G. Mather as manager and R.B. Young as editor. Young was replaced first by Lyons then H.S. Webb and finally by James Rossiter, who stayed.

Geelong, with a population of 36,000 engaged in agriculture and manufacturing, south of Melbourne, also had with Bendigo two important morning dailies as well as an evening paper. The _Geelong Advertiser_ was historically the most important, being the oldest morning newspaper in Victoria with the exception of the _Melbourne Herald_. The paper, begun in 1840, had been bought for £2,500 in 1861 by Alfred Douglass, who became sole proprietor in 1864. Under its talented early editor James Harrison, the paper became according to one historian, the 'first

¹ G. Mackay, _Annals_, op.cit., p.197.
² G. Mackay, _Annals_, op.cit., pp.240-1.
newspaper advocate of protectionism in Victoria', 1 giving a valuable lead to the Age's radicalism. 2

Much more restrained in its liberalism was the mildly protectionist Geelong Times re-established in 1875 upon the death of its radical predecessor founded in 1857. James Bell, son of William Bell the mayor of Geelong, took over the proprietorship from his father in 1894 and remained in the post and in parliament until his death in 1908. Benjamin Hoare, who followed Rowcroft, was its most talented editor until he left and joined the Age in attacking the paper's elitist conservatism and luke-warm federalism. 3 Despite its pretensions the paper and its offshoot, the Geelong Evening Star, were clearly redundant by 1908, a position not helped by their parochial attitudes.

'I never knew any town of any size where people were content with a single local journal', Hoare wrote of Australia in general. The statement held true for Castlemaine, a once important gold-rush town which had also impressed Dilke in the mid-1860's. Though with a population of only 13,000, engaged chiefly in mining, fruit and agricultural pursuits there were two dailies - the Mt. Alexander Mail a morning production and the Castlemaine Leader in the evening. The earlier paper was the more impressive. Founded in 1854, its history is contemporaneous with Castlemaine's. 6 C.A. Saint, its first editor, had been instrumental in obtaining a rail link from Melbourne. He established the paper's progressive reputation, carried on by James Robertson (the oldest journalist in the colony), A.L. Windsor and Frank McKillop - 34 years editor and public benefactor. In the period under consideration it was however largely conservative-liberal. With the Warrnambool Standard a daily evening paper of similar policies, serving an agricultural and dairy area of 20,000, it had an excellent coverage of foreign events and a bold

4 Hoare, op.cit., p.76.
5 Dilke, Greater Britain, op.cit., p.27.
editorial commentary. C.H.A.T. Opie (to 1898) and M.M. Hassett after
1903, encouraged in the latter paper a staff of leader writers, including
J.D. McKellar prominent in the press association, J.F. Archibald, later
founder of the Bulletin, Ernest Scott, the war historian, and Walter
Murdoch, the essayist, historian and biographer of Deakin. Both papers
had area circulations probably in the vicinity of 20,000 per day.
Christopher Crisp (1844-1915), editor of the Bacchus Marsh Express, the
paper of a small town outside Melbourne, was highly influential for his
perceptive comments and correspondence on national and international
trends.¹

In 1891, the Victorian Country Press Co. Limited was formed on the
fourth attempt, two years after its New South Wales equivalent.
Prominent in the movement were John Bouser M.L.A., editor of the
Wangaratta Chronicle and one of the chief organizers, H.F. Swords of the
Dandenong Advertiser, A.A. Luke of the Gippsland Mercury, J.D. McKellar
of the Camperdown Chronicle and Fred Martin of the Horsham Times. After
1901 the telegraphic stereo plate and weekly supplement service was
improved. Managing director was E.F. Hughes of the Casterton News and
Portland Chronicle. J.D. McKellar, also of the Numurkah Standard and
most of the earlier group.² The latter became chairman in 1905-6 and
was delegate to the New South Wales, New Zealand and Commonwealth Conferences
of the Country Press Association. The Commonwealth Association in 1907
was aiming for an independent cable service, revision of libel laws and
uniformity on cable copyrights and press agencies.

Other important Victorian newspapers included the Maryborough
Advertiser founded in 1856. Associated with it had been J.W. Banfield,
later proprietor of the Ararat Advertiser in the period 1889-1908 and
Julius Vogel - onetime editor, and later premier of New Zealand.
E.H. Nuthall and J.H. Gearing were also important names connected with it.
Other significant journals were at Bairnsdale (Advertiser, Courier);
Beechworth (Ovens and Murray Advertiser, Ovens Register); Colac (Reformer,
Herald, Daily News); Benalla (North Eastern Ensign and Standard);
Kyneton (Guardian, Observer); Sale (Gippsland Mercury, Gippsland Times)
and St Arnaud (Mercury, Times). As well, the Portland Guardian (1842)
and Port Fairy Gazette (1849) were among the oldest surviving journals

¹ For Crisp, see National Dictionary of Biography, op.cit., Vol.3, p.495.
² Review of Reviews, 1 Nov. 1907, pp.445-51.
during the period.

Certainly few overseas - perhaps few in Australia - realised the strength in numbers of the Queensland country press. In 1904, the state produced outside the metropolitan area nine dailies - five evening and four morning papers, ten tri-weeklies, 14 bi-weeklies, 55 weeklies and two monthlies for a total of 90 newspapers. The total of dailies and tri-weeklies (19) surpassed even that of New South Wales. One commentator, in 1907 could thus write: 'in journalistic enterprise, North Queensland is conspicuous, both as to the quality and quantity of its newspapers'.1

We have little space to enter into the development of these journals, made strong by their isolation. Townsville, Charters Towers and Cairns boasted cable services to equal those in the capitals during this period. Due to lack of metropolitan domination one observed could write, 'the journalism of Queensland is characteristic of the northern state - full of light and life and virility'.2 The doyen of the Queensland press in his role of President of the Queensland Provincial Press Association was J.K. Mehan, managing editor of the North Queensland Herald and Townsville Daily Bulletin which he helped found in 1881.

Toowoomba's evening daily, the Darling Downs Gazette had been founded in 1858 and the tri-weekly Chronicle, in 1861. The latter was under the proprietorship of the Hon. W.H. Groom (formerly speaker of the Queensland House of Assembly). Both papers circulated widely among the 30,000 farmers of the Darling Downs. The Queensland Times at Ipswich was first published as a weekly in 1859 and was in this time a tri-weekly dominating the readership of the 20,000 inhabitants, interested mostly in agriculture and mining. Maryborough's daily, the Maryborough Chronicle, dated from 1860 and flourished under C. Hastings Barton as editor from 1867 to 1902 and G. Roberts as editor after 1905. W. Keith, who owned and edited the Wide Bay and Burnett News, challenged it for patronage in an agricultural and mining area of 22,000. Gympie's interests were mainly mining and the area of 20,000 inhabitants was served by two tri-weeklies, the Gympie Times and the Gympie Miner.

1 Review of Reviews, 1 Nov. 1907.

Further north, the *Rockhampton Morning Bulletin* dated from 1861. W.H. Buzacott was until 1880 a proprietor and editor. Then William McIlwraith (brother of Sir Thomas McIlwraith) was editor and part proprietor when in 1883, Stewart Williamson Hartley joined the firm also as part proprietor. The *Daily Northern Argus* begun in 1863 in Rockhampton, became in the period under consideration the *Daily Record*—an evening daily. It was the first penny paper published north of Brisbane. The paper to 1880 was owned and edited by A.L. Bourcicault, who later owned and edited the *Gympie Miner*. Both papers beside serving a district of 30,000 interested in pastoral and mining activities, circulated widely in central and western Queensland. Mackay, centre of the sugar industry, had three tri-weeklies, serving a population of 10,000: the *Mercury* owned by Hodges and Chattaway, the *Standard*, owned by H.B. Black and Co. and the *Chronicle* begun in 1895 and in 1905 incorporated in the *Mercury*. Both the *Mercury* and *Standard* were ably edited.

Townsville, in an area serving 30,000 interested in mining and pastoral activities, exhibited great growth in newspaper work. The *Daily Bulletin*, a morning journal and the *Evening Star*, were both dailies, the former being founded in 1881 and a daily from 1883. Others, like the *Northern Age* (founded 1885) soon died. Charters Towers, 80 miles by rail from Townsville, also had two dailies in a mining area of 20,000. The *Northern Miner*, edited by Thadeus O'Kane, was famous for its libel suits. The *Evening Telegraph* was also left-leaning like other papers in the area. The *Herald and Times* were short lived dailies (1888-1899). Cooktown's two bi-weeklies, the *Independent* and *Endeavour Beacon* were short-lived as was the *Courier* (ceased 1895) and the *Endeavour Times* (ceased 1891). They served a population of 2,500. The *Courier* was the paper of the Palmer Gold Rush and boasted Carl Fielberg, St Just De B. Mackay and the explorer Captain Armit, as former editors as well as having the oldest printing press in Queensland, a small hand-powered 'Albion' which had printed the first copy of the *Moreton Bay Courier*. The *Cairns Argus* was a daily evening paper among a population of 5,000 interested in sugar and mining. The *Norman Chronicle* became a weekly as population abandoned Normanton.

---

1 Gordon and Gotch, op.cit., p.40.
Other papers must be mentioned as quickly: the other four large areas well served by the press were Bundaberg (Star, Mail) in a mining area of 10,000; Warwick (Examiner & Times, Argus) in an agricultural and pastoral area of 10,000; Roma (Western Star, Maranoa Advocate) in an agricultural and pastoral area of 8,000. As in other areas purely mining papers tended to be radical-liberal, while agricultural and pastoral areas were more conservative. Areas of mixed economies were often as liberal-conservative or conservative-liberal as others described elsewhere. Given the unusual geographic spread of population in Queensland, its journalistic pattern is the most decentralized in Australia. No provincial press more needs and deserves a historian. Especially is this so in the light of the successful socialistic and trade union developments in the colony culminating in Australia's first Labor government in 1899 and the role of journalism in this advance.

A completely opposite picture is evident in the provincial press of South Australia. Unlike Brisbane in relation to Queensland, Adelaide virtually dominated in a centralised way the press of South Australia. Outside the capital in 1904 there was not one daily or tri-weekly. Of bi-weeklies there was only six. Of weeklies there were 22. There were no monthlies. The provincial press of South Australia was a scanty 28 newspapers. The Port Pirie Recorder and Port Pirie Advertiser both begun in 1898 served a population of 11,000 in agriculture and shipping as a bi-weekly. In Mt Barker, the Mount Barker Courier had served an agricultural population of 15,000 since 1880. Mt Gambier's population of 10,000 similarly in agricultural and pastoral pursuits, was served by two bi-weeklies, the Border Watch since 1861 and the South-Eastern Star, since 1877. Beside the Adelaide papers, the trains delivered the Melbourne papers here simultaneously. The Gawler Bunyip first entitled in 1863 the Gawler Humbug Society's Chronicle, served weekly a population of 8,000 engaged in agriculture and mining. Two weeklies served the 7,000 miners at Moonta: the York Peninsula Advertiser (1872) and the People's Weekly (1890-1906), a Labor paper. The Kapunda Herald served Kapunda's 6,000 inhabitants engaged in agriculture and mining.

Outside of Hobart and Launceston, Tasmania had five newspapers in 1904: two dailies, two bi-weeklies and a weekly. The Times & Advocate at Burnie, served an agricultural population of 7,000. Since its foundation in 1890, it had had a variety of names: to 1897 it was the Wellington Times & Mining and Agricultural Gazette and came into the possession of the
Harris family. To 1899 it was the Emu Bay Times and North-West and West Coast Advocate. To 1908 it was the North Western Advocate & the Emu Bay Times. In 1899 it absorbed the Devonport North-Western Advocate. This left Devonport with the bi-weekly North-West Post which had run since 1887. At Zeehan, the 7,000 miners had been served since 1890, by the Zeehan & Dundas Herald, a daily.

The provincial press of Western Australia was by far the most impressive due to its rate of growth in the 1890's. In 1904 it had 32 newspapers - five dailies (three evening, two morning), four tri-weeklies, six bi-weeklies and 17 weeklies. It fell clearly into two divisions: papers serving the ports and agricultural areas and those serving the goldfields. Of the former, the Albany Advertiser had since 1888 been a bi-weekly serving a port population of 6,000. The tri-weekly Southern Times at Bunbury served a timber, agricultural and pastoral population of 9,000, from 1892. The Bunbury Herald another tri-weekly, similarly dated from 1892. The Fremantle Mail an evening daily from 1903 served the general port area of 24,000 as did the Evening Courier, a daily lasting only a year, 1902-3. Weeklies such as the Echo (1905), the Empire (1907), Liberty (1891), The Messenger (1895), Once A Week (1889), The Times (1896) and The Umpire (1897) were mostly ephemeral and lasted less than a year. The Newcastle Herald serving an area with 10,000 in agriculture lasted only from 1902 to 1911. The Northam Advertiser and Kanowna Democrat, the former edited by J.A. Cohen, were also important.

Of the other areas, Geraldton, with 6,000 people in agricultural and pastoral pursuits, had been served from 1878 by the Geraldton Express. In the 1890's this paper went through several changes of title. In 1905, it absorbed the tri-weekly Geraldton Advertiser, published since 1890 and was in turn swallowed by the Geraldton Guardian founded in 1906. It lasted until 1928 and employed some of the best journalists in the State. The Geraldton-Murchison Telegraph lasted from 1892-98, while the Morning Post lasted only from 1895 to 1896.

Coolgardie with a gold-mining population of 15,000 isolated inhabitants, had the daily Coolgardie Miner from 1894. F.C.B. Vosper, A.G. Hales and W.E. Clare left their mark as editors in this period. The Coolgardie Mining Review, a weekly, lasted from 1895 to 1897; the Coolgardie Pioneer from 1895 to 1901; the Hocking's Golden Age from 1894-1896; the Goldfields Morning Chronicle from 1896-1898; the Herald from 1899-1901; the Tothersider only April-August 1897 and the West
Australian Goldfields Courier 1894-1898: flourishings that were as ephemeral as the plants of the desert after rain.

The most important of the provincials took root at Kalgoorlie where gold seams were deeper and more lasting. The Kalgoorlie Miner served from 1895 and survives today. In 1904, the population was 50,000 - substantial by any standards. It produced a substantial man, in the person of the Hon. John Waters Kirwan, M.L.C., the paper's editor in chief. In 1901 he was elected to represent Kalgoorlie in the Commonwealth parliament and was an important Australian delegate at the Imperial Press Conference of 1909. S.E. and P.C. Hocking bought the weekly Western Argus from the Mott brothers for £250. It then became the Miner's weekly. Five years later they refused £150,000 for the establishment.

But the town had its crop of ephemerals. Some were the Goldfields Advocate (1902); Mannans Hatchet (1902); Kalgoorlie & Boulder Standard (1897); Sporting Life (1905) and the Australasian Clarion (1903). The Sun which had the lively H. Mahon as editor from 1898-1900, lasted until 1928.

Boulder City, with a mining population of 12,000 had a sickly plant in the Miners' Right (1897), but a healthy service after 1898 from the Evening Star, an evening daily. At Cue, the Murchison Times run by James Thomson of the Melbourne Herald, and the Murchison Advocate, served a mining population of 6,000, as did the Day Dawn Chronicle.

From 1889, when the first Country Press Association was formed, the country press of Australia gained a new confidence in the role it was playing. In 1908, one of their number wrote:

The Country Press of Australasia is a very potent factor in the development of the Commonwealth. Probably in no country in the world is the country press of a cleaner and higher type than here.

This sense of achievement had been won in the face of great material difficulty.¹

C. Weekly Magazines

The great city dailies and the multitudinous country journals are very like the same classes of papers in other lands; but the great weekly journals of Australia have no exact equivalent elsewhere.

¹ Review of Reviews, 23 Nov. 1908, p.xcvi.
wrote an observer in 1892. The American writer Mark Twain remarked in 1895:

The bulky weeklies such as are printed in Australia and New Zealand are unknown to us. The rapidity of transmission of the daily journals prevents this altogether. They are unique combining as they do the magazine, the sporting paper, the illustrated paper and the special features of a daily journal.

Such a unique production evoked a special pride. One contemporary writer remarked:

If the literary taste of the colonies had to be judged by any single test, any wise Australian, we imagine would gladly consent that we should be judged by the standard of our great weeklies.

Frank Bullen considered the weeklies 'marvellous'.

These weeklies, which were usually published by the great metropolitan newspapers on Thursdays and shipped to the country areas for the weekends, were well illustrated and carried their own editorial comment and news summaries as well as literary and country sections. The most outstanding were the Australasian, published by the Argus since 1864; the Sydney Mail, published by the Sydney Morning Herald since 1860; the Australian Town & Country Journal, published by the Evening News since 1870; the Queensland, published by the Courier since 1866; the Observer, published by the Register since 1843. The Leader published by the Age; the Weeklies Times published by the Herald; the Chronicle published by the Advertiser; the Capricornian published by the Rockhampton Morning Bulletin; the Bendigonian published by the Bendigo Advertiser and the Western Mail published by the West Australian were also creditable weeklies.

From a single number of the Australasian a man of the world visiting the colonies could form a capital idea of Australian life and Australian interests...a journal such as the Australasian is the Spectator, the Field and the weekly edition of the London Times thrown into one — and it is well nigh as large as the three journals named put together,

a commentator wrote in 1892. D. Watterson (who had covered the 1876 Philadelphia Exhibition) was its editor in the 1890's. Edward T. Fricker, who had been with the Argus since 1889, edited the paper from August 1903. Throughout the period it produced 100 pages for sixpence. Its circulation was Australasian-wide, thus living up to its title. Cartoons by T.

1 Review of Reviews, 1892, Vol.1, No.1, p.13; Table Talk, 6 Dec. 1895; Frank T. Bullen, Advance Australasia, pp.260-1.
Carrington assisted its popularity.  

C.B. Fletcher said of the *Sydney Mail* in the late 1880's, "no paper of its character could have been better edited". He was referring to its brief period under F.W. Ward, before he left, with H. Gullett, editor of the *Australasian*, for the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*. Nonetheless, William Charlton performed creditably as editor from 1905 upon the death of J.P. Dowling. The paper which was taken up more with rural technicalities after 1890, was only half the size of the *Australasian* (50 pp. for sixpence), though of similar format.  

Of the other weeklies, the **Leader** had one of the most independent editorial policies. H.M. Green reserved special praise for the *Queenslander*, which attracted a wide number of promising literary contributors. It was edited for much of the period by William J. Buzacott, son of the *Courier's* editor. In 1893 it was described as 'one of the most influential of the leading weeklies of the colonies'. Its cartooning was good and it ran to 46 pages for sixpence. The *Chronicle* offered 48 pages for fourpence; the *Capricornian*, 36 pages for sixpence and the *Bendigonian*, 20 pages for threepence. Smaller weeklies such as the *Maitland Weekly Mercury* repeated verbatim the most important editorials of the daily edition and had little original opinion to offer on American affairs.  

D. Satiric Weeklies  

Not all weeklies were family reading. Australia's most notorious weekly publication was Sydney's *Truth*. It first appeared in 1879, two years after London's *Truth* and described itself as a 'fearless exposér of Folly, Vice and Crime'. After a lapse, it was restarted in 1890 by William Nicholas Willis and William Patrick Crick. Its radical, protectionist, irreverent and pro-worker sympathies established it as a crusading paper of low-brow tastes, similar in style and tone to the *Denver Post*. It gained its constituency during the great 1890 Maritime

---

1 Review of Reviews, Sept. 1892.  
3 H.M. Green, op.cit., pp.339-40; Review of Reviews, op.cit., ibid.
Strike and never failed to amuse it by the fury of its abuse of the establishment.

From April 1891, John Norton, a London adventurer, was its editor, and was continuously involved in brawling and litigation with men such as George Black, sub-editor of the Bulletin (1889-91). T.O. Keating (alias J.J. Crouch), W.H. Traill and A.G. Taylor briefly edited the paper, but during the period under discussion the Truth was dominated by the belligerent personality of John Norton, often described as a miniature version of William Randolph Hearst. Though comment on foreign events was usually shallow, his paper skilfully blended demagogic and muckraking-progressive elements supposedly in the cause of the little man, but most often to feed the cynical, undoubtedly criminal ego of Norton himself. The weekly succeeded. In 1905, the paper that had coined the word 'wowser' in 1899 to satirize puritanical authority, was selling 125,000 copies per issue by one (probably inflated) estimate. It had branches in Melbourne, Brisbane and Perth and a plant worth £75,000. It was the one clear and noxious example of the worst of the 'Yellow Press' in Australia.¹

The single most famous paper both in and outside Australia, a weekly primarily satiric, but of central importance to the growth of Australian nationalism, was the Sydney Bulletin. In 1894 the world traveller, Max O'Rell described it as,

in its way...the most scathing, most daring, the wittiest, the most impudent and best edited paper I know. Nothing quite so audacious exists, even in America, where all sorts of journalistic audacities are permitted.

In the same year it was described by another as '...the most powerful journal of its class in the colonies' - violently hated and fervently loved.²

The paper was admired for the catholicity of its abuse as well as criticized for the lack of discrimination in its attacks on all aspects of authority. This 'Carlylean hatred of shams and injustice' won it a wide radical-progressive readership. Few knew its circulation except that it was generally considered to be higher than any other Australian


journal, due to its Australia-wide appeal. It was probably well in excess of 150,000 copies per week. Able and courageous and with reform, republican, protectionist, xenophobic, democratic, socialistic and nationalistic biases, it mercilessly satirized the Anglophile-Imperialist-Religious-Free Trade-Capitalist establishment. Yet one commentator criticized it for lack of influence on men and events in Australia. Certainly its comment on foreign affairs was minimal: its forte was domestic politics.\(^1\)

First published in 1890 by John F. Archibald and John Haynes, the paper came to be dominated by Archibald. W.H. Traill, an ex-editor of the Sydney Mail edited the paper into particular success. This was done in two ways - through spectacular libels which established the paper in the people's eyes as their energetic tribune and through the hiring of two brilliant comic cartoonists - Phil May and Livingstone Hopkins. These two - the latter through the whole of this period 1889-1908, did much to popularize the paper. William Macleod was the capable managing director, while Archibald as editor was assisted by George Black to 1891; Alfred George Stephens on his return from the United States in 1894 - founder of the famous 'Red Page' of literature (1896-1906), and James Edmond sub-editor since 1892; editor from 1903.

Of Archibald it was written, 'as a paragraphist, satirist and epigramsmatic writer, he has few equals'. And 'he knows the public men in the colonies as the monk knows his rosary beads. His searching eye is everywhere and nothing escapes him'. The paper was usually pointed, virile and relevant, but not always consistent in its policies. Its ornament since 1882, the American Livingstone Hopkins, was described by Stephens as 'one of the most humorous and original of the world's illustrators'. Norman Lindsay's drawings enlivened the paper after 1905. One commentator wrote of the paper: 'It rivalled Syme's Age as a political influence and surpassed that of all other journals as a stabilizer of national emotions and desires'.\(^3\)

---


2 For Archibald, see Quiz & Lantern, 27 Apr., 4 May 1899 and 'The Genesis of the Bulletin', Lone Hand, June 1907, p.163.

Melbourne's Bulletin had been incorporated into the Melbourne Punch, a satirical weekly which had modelled itself on the London Punch since 1855. From 1872 Irishmen James and Alexander McKinley especially the latter, put it on a paying basis. From 1880 it incorporated the Bulletin and took on a social, gossip, sporting and dramatic nature, as well as retaining a major portion of political comment both domestic and overseas. It carried a valuable series of political profiles. Edmund Finn ('Garryowen' - the chronicler of early Melbourne) steered a moderate course as editor - one virtually free of libel. Fred J. Ashton was business manager and J.J. Halligan printer and publisher.

Artists included N. Chevalier, O.R. Campbell, Charles Gregory, T. Carrington, the American L.D. Bradley, J. Sutherland, Alek Sass and G.H. Dancey, especially the latter in the period under consideration. The satire was much more playful and 'proper' than that of the Bulletin and had an English-Tory conservative flavour. Unlike the Bulletin, it frequently satirized overseas developments.

E. Labor Press

Though many of the newspapers described, especially the Bulletin had radical-worker sympathies, a distinct Labor press grew up in this period.

The Australian Workman which grew out of the great maritime strike in 1890 in Sydney was the product of the Labor Defence Committee, seeking its own mouthpiece. The New South Wales Trades and Labor Council were its direct proprietors and Charles Hart was appointed manager on behalf of the Central Labor Executive. W.G. Higgs, a member of the Typographical Association was its first editor. George Black edited the paper 1891-92 and by 1893, it was ably served by Frank Cox, at 18, one of the youngest newspaper editors in the world. The paper devoted most of its energy toward achieving political power for the Labor Party and confined its American comment to the situation of the workers. With George Hawkins as manager, the paper survived until 1897, when it was incorporated into the

2. Review of Reviews, Sept. 1892, p.56.
Sydney Worker (formerly published at Wagga Wagga and known 1891-92 as the Hummer). 1

The Worker in Brisbane was begun March 1890 as the journal of the associated workers of Queensland. By 1893 it was in a strong financial position and had a circulation of 16,000 a week. It was thus maintained at an enviably low expenditure of £30. Eight thousand unionists had backed the Labor-paper conference held at Brisbane in 1891 to discuss arrangements for its production. It was decided that each co-operative union should pay a penny per month per member to maintain it. The paper was managed by trustees elected by district groups of the co-operating unions and produced as a 16 page monthly. When the larger Australian Labor Federation was formed in Queensland, the circulation amounted to 22,500 copies among a male population in Queensland of slightly over 100,000. Its size was reduced in 1893 due to the depression. Editors were elected by subscribers and could be removed by vote. William Lane held the position for three years before retiring to organize the ill-fated utopian New Australia Co-operative Association. Lane was most famous as editor and part-proprietor of the Boomerang, an inspired satirical and radical weekly (1887-92). Gresley Lukin ably followed Lane as editor of the latter journal. W.H. Demaine, editor and proprietor of the Alert at Maryborough, also deserves mention.

The paper was marked by moral intensity and saw labor's approach to social ills as 'the latest phase of Christian thought'. The Wagga and ultimately the Sydney Worker, were based on the Brisbane model. The Sydney Worker was edited by George Black from 1900 to 1904. Cartoons enlivened the Brisbane edition. 2

Victoria's most successful Labor journal begun in October 1897 was the twelve page weekly Tocsin produced in Melbourne and also based on the Brisbane Worker. G.M. Prendergast was proprietor and part editor and J.P. Jones its business manager. It supported Socialist candidates for office; was enlivened by some comment on overseas events and the art of Norman Lindsay and survived until 1906, when it was succeeded by the Labour Call. Other Victorian efforts included the Shearers' & General Labourers' Record, a monthly published at Newport from 1887, incorporated

from September 1893 into the Melbourne Worker, a journal which died in 1895. George A. Andrew was its editor. Its circulation never exceeded 5,000. The Commonweal & Workers' Advocate, founded August 1891 and edited by Joseph Winter, represented extreme socialism and suffered repeated boycott from newsagents. It died July 1893.1

South Australia's official labor organ was the Weekly Herald from 1894-1910. It went through many editors: H. White, W. Wedd, J. Wood, J. Hutchison and E. Roberts in this period. The Pioneer, a bi-weekly, lasted briefly from November 1890 to December 1892. With fellow labor journals, it struggled for the single tax, nationalization of land and municipal socialism. H.S. Taylor and E.J. Hiscock were briefly its editors. The Voice, a weekly edited by the able J. Medway Day, took over its functions from December 1892 to December 1893. The Hobart Clipper (1893-1909) had J.J. Paton and W.A. Woods as editors 1902-08. The Tasmanian Democrat from Launceston, lasted a little over a year (1892-93) as a workers' organ, though it had no official connection with trades unions. It formed the Federalist from 1898 with W.A. Woods as editor. New Australia, which survived only a few months in 1893 was the worker-utopian curiosity of William Lane's New Australian Cooperative Settlement Association. In Western Australia, the Westralian Worker from 1900 and from 1904 the Democrat and Sunday Figaro (with T.H. Bath as editor) were important.

But for the Worker(s) of Sydney and Brisbane and the Tocsin in Melbourne the labor press was not strong in Australia during this period. The papers possibly reached fewer than 20,000 readers each, had few mutual connections or cable services and were sometimes short of journalistic talent. Yet even their conservative enemies agreed that they were not run 'by adventurers or by journalistic demagogues' and were worthy of some respect. In 1893, a writer in the Review of Reviews commented:

Let anyone of competent knowledge compare the Labour papers of Australia with the incendiary rags of the continent or even of the more than semi-atheistic journals which too often assume the advocacy of Labour interests in Great Britain and he will be glad to recognize that the Labour Press of the colonies has some good elements.

The only criticism offered from the point of view of this thesis, is that

---

they were too inward-looking and carried some foreign comment, mainly pertaining to labor matters.

F. Religious Press

The Catholic press in Australia was well established and attempting to grow stronger during the period 1889-1908. The *Freeman's Journal* founded in Sydney in 1850 described itself as the 'oldest established weekly newspaper in the Australian colonies'. It was protectionist, pro-Irish and often against the British jingo-imperialist establishment. Edited by Thomas Butler to 1894 and thereafter by J. Blakeney, it contained valuable comment on overseas affairs. Its circulation was probably less than the 40,000 quickly achieved by its rival, the slightly more progressive *Catholic Press* founded in November 1895. This co-operative venture was pro-free trade and was edited by J. Tighe Ryan. Not until 1942 did these papers merge. These weeklies were the leaders among New South Wales' 300,000 Catholics and they fearlessly attacked any anti-Catholicism they felt existed in the *Daily Telegraph*, *Sydney Morning Herald* or any other local Australian or overseas opinion leader. Other papers, both secular and religious, attacked these two Catholic papers for their narrow, partisan elements and the sectarian dissension they fostered.

The *Melbourne Advocate*, though less fiscally oriented, was their Melbourne equivalent. Founded in 1868, it contained important foreign commentary. Joseph Winter was proprietor of a journal with some worker-radical tendencies and J.L. Forde edited it. Perth's Catholics were ably served by the *Record*. The famous Archbishop of Perth, M. Gibney, was the proprietor and the Rev. P. Brennan its editor. In Launceston, the *Monitor*, formed by the merger of the Hobart *Catholic Standard* and the *Morning Star* in 1894, served Tasmania's Catholics with the Rev. Dr John O'Mahony as editor. Most of these weeklies averaged 20 pages for threepence. The *Austral Light*, a monthly, was founded in 1891 and edited by W.R. McMahon, J.T.P. O'Meara, O'Reilly and S. Bonditch. Their influence became most noticeable during the Boer War when they stood against Imperial policies.

---

1 Gibney had achieved unexpected fame in 1880 as the priest who entered the Jones's burning hotel at Glenrowan, where the Kelly gang of bushrangers were making their last stand.
in the Transvaal. ¹

Protestants in Australia were served by a large number of papers, but few contained foreign comment as the largely protestant-oriented dailies spoke for them. Strongest in its attacks was the Sydney-based organ of the Orange Lodge, the Protestant Banner. It flailed awkwardly at Romanism and Papism and saw 'Catholic Plots' in everything. Its maliciousness made it absurd in the eyes of most. Founded in August 1895, the weekly ceased publication in July 1906.

Less extreme was the Sydney Protestant Standard, incorporated in 1895 into the Australian Christian World. The Sydney Methodist, edited by Rev. J.E. Carruthers and the Presbyterian Messenger, edited by the Rev. W.W. Watt were among the leaders in New South Wales, although the Salvation Army's War Cry achieved a large circulation 1891-92 before moving to Melbourne. The Southern Cross, a publication covering all protestant denominations, published by T. Shaw Fitchett and edited by the Rev. Dr W.H. Fitchett; the Church Commonwealth (Anglican), Independent (Congregational) and Methodist were significant weeklies published in Melbourne.

Praise was often reserved for the Hebrew Standard of Australasia, first published in November 1895 in Sydney.² A contemporary, the Australasian Hebrew lasted only a year (1895-96). Melbourne's Jewish Herald was printed and published by Alexander McKinley. These publications were felt to be truly 'religious' and rarely ventured political comment. On the contrary, the Liberator - a Freethinkers' weekly from Melbourne edited by Joseph Symes³ and managed by A.T. Wilson since 1885, commented freely on all foreign events. Though nominally 'Republican and Atheistic', Symes' attitudes were inconsistently progressive-conservative.

G. Monthlies

Except for the Sydney monthly Lone Hand, which continued the Bulletin's policies, published from 1907, there were few significant monthlies in

¹The Religious Press of Australia: An Indictment', Lone Hand, 1 June 1907, pp.190-3; the Monitor, 1 Dec. 1899.
²Lone Hand, op.cit.
Australia carrying information on foreign affairs until W.T. Stead's *Review of Reviews* appeared in an Australasian edition issued from Melbourne in July 1892. Stead's English edition was selling 150,000 a month and his American edition, 75,000 a month under the editorship of Dr Albert Shaw. Stead had always sincerely admired Australia and wished to have his magazine perform an Australian function by encouraging Australian nationalism and Australian interests in a 32 page Australian section forming a quarter of the magazine, while catering to curiosity regarding British and American events in the rest. W.H. Fitchett, an 'upright' man and Empire enthusiast, whose wide editorial experience has been noted elsewhere was given carte blanche to carry out the Australian editing. Stead especially wished to make the world aware of Australia's caricaturists whose vigour, humour and vivacity he found 'second to none'.

The magazine was made a monthly (appearing on the twentieth) to better collate and distribute overall Australian and overseas news impressions. Stead's larger ideal was the unity of the English-speaking race, through mutual understanding leading to equal partnership and promotion of common interests.\(^1\)

Stead's purpose was serious and educative. Practical Christianity, democracy, unity, seapower, 'free' labur and the enfranchisement of women were in his programme. This world-view was very much at odds with that of the *Bulletin*, the devil's advocate for all Stead's proposals. Writing at the time of federation, Stead believed

> it is curious to contrast the two and the future destinies of the Empire will probably be decided by the question whether it is the Australasian *Review of Reviews* or the Sydney *Bulletin* which dominates the policy of the continent.

Stead maintained in 1901 that his magazine was the only other publication which has an Australasian circulation which rivalled or exceeded that of the Sydney *Bulletin*. If this was so, and it is a dubious claim for the period following the Boer War, the magazine must have circulated in Australasia at around its British figure of 150,000.\(^2\)

It evoked widespread enthusiasm from numerous politicians, lawyers, professors, governors and churchmen who saw in it an excellent means of


\(^2\) *Review of Reviews*, 20 Feb. 1901, p.191, for Stead on 'The Commonwealth of Australia'.
keeping abreast with the voluminous outpourings of most of the overseas monthly and quarterly magazines, whose most important articles were usually summarised in a concise form. Nonetheless it lost the sympathy of many sensitive souls for its hostility to the Boers, a policy pursued by Fitchett in defiance of Stead's more peacable, humanitarian opposition to the war. Stead's progressivism did not appeal to many because of its utopian idealism, sudden enthusiasms and internal contradictions.

Though protectionist, it acted as a conservative, imperialist foil to the Bulletin's radical republicanism especially for the decade 1892-1902, after which Fitchett was replaced as editor by William H. Judkins. As well it provided a unique forum for ideas on arbitration and bimetallism, among other things, while making Australia more aware of the world and the world more aware of Australia. Its function in presenting summaries of articles from a variety of monthly magazines and its important influence on Australian thought in the 1890's and especially Australia's perceptions of the world, has not yet been placed in its proper perspective. Certainly it is one of the period's most valuable sources of impressions of America, both English and Australian.

H. Others

The commercial, suburban, foreign language and social presses of Australia have not been much mentioned in this thesis due to the lack of foreign comment in both the social, commercial and the suburban presses in general and due to the very marginal importance of the foreign language (particularly the French and German) presses of this time in their comment

1 Review of Reviews, Aug., Sept., Oct. 1892 see 'Notices'; for Australian materials appearing in the overseas press during only June and July 1892, for example, it quoted: Figaro, 25 June; Financial News, 28 June; Engineering, 10, 24 June; Pall Mall Gazette, 1 July; Financial News, 6 July; Daily News, 27 June; Economist, 25 June; Morning Advertiser, 28 June; Trade and Finance, 29 June; Illustrated London News, 2, 16 July; Bell's Weekly Messenger, 4 July; Manchester Courier, 2 July; Church Reformer, July; Lancet, July; Westminster Review, Aug.; Scottish Leader, 1 Aug.; Standard, Nature, 28 July; New Review, Financial Standard, 16 July; Daily Graphic, 20 July; Financial News, 30 July etc. Nonetheless, news in Britain concerning Australia was notoriously difficult to obtain. See Perth Morning Herald leader, 5 May 1898. There is research opportunity here on such overseas press perceptions of Australia.
on foreign affairs. Clippings of commercial weeklies such as the Meat Traders' Journal or monthlies like the Australian Storekeepers' Journal sometimes found their way into the despatches from American Consuls and in Colonial Office materials with their comment on economic reactions to overseas trends.

There were 16 suburban newspapers in Sydney in 1904, half a dozen of them serving areas of over 20,000 population. In Melbourne, there were 40 suburban papers in 1904, the Prahran Telegraph and South Melbourne Record reached 40,000 people while the Richmond Australian and Guardian reached 37,000; the Carlton Gazette 34,000 and the Collingwood Mercury 32,000. These weeklies would richly reward research.¹

Miriam Gilson and Jerzy Zubryzcki have examined the foreign language press in an introductory way. The Australische Zeitung of Melbourne and Tanunda, and the Nord Australische Zeitung (to 1903); Der Lutherische Kirchenbote fuer Australien; the Australischen Christenbote and Kirchen und Missions Zeitung; the Deutsche Australische Post and Queenslander Herald, were the most important German publications during the period serving 45,000 immigrants. Of the Scandinavian press, the Hjemlandstoner 1893-96 and the Norden after 1896, were monthlies. Le Courrier Australien was first issued on 30 April 1892 by C. de Wroblewaki, a Polish emigré who married the daughter of a French pioneer in Dubbo - Jean de Buillon Emile Serisier. The French weekly has been one of the most durable papers in Australia. The Uniamoci published by Joseph Prampolini (1903-04) and L'Italico Australiano (1905-09) were left-wing Italian weeklies. The Chinese Australian Herald from 1894 in Sydney and the Chinese Times from 1902 in Melbourne were weeklies serving that group.²

Of the social weeklies, Melbourne's conservative Table Talk (very important for local politics when run by Maurice Brodzky as editor and proprietor 1885-1903) and the left-leaning Champion (1895-97) were noteworthy. In Adelaide, the Quiz and Lantern and the Critic, founded September 1897 had some small overseas comment, generally of a frivolous nature.

¹Reuter's Telegram Co. Lists (1904), op.cit.
²M. Gilson and J. Zubryzcki, The Foreign Language Press in Australia, 1848-64 (Canberra, 1967), Chapter one.
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Office Papers

Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, Melbourne, 1901-08.
Congressional Record, Washington, 1889-1908.
Despatches, United States Department of State, United States Consuls in Sydney, Melbourne, Newcastle, 1889-1906, microfilms, A.N.L., Canberra.
Parliamentary Debates, Legislative Assembly, N.S.W., Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, West Australia, Tasmania, 1889-1908.

Newspapers, Magazines and Journals

Advance Australia (Melbourne)
Advertiser (Adelaide)
Advocate (Melbourne)
Age (Melbourne)
Albury Border Post
Albury Daily News
Ararat Advertiser
Argus (Melbourne)
Armidale Chronicle
Armidale Express
Arrow (Sydney)
Austral Light (Melbourne)
Australasian (Melbourne)
Australasian Hebrew (Sydney)
Australasian Independent (Melbourne)
Australian Christian World (Sydney)
Australian News (Sydney)
Australian Star (Sydney)
Australian Storekeepers' Journal (Sydney)
Australian Town and Country Journal (Sydney)
Australian Workman (Sydney)
Bacchus Marsh Express
Bairnsdale Advertiser
Bairnsdale Courier
Ballarat Courier
Ballarat Star
Barrier Miner (Broken Hill)
Bathurst Daily Argus
Beacon (Melbourne)
Bega Gazette
Bega Standard
Benalla Standard
Bendigo Advertiser
Bendigo Evening Mail
Bendigonian
Bendigo Independent
Boomerang (Brisbane)
Border Morning Mail (Albury)
Bowral Free Press
Braidwood Despatch
Brisbane Evening Observer
Brisbane Worker
Bulletin (Sydney)
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Cairns Argus
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Carlton Gazette (Melbourne)
Casterton News
Castlemaine Leader
Catholic Press (Sydney)
Champion (Melbourne)
Chronicle (Adelaide)
Church Commonwealth (Melbourne)
Clarence and Richmond Examiner (Grafton)
Cobarco Watch
Colac Reformer
Collingwood Mercury (Melbourne)
Commonweal and Workers' Advocate (Melbourne)
Coolgardie Miner
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